

Third 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. LXXI No. 84B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, November 1, 2018

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	Man.
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	Ind.
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
LAMONT, Dougald	St. Boniface	Lib.
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, Hon.	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	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
SMITH, Andrew	Southdale	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
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, Hon.	Gimli	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, November 1, 2018

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon, everybody. Please be seated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Madam Speaker: Introduction of bills?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development Fifth Report

Mr. Dennis Smook (Chairperson): I wish to present the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Your Standing Committee on Social and Economic—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development presents the following as its Fifth Report.

Meetings

Your Committee met on October 31, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building.

Matters under Consideration

- **Bill (No. 29)** – *The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune (pratiques de chasse sécuritaires et gestion intégrée de la faune)*
- **Bill (No. 35)** – *The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales (gestion améliorée des pâturages communautaires et des terres domaniales agricoles)*
- **Bill (No. 36)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Offences)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (conduite avec facultés affaiblies)*

- **Bill (No. 223)** – *The Child and Family Services Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille*
- **Bill (No. 228)** – *The Animal Shelter and Rescue Awareness Day Act/Loi sur la Journée de sensibilisation aux refuges et aux établissements de secours pour animaux*

Committee Membership

- Hon. Mr. CULLEN
- Hon. Mr. EICHLER
- Ms. FONTAINE
- Ms. KLASSEN
- Mr. MARCELINO (Tyndall Park)
- Mr. PIWNIUK (Vice-Chairperson)
- Mrs. SMITH (Point Douglas)
- Mr. SMOOK (Chairperson)
- Hon. Ms. SQUIRES
- Mr. WISHART
- Mr. WOWCHUK

Public Presentations

*Your Committee heard the following ten presentations on **Bill (No. 29)** – The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune (pratiques de chasse sécuritaires et gestion intégrée de la faune):*

*Scott Phillips, Municipalities in the Ag Zone
Cameron Neurenberg, Private Citizen
Archie McPherson, Reeve for Westman Area
Michelle Assailly, Private Citizen
Joseph Maud, First Nations and Treaty Two Territory
Cornell McLean, Chief, Lake Manitoba First Nations
Cindy McKay, Private Citizen
Brian Kotak, Manitoba Wildlife Federation
Jimmy Thunder, Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs
Jeremy McKay, Private Citizen*

*Your Committee heard the following three presentations on **Bill (No. 35)** – The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales (gestion améliorée des pâturages communautaires et des terres domaniales agricoles):*

Dean Harder, National Farmers Union – Manitoba
 Brian Lemon, Manitoba Beef Producers
 Christian Artuso, Bird Studies Canada

Your Committee heard the following three presentations on **Bill (No. 223)** – *The Child and Family Services Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille*:

Manoj Nowrang, Private Citizen
 Dr. Mary LeMaître, Private Citizen
 Michelle Scott & Breanne Hepp (by leave), Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre

Your Committee heard the following two presentations on **Bill (No. 228)** – *The Animal Shelter and Rescue Awareness Day Act/Loi sur la Journée de sensibilisation aux refuges et aux établissements de secours pour animaux*:

Kevin Toyne, Winnipeg Humane Society
 Katie Powell, Save A Dog Network Canada

Written Submissions

Your Committee received the following five written submissions on **Bill (No. 29)** – *The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune (pratiques de chasse sécuritaires et gestion intégrée de la faune)*:

Joe Masi, Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM)
 Tom Teichroeb, Manitoba Beef Producers
 Michel Leclaire, The Wildlife Society, Manitoba Chapter
 James Battershill, Keystone Agricultural Producers
 Pam Robins, Function Four Ltd.

Your Committee received the following five written submissions on **Bill (No. 35)** – *The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales (gestion améliorée des pâturages communautaires et des terres domaniales agricoles)*:

James Battershill, Keystone Agricultural Producers
 Lynne Fernandez, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
 Barry Ross, Association of Manitoba Community Pastures

Duncan Morrison, Manitoba Forage and Grassland Association

Katherine Storey, Private Citizen

Bills Considered and Reported

- **Bill (No. 29)** – *The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune (pratiques de chasse sécuritaires et gestion intégrée de la faune)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill, without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 35)** – *The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales (gestion améliorée des pâturages communautaires et des terres domaniales agricoles)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill, without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 36)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Offences)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (conduite avec facultés affaiblies)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill, without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 223)** – *The Child and Family Services Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill, without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 228)** – *The Animal Shelter and Rescue Awareness Day Act/Loi sur la Journée de sensibilisation aux refuges et aux établissements de secours pour animaux*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill, without amendment.

Mr. Smook: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee on Private Bills Second Report

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Chairperson): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

Clerk: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the following as its Second Report—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Clerk: —meetings. Your committee met on October—dispense or no dispense, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: I heard dispense and then I heard a no, so I'm assuming the member has to—

Clerk: Okay, your—meetings: Your committee met on October 31st, 2018 at 6 o'clock p.m. in room 254 of the Legislative Building.

Matters under consideration: Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act; Bill 230, the fetal alcohol spectrum disorder awareness act.

Committee membership: Mr. Allum; Honourable Mr. Gerrard; Mrs. Guillemard; Mr. Helwer; Mr. Isleifson; Mr. Lindsey; Mr. Michaleski; Mr. Nesbitt, Chairperson; Honourable Mr. Pedersen, Mr. Swan.

Your committee elected Mr. Isleifson as the Chairperson.

Public presentations: Your committee heard the following seven presentations on Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act: Kristen Hardy, private citizen; Angie Herrera, private citizen; Debbie Mintz, private citizen; Isha Khan, Manitoba Human Rights Commission; Alex Edye-Mazowita, by leave, private citizen; Samantha Rayburn Trubyk, private citizen; Lindsey Mazur, Manitobans Against Weight Stigma.

Your committee heard the following two presentations on Bill 230, The Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Awareness Day Act: Debbie Cielen, FASD life journey; Ab Chudley, doctor, private citizen.

Written submissions: Your committee received the following eight written submissions on Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act: Alexander Edye-Mazowita, private citizen; Ian Patton, Obesity Canada; Kaileigh Tod, private citizen; Laura Elliott, private citizen; Melissa Flick, private citizen; Shirin Moossavi, Obesity Canada Students and New Professionals, Manitoba chapter; Kristy Wittmeier, private citizen; Jocelyn Greenwood, private citizen.

Your committee received the following four written submissions on Bill 230, The Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Awareness Day Act: Carrie McIntosh, Manitoba FASD Coalition; Joanne Wyman, The Pas and Area FASD Committee; Lisa Balcaen and others, FASD Family Network advisory council; Maraleigh Short, Touchstone FASD program.

Bills considered and reported: Bill 230, The Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Awareness Day Act. Your committee agreed to report this bill without amendment.

Bills considered and not reported: Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act.

Mr. Nesbitt: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Isleifson), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

House Business

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): On House business.

Madam Speaker: On House business.

Ms. Fontaine: Madam Speaker, despite the October 31st, 2018, decision of the Standing Committee on Private Bills to not report Bill 216, could you please canvass the House to—for leave to 'rever'-refer Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act, back to the Standing Committee on Private Bills so that the committee can reconsider the decision to report the bill to the House?

Madam Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable member, however routine proceedings is not the usual time to deal with committee announcements or referral of items to committees. Those types of announcements or decisions are usually made just prior to or just after orders of the day are announced. So I would invite the honourable member to raise her issue then.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Infrastructure): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table Manitoba Infrastructure Annual Report for 2017-2018 and I am also pleased to table the Annual Report for 2017-2018 Crown Lands and Property Agency.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise today in the Assembly to table addendum the—Responsible Recovery, Public Accounts 2017-18, for the year ending March 31st, 2018, volume 2.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

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

Would the honourable minister please proceed with her statement.

Domestic Violence Awareness Month

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Domestic violence affects women, men and children and it has long-lasting effects that reverberate through generations.

Intimate partner violence ranges from verbal and emotional abuse to physical and sexual abuse, and we know that women are more likely to suffer from domestic violence and other extreme forms of gender-based violence.

Sadly, intimate partner violence is an issue that often evokes secrecy and shame. It is an issue that many people live in silence with. It is incredibly hard for one to admit that the very person that they love the most is the person that is hurting them the most.

That is why today I would like to commend and acknowledge the bravery of one extraordinary woman, Emily Cablek, who is in the gallery with us here today. Emily has recently published her book called *Holding Onto Hope* which describes her journey of surviving a violent relationship and the abduction of her children to Mexico by her former partner.

Emily's former partner abducted her two young children while they were on a court-approved visit. After four years, the children were located in Mexico and, with the assistance of Winnipeg police and the Canadian Centre for Child Protection and many, many other supporters, Emily was reunited with her children.

Emily is now sharing her story and demonstrating strength and resiliency. Because of her voice,

other women like her will garner the strength to stand up against domestic violence.

Her voice also reminds us that we all have a responsibility to end violence. We must continue to promote education and awareness programs and ensure that those we care about are able to live free from violence. It is our responsibility to create an environment where survivors are supported as they rebuild their lives.

Today I'd also like to commend all the agencies in Manitoba providing support to survivors of domestic violence. These front-line workers are angels on earth.

I would like to ask all my colleagues in the House to help me honour Emily for her bravery and courage in sharing her story of survival and letting the world know and other domestic violence survivors know that they are never alone.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

* (13:40)

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): November is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, bringing attention to the epidemic levels of violence against women and girls.

Every year, Madam Speaker, one in 10 Canadian women are physically and/or sexually abused by her partner. Approximately every six days, a woman in Canada is killed by her intimate partner. Sixty-seven per cent of Canadians say they have personally known at least one woman who has experienced physical and sexual abuse. Indigenous women are murdered six times the rate of non-indigenous women, significantly contributing to the issue of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls here in Canada.

We know women do not report domestic violence because: (1) they fear for their safety of themselves or their children, (2) they lack supports or resources to get them out of their current situation, and (3) unfortunately, they feel shame about coming forward with the abuse because of the stigma attached to domestic violence.

Domestic violence affects women and girls from all socio-economic circumstances, ages or cultural or racialized communities, Madam Speaker. While physical violence is the most commonly discussed form of domestic violence, verbal, psychological, financial and spiritual abuse is far too often also experienced.

Reducing the stigma around domestic violence necessarily involves openly and courageously continuing to discuss and bring awareness to domestic violence, not only during the month of November, but year round.

I encourage all Manitobans to participate in events that honour victims of domestic abuse, including MMIWG here in Manitoba, throughout November, including tonight's Wabnung Abinoonjiag's second annual Domestic Violence Awareness Walk that begins at 6 p.m. at 225 Dufferin Ave.

Miigwech, Madam Speaker.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): Today begins Domestic Violence Awareness Month, which here in Manitoba is so very important as we still maintain the second highest police reported intimate partner violence of all the provinces. This is double the national rate, Madam Speaker.

The tendency that it has in being passed down over generations makes it all the more important that we develop effective methods for combating abusive behaviors. Domestic violence comes in many forms, and it can affect anyone of any age, gender, race, or sexual orientation.

Understanding the cycle of abuse is the first step towards breaking it. For those experiencing domestic violence, you are not alone and there is help out there.

Today a group called Ending Violence Across Manitoba is holding a training session about domestic violence and technology. Here they will teach service providers about the ever changing face of domestic violence and how technology can be used against victims and how they can protect themselves.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and I, I would like to thank Emily again for sharing her story, and to thank all the staff and volunteers and funders of Ending Violence Across Manitoba, as well as the 33 agencies across our province that help for—people affected by domestic violence.

Thank you.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Jackie Ratz

Ms. Janice Morley-Lecomte (Seine River): Heart warrior queen: the name is presented strongly and clearly and depicts the individual who wears the title.

At 24, Jackie Ratz was treated for cancer, a lump in her chest. About 20 years later, she entered a doctor's office and was told, you are right on time. What a greeting to hear. Jackie then learned that this is the timeline identified for individuals who have received chemotherapy. She also learned that due to the proximity of the mass to her heart, she had developed a heart illness: chemo-induced cardiomyopathy.

Determined to understand the condition and seek support, Jackie embarked on an ambitious path. She quickly learned Manitoba had no support for women who suffered from heart disease, and no formal groups for women to share their experiences with each other.

Heart disease is the No. 1 killer of women. However, women are often unaware of its symptoms and uneducated about prevention measures. Heart warrior queen evolved in response to create awareness of the disease and support for women who have it.

In 2016 Jackie began the Canadian Women with Medical Heart Issues support group. The group amassed support, medical experts and other women dealing with heart disease. There are now more than 350 women in this support group.

Jackie has also established a Manitoba chapter of the Canadian HeartLife Foundation. The first annual World Heart Day Walk was held at the Dakota Fieldhouse this fall. The walk was a huge success, with more than 90 individuals of all ages walking for heart health. The second World Heart Health Day Walk is already being planned.

Jackie also recently participated at the Canadian Cardiovascular Congress in Ottawa. Jackie never imagined herself in this position. However, her thirst for knowledge and the desire for change is leading the way for women to lead better, healthier lives.

Let us all rise in honour of Jackie Ratz and her contributions to heart health.

Allan and Dorothy Smith

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): Madam Speaker, today I rise on a matter that troubles me deeply.

Barbara Smith recently contacted me about the injustice her parents are suffering at the hands of our health-care system. Her parents, Allan and Dorothy Smith, two residents of Brandon, Manitoba, are celebrating their 70th wedding anniversary this year.

They have spent their entire lives together and believed they would continue—that would continue into their twilight years. But after Dorothy fell and broke her hip, she now needs 24-hour care and has been placed in a personal-care facility.

When Allan, a 95-year-old veteran, applied to live in the same care home as his wife and life partner, he was denied. He was too healthy. In order to spend time together, Allan now drives to Dorothy's care home every day.

They are not the first couple to be put in this situation. Ruth and Claire Wyatt were separated this year when Ruth was placed in a care home.

Other provinces, like BC, have provisions that allow partners to live with their spouse in their care facilities, but they take care of their own meals, so they aren't using home-care resources.

We need a review of our policies so we are no longer separating Manitobans from their loved ones.

Reynold Reyes

Mr. Jon Reyes (St. Norbert): Imagine you're 22 years old, you've been married just over a year, and you leave your spouse and daughter behind to immigrate to a country that you have never been to before because you have to provide for your family.

Today, I pay tribute to the individual who took a chance to take that opportunity to come to Canada and to call Manitoba his new home. That person is none other than my father, Reynold Reyes, who celebrates this month of November, 50 years in this great country and province.

In November 1968, my father boarded the plane from the Philippines and on the way to Winnipeg, Manitoba.

My father was a garment worker and I was happy to attend the 50th anniversary and reunion of the Philippine Garment Workers Association and to recognize their group on behalf of our province on this significant milestone. It was very admirable for them to leave their homeland and make Canada their new home.

Many immigrants and their children, whether they immigrated in the past or present, still face common challenges such as language barriers, employment, housing, prejudice and racism, to name a few. Successful immigrants rise to the challenge. They are here to work, they're here for opportunity, they assimilate into Canadian culture. They are here

to build a foundation for their family for a better future for their children and future generations to come.

As we know, many Filipinos started immigrating to Manitoba back around the time my father did and we have seen a significant growth in the Filipino community across our province.

* (13:50)

We should always recognize those who came before us and those who paved the way for a better future, and today, I recognize you, Dad. Tito Junior told me if it wasn't for you, our family would not be here.

So, on behalf of my father, who has been here for 50 years this month, I want to say thank you, Winnipeg; thank you, Manitoba; thank you, Canada, for accepting my father, accepting my family and many immigrants who have immigrated to our great province, and most of all, thank you, Dad.

Shining Star Productions Manitoba

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): Shining Star Productions is a local company that highlights the young talent found in our communities here in Manitoba.

Since 2016, Dr. Gurinder Randhawa, who is the managing director and producer of Shining Star and who has joined us here today in the gallery, has been promoting the talent of children and youth through Mega Asian Beauty Pageants and Kids Fashion Show that she created with a dedicated team here in Manitoba.

Shining Star provides a free-of-charge platform for children and youth, and this is only possible because of generous sponsors such as Kings Cargo Express and Print Point.

Madam Speaker, through Shining Star, children and youth here in Manitoba are given a chance to shine and showcase themselves to industry professionals. Contestants in this pageant frequently find themselves becoming part of a greater performance. Whether it's music videos, modelling, acting in Canadian-based movies, singing or hooping, these contestants remain motivated.

When I asked Dr. Gurinder her thoughts about Shining Star Productions, she explained that for those involved, they end up becoming like extended family to one another. She emphasized how many relationships are built throughout the process, how

the talent amongst the youth and children are strengthened and how all contestants and people who come out of the shows are empowered and motivated.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to applaud the hard work and dedication that all contestants showcase, and a big thank you to Dr. Gurinder for all your continued dedication and hard work that goes into providing children and youth here in Manitoba opportunities to further explore their passions in the arts.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in thanking Dr. Gurinder for the work she's doing for children and youth here in our province.

Nancy and Robert Wheeldon

Mr. Bob Lagassé (Dawson Trail): Madam Speaker, I am rising today to honour two very humble Dawson Trail heroes, Robert and Nancy Wheeldon.

Robert and Nancy are the founders of Parkland Mews Falconry and Bird of Prey Education Centre. They have dedicated their time, energy, home and land to the conservation, research and protection of one of Manitoba's most loved birds, the peregrine falcon.

In 1992, the Province of Manitoba first declared that—the peregrine falcon as an endangered species. It's at that time when Robert and Nancy began their work. Researching, studying and tracking all became part of their daily life. They built a captive area for young peregrine chicks, as well as a specialty—designed breeding facility, all while producing the official provincial peregrine falcon recovery plan and strategy.

In 2005, their very first captive breed peregrine chicks were successfully released into the wild, and since then many more have followed.

Thanks to Nancy's connections with the University of Manitoba, Parkland Mews has been in partnership with the faculty of environment, providing internship opportunities to students as well as collaborating for research purposes. This remarkable organization has also been assisting the province of Alberta with their efforts in protecting the peregrine falcon and the design of their provincial release program.

Robert and Nancy want to ensure that peregrine falcons are still around for the next generation. Therefore, they have created an education centre within the falconry. School groups and other groups

can come in and learn about peregrine falcons and other birds of prey.

Unfortunately, they have seen a decline in peregrine falcon breeding pairs within the last year. This, however, does not discourage Robert and Nancy or their team, and they will continue their efforts to ensure peregrine falcons are around for years to come.

Please join me in recognizing the extraordinary efforts of Nancy and Robert Wheeldon.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to oral questions, we have some guests in the gallery that I would like to introduce to you.

I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today family members of the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Reyes). They are: father, Reynold Reyes; mother, Leticia Reyes; sister, Lorraine Vilela; and spouse, Cynthia Reyes. And on behalf of all members here, we welcome you all to the Manitoba Legislature.

Also seated in the public gallery from Seven Oaks Adult Education Centre we have seven students under the direction of Samantha Hancox, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine).

And also seated in the public gallery from Springs Christian Academy we have 36 grade 9 and 11 students under the direction of Brad Dowler, and this school is located in the constituency of St. Boniface.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Manitoba Hydro Privatization Inquiry

Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Speaker, all across Canada we've seen Conservative premiers promise to not privatize Crown corporations, and then break their words and move towards privatization. We know privatization's bad because it always leads to higher bills for families who got to pay for their hydro rates.

Now, here in Manitoba we know that Gary Filmon made a promise to not privatize MTS during

an election and then he broke that promise immediately following that election.

In British Columbia a similar situation happened. Gordon Campbell made a promise not to privatize BC Hydro in the 2001 election, then he proceeded to break that promise over the following years. The first thing that Campbell decided to privatize was the back-end operations of that Crown corporation.

Now, this Premier says he won't privatize, but he's gone out to hire the very same Gordon Campbell, and now his new Hydro CEO is someone who worked with Gordon Campbell to privatize BC Hydro.

Will the Premier commit to not privatizing any part of Manitoba Hydro?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Manitoba Hydro belongs to all Manitobans, and on this side of the House we believe, Madam Speaker, that all Manitobans should have a say in the ownership structure of Manitoba Hydro. That's why on this side of the House we support a referendum as being the only mechanism that could possibly ever result in the privatization of Manitoba Hydro in any way, shape or form.

So, Madam Speaker, we stand by that. We believe Manitobans are the proper decision-makers in respect of any of the future structuring of their Manitoba Hydro.

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

Mr. Kinew: So immediately after promising to not privatize hydro in that 2001 election, Gordon Campbell broke that promise and he started the process of breaking up the corporation. Now, the first thing he privatized was the back end—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —of BC Hydro: the management, the administration, the IT services. They were what was privatized and they were farmed out to an accounting firm called Accenture.

Now, Accenture made over a billion and a half dollars over the following 10 years after Campbell privatized those parts of that company. The net result of Campbell's promise being broken? Well, billions of dollars paid out to a private firm and higher and higher bills paid by families in BC.

The common thread in this story is, of course, that Gordon Campbell has been hired to review our Crown utility. And now Jay Grewal, the new head of the corporation, who was in senior management at BC Hydro and then also went to work at Accenture, has now been named the CEO of Manitoba Hydro.

These are very important issues.

Will the Premier commit to privatizing no part of Manitoba Hydro?

Mr. Pallister: Well, Madam Speaker, what we'll commit to do is exactly what we've been doing, which is to pursue the better operations of all aspects of government, including our Crown corporations. What we will commit to not doing is allowing the political decision-making—as happened under the NDP—to result in the imperilment of the future of Hydro.

* (14:00)

A \$15-billion expansion was made under the NDP without the authority of—that should have been given to the people of Manitoba to participate in the process of such an unprecedented and illogical expansion.

Madam Speaker, that's the kind of thing we're trying to clean up. We inherited a mess at Manitoba Hydro and we'll do our best to get the bottom of how to clean it up.

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

Mr. Kinew: Madam Speaker, Gordon Campbell broke his promise to not privatize BC Hydro. Now, when he broke that promise more than a decade ago, he hived off a part of BC Hydro to a firm called Accenture.

Now, that private—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —corporation made millions of dollars in profit out of billions of dollars in payouts, even as regular families in BC saw their hydro bills increase.

Now, one of the senior management at BC Hydro who helped implement Campbell's privatization plan was Jay Grewal. She later became a managing partner at Accenture, the private company that took over the public utility's former services.

Now, the expertise in leading a campaign for privatization is the expertise that this Premier is after.

He's paying millions of dollars to pay the people who privatized BC Hydro. The end result will be higher bills for Manitobans.

Will the Premier commit to not privatizing any part of Manitoba Hydro?

Mr. Pallister: Nowhere in there, Madam Speaker, was any respect shown for the tremendous capabilities of Mr. Campbell or Ms. Grewal, who will become the first female head of Manitoba Hydro in its history. That's something to celebrate.

The member's slightly veiled attacks on the character of those two people are unsuitable and inappropriate, Madam Speaker, and belie the fact that he himself asks for forgiveness for past transgressions and now tries to chastise others for their decisions, not based on their lack of competence or integrity, but rather on the philosophical differences he has with decisions that they took.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is highly inappropriate and disrespectful, and I expect that the member would want to apologize to Ms. Grewal immediately.

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

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: The former BC premier and now paid employee of this Manitoba government, Gordon Campbell, broke his word, not only privatizing BC Hydro, but he also banned the public generation of electricity in that province. He forced BC Hydro to buy their electricity from private producers.

Now, this is the person that this Premier gave two and a half million dollars to conduct a so-called study of our most important Crown corporation. There's no other reason to hire Gordon Campbell unless this Premier wants to privatize Manitoba Hydro.

Now the Premier has also hired one of the executives who helped Campbell implement the privatization of BC Hydro. Now, their experience is in privatization. We know that Manitoba's hydro-Hydro's future—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —has already been put at risk by this Premier, but is he setting the stage for privatization?

Will the Premier commit to not privatizing any part of Manitoba Hydro?

Mr. Pallister: Madam Speaker, this tired old chestnut revealed again in the persona of the new leader of the NDP has been run up and down the pole by NDP governments for the past 20 years.

I've answered his question in respect of privatization by saying that we on this side of the House respect the will of the people of Manitoba. But I would also encourage him to understand that to chastise or to try to discredit a person of the integrity of Gordon Campbell is totally inappropriate for this Chamber.

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

Mr. Kinew: So after cutting a cheque to Gordon Campbell for a few million dollars, the Premier announces today that he's bringing in an executive who helped to execute Campbell's privatization effort in BC.

Now, she moved—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —from being senior management at BC Hydro to being a managing partner at Accenture. Now, over the course of a 10-year period following this privatization, Accenture was paid over one and a half billion dollars.

Now, it looks like there's a lot of money in privatization for well-off executives, but it always leads to higher bills for the families who have to pay those rates. That's what happened in BC and now the Premier is bringing the people who wrote that playbook here to Manitoba. That's what the concern is; the Premier is sowing chaos with our largest Crown corporation and is now bringing in privateers to work for Manitoba Hydro.

Will the Premier commit to not privatizing any part of Manitoba Hydro?

Mr. Pallister: If anyone has a record for sowing chaos it would be the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew), Madam Speaker.

As far as the issues at hand, Madam Speaker, we have the intent to clean up the mess at Manitoba Hydro left by the previous NDP government. Mr. Campbell and Madam Grewal both have experience in cleaning up the messes left to them by previous socialist governments in their jurisdiction, and we—when the member speaks about

the costs, the cost of the entire exercise is one ten-thousandth of 1 per cent of the \$15 billion that the NDP threw away with the excessive expansion of Manitoba Hydro. And in terms of the—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —just the bipole and Keeyask projects, Madam Speaker, that was 15—I repeat—\$15 billion. The cost of this exercise will be more than repaid, and we expect one ten-thousandth of 1 per cent in our ability to move forward and strengthen Manitoba Hydro for the good of Manitobans.

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

Mr. Kinew: He won't commit to not privatizing any part of Manitoba Hydro, Madam Speaker.

Now, the Conservative privatization playbook is predictable, but it still needs to be called out. Step 1 is to deny, deny, deny and attempt to lull the public into a false—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —sense of security. Step 2 is to create chaos and uncertainty regarding said Crown corporation, and then—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —step 3 is to bring in the experts who will break up the Crown utility and oversee the actual selling off of those public goods.

Now, we know that they're brought it—they're bringing in these experts in the form of Boston Consulting, KPMG and now Gordon Campbell and the new CEO of Manitoba Hydro. It happened in BC, it happened in Ontario, and now the Premier is trying to do it here.

Manitoba Hydro is too important. We need our bills to stay affordable.

Will the Premier of Manitoba promise to not privatize any part of Manitoba Hydro?

Mr. Pallister: If the member wants to have an integrity duel with Gordon Campbell, he best come up with a better rap sheet than the one he has.

Madam Speaker, Gordon Campbell is a man of integrity and he has represented the people of his province and this country for decades. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: He deserves better treatment than the member's giving him from the ideological platform he chirps from.

Madam Speaker, we are cleaning up a mess—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: We are cleaning up a mess at Manitoba Hydro. Fifteen billion dollars was thrown at two projects that the previous NDP government had no reason to throw away, money that could've gone—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —to health care, money that could've gone to roads or education, money that could've helped people living in poverty. It cannot help them today because the NDP squandered that money.

We're going to get to the bottom of the processes that led to those fateful decisions, and we're going to find out how we move Manitoba Hydro forward and strengthen it for all the people of Manitoba, regardless of their ideologies.

Education Review Committee Student–Teacher Representation

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Well, it's clear, Madam Speaker, that this government continues on its agenda of privatization and cuts, and because of that, teachers around the province are telling me that they're concerned.

They're concerned about their future and how they'll have to do more with less. They'll have to teach more students and more students with complex needs, with fewer resources and fewer EAs to help them in the classroom.

We know that the Education Minister's review is really an excuse for a cost-cutting exercise.

Instead, will this minister listen to teachers? Will he, in fact, commit to having representations—representatives from teacher organizations, like MTS, be a part of the committee that will write his review?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Education and Training): We will absolutely listen to teachers. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

The honourable member for Concordia, on a supplementary question.

* (14:10)

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, the minister's already taken steps to make cuts in advance of his so-called review. He told the people of Gimli, for instance, that they were not allowed to use their own money to build the badly needed music facility that the students were asking for, and then on top of that, his caucus laughed at the plight of those students here in this House when the issue was raised.

Parents and students know what's best for their education and their voices need to be heard. They need to be respected. We've—haven't seen that so far from this minister.

So I'll ask him again: Will this minister commit to having representatives from student and parent organizations as part of the committee that will write his review?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, I'm glad that the member opposite raises the issue of capital investments.

Of course, we have the seven new schools, but we also know that there needs to be maintenance in schools as well, something the NDP never did. I would reference a school in Ochre River, Madam Speaker, that the furnaces were so old and they were expired that it did not provide adequate fresh air to the school in accordance with code. There wasn't fresh air to the students in accordance with code. But, of course, they came to the NDP and they asked for support; they were rejected for five years.

We came into government; we're providing fresh air to students. I think that's important.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, once again the minister refuses to answer a simple question here in this House.

Local communities are concerned; they see the impacts of the cuts that this government has made to the education system over the past two years. They see it in the classroom. They see they're getting bigger and the resources which are harder and harder to find. They see a government which is more concerned about the bottom line than it is about the education that our students receive.

So I'll ask him again, clearly, the voices of people outside of his Cabinet table need to be heard. Will the minister commit to having voices of local

trustees and their school board representatives as part of the committee that will write his review?

Mr. Goertzen: Well, Madam Speaker, I answered in the first question: we absolutely are going to be listening to educators.

But I think it's important, when you talk about the quality of education, it also talks about the quality of the facilities that you're in. Now that was referenced in the second question by the member opposite.

When I look to the Lac du Bonnet school—Lac du Bonnet—the boilers were 58 years old. In fact, the ventilation rates—the ventilation rates in the school did not meet the codes. But, of course, the NDP were asked to fix the boilers so that the ventilation could—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Goertzen: —be fixed and brought up to code. They asked the—they asked in 2002, Madam Speaker, but for 15 years the NDP said no to proper ventilation.

The member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko) came into government and got it done.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Accessibility for Manitobans Act Implementation Timeline

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): Today is a crucial deadline for accessibility in Manitoba. This government has—if they had done their job today, 200,000 Manitobans with disabilities would be able to access the same services as everybody else does. But this government has failed. The accessibility for Manitoba act has—was designed so that every Manitoban could enjoy life to the fullest and that barriers would be removed.

We know that Barrier-Free Manitoba—from Barrier-Free Manitoba that this government doesn't even have a system to make sure that businesses are complying with the act.

Madam Speaker, I'll ask the minister today—for Families—to explain why this work has not been done and why she's broken the promise to over 200,000 Manitobans with disabilities.

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Families): Well, once again, Madam Speaker, a litany of false assertions from the member opposite.

In fact, today is the first day and the first time that all government offices, businesses, not-for-profits must comply with the accessibility customer service standards in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, we have committed to implementing the five accessibility standards. We are on track to do so ahead of time, ahead of what the NDP had promised that they would do it. We are committed to delivering for Manitobans.

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

Mrs. Smith: The Accessibility for Manitobans Act was designed to remove barriers so that every Manitoban could live 'til their—to their fullest. Barrier-Free Manitoba calls this government's failure to make sure that AMA is being followed, and I'll quote: a grave concern. End of quote.

They also go on to say that this government has ignored Barrier-Free Manitoba's request to consult with disability communities. When it comes to making sure that the law is being followed, they're failing.

Madam Speaker, why has this government failed to consult with disability communities regarding legislation that directly impacts over 200,000 Manitobans with disabilities?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, the member opposite couldn't be further from the truth, Madam Speaker. In fact, I am pleased to be working with the Accessibility Advisory Council to advance this very important piece of legislation.

I have said that we are on track to actually deliver. It will be the fastest implementation of accessibility standards in the country. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a final supplementary.

Mrs. Smith: We know the track record of this government in working with groups. It's not good, and I'll give you an example. Barrier-Free Manitoba says that their work has been hampered by the lack of resources, the lack of support and a lack of commitment from this government.

It's no surprise when this government is proudly cutting front-line workers and applauding cutting 1,200 civil servants ahead of schedule. Cutting jobs seems to be what this government does.

Madam Speaker, Barrier-Free Manitoba also says that when it comes to The Accessibility for Manitobans Act, this government doesn't have a clear plan.

Will this minister produce her plan today to fully catch up and get the work done in Manitobans—for the over 200,000 people with disabilities?

Mrs. Stefanson: Again, I am pleased to be working with the Accessibility Advisory Council in implementing and advancing this very important piece of legislation on behalf of all Manitobans, Madam Speaker.

In fact, when all five standards, Madam Speaker, are in place under this timeline, in 2020, this government will have achieved substantial process on the implementation of the accessibility Manitoba act three years earlier than anticipated under the legislation.

Lead Contamination in Soil Release of Unpublished Reports

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): We all know there was a report into lead in the soil in Point Douglas, Weston and elsewhere. The report was written 10 years ago, tabled a year ago but only received public attention in September.

The impression may be of 10 years of inaction, but the details of the report show the problem is clearly much worse.

The introduction to that report and its details refer to unpublished data of the Manitoba government going back to the early 1980s. This includes unpublished data from 1988-1989 showing very high levels of lead and other metals on Sutherland Avenue.

Since these reports were available to researchers of the department 10 years ago, will this government release that unpublished report about lead in the soil?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): The member is right to refer to the cover-up of these results for a significant period of time, but he should give credit to this minister and he should give credit to this government for the proactivity of dealing with the issue by ordering retesting, by making sure that that full lab analysis is done and by committing to releasing those results in December of this year.

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

* (14:20)

Request for Remediation Plan

Mr. Lamont: They—it's not clear to me that the Premier is referring to tests in Weston or in Point Douglas, but I asked about these unpublished reports, Madam Speaker, because I was contacted over the weekend by Dr. Eva Pip, a professor of toxicology who did tests on Sutherland in the 1980s. She's here in the gallery today.

And there was an article about these tests, which I table. In the 1980s, acceptable levels of lead were higher, and the levels measured would be 100 times—100 times—what would be considered acceptable today, including contamination in vegetables grown in gardens.

In the last 30 years, up to now, has there been any effort at remediation or notifying the affected neighbourhoods in Weston or Point Douglas?

Mr. Pallister: I'm not really clear, Madam Speaker, if the member is referring to Point Douglas specifically and solely, or to Weston and the example in his riding of St. Boniface in combination with all three, I'm not sure.

But I will say this: the previous inquiries from people in the area that he now represents were dismissed by the previous governments. The people themselves were referred to as troublemakers and problem-causers.

This minister took the initiative to listen, took the initiative to act, acted promptly and acted in a manner which shows respect for the people of his riding and I'm sure he'd want to thank her for that.

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

Mr. Lamont: Madam Speaker, if there's a common feeling in this House it is that we are all frustrated with the challenges we've inherited. I haven't referred to political parties at all in these questions. I haven't pointed a finger of blame, because the people I talk to don't care about who is to blame; they want something done.

As opposition we can ask questions and make amendments, but it is up to this government to act and we need to do more than just engage in testing.

When I look at these reports of lead and other toxic metals, I see a pile of terrible mistakes with terrible consequences and all I can think of is the people who were exposed to it and didn't know.

Those people elected us and they trusted us to protect them and to do something about it.

We know that what is required is widespread testing, public information and remediation in the affected communities and it is needed now.

Can the government and will the government commit not just to testing, but to remediation and letting people know what they can do to keep themselves safe?

Mr. Pallister: I do, Madam Speaker, appreciate the mini lecture on my responsibilities as an elected official, as I'm sure all members of the House do, from the newly elected member.

But that being said, we have taken action, Madam Speaker, on this issue and we will continue to delve deeper and we will continue to work in an accountable and transparent way to address these and many other issues which we did inherit and which were not dealt with in the same manner.

A culture of cover-up now being over, Madam Speaker, we will deal with these issues cooperatively and I appreciate the member's enquiries on this important issue.

Family Conciliation Services Budget Reduction Concerns

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): There's been a dramatic loss in resources for the Family Conciliation Services. These are essential services for families in crisis. They give courts the information they need to make decisions that are in the best interest of Manitoba children,

But instead of focusing on how to make services better, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) is focused on his cuts while his Families Minister puts false information on the record. The budget is hundreds of thousands of dollars less than what was budgeted in 2015.

Why is the Premier cutting Family Conciliation Services?

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Families): The member opposite is wrong, Madam Speaker. There—we continue to deliver conciliation services to the—Manitoba, as we did last year, the year before.

I will remind member opposite that we did inherit a mess from the previous NDP government. We are taking action to cleaning up that mess, Madam Speaker.

But when it comes to family law reform, the members opposite had 17 years to get it right. They chose to not make it a priority. We will make it a priority for Manitoba families.

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

Ms. Fontaine: The minister stood in the House yesterday and stated, and I quote: "The fact of the matter is that the money that goes into conciliation services in Manitoba is more than was ever put into conciliation services in Manitoba under the previous NDP government."

Not true, that's just false, Madam Speaker. In fact, in 2015-2016, \$1.58 million was budgeted for conciliation services. This year the minister is budgeting only \$1.2 million. That's hundreds of thousands of dollars less. Maybe the minister isn't aware of what she's cutting, but families are.

Why is the minister cutting these important services?

Mrs. Stefanson: The member opposite is wrong. Manitobans will continue to get conciliation services in Manitoba. The member opposite may not be aware of that, Madam Speaker, but that—these are the facts and it's important that we put the facts on the record.

We will—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Stefanson: —continue to clean up the mess from the previous NDP government. Where they did nothing for families in Manitoba—nothing for families when it comes to family law reform, they've never made it a priority—we will continue to make it a priority for Manitoba families.

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

Ms. Fontaine: Judges in our courtrooms raised the alarm this summer about the massive drop in services. They wanted to use this tool, but they couldn't because there's no staff available to provide the services.

This is a result of the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) family law reform: cuts for direct supports for Manitoba children, Madam Speaker, and families. Misinformation from the minister is meant to hide their true agenda to put money before Manitoba children. Family conciliation provides front-line social workers to families in crisis.

Why is the Premier cutting these supports for Manitoba children?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, Madam Speaker, again a litany of false assertions from the member opposite. There is a—same level of staffing available to deliver this—conciliation services as there was before. And so—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Stefanson: —again, we will continue to work. There are challenges for sure. And as there are more who want to use conciliation services, we will ensure that it's there for them when they need it.

Unlike members opposite who chose to not—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Stefanson: —do anything in the way of family law reform under their—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Stefanson: —watch, Madam Speaker, we will continue to work to ensure that Manitoba families get the resources that they need when they need them.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I have had to stand a number of times today, and I don't think it was ever the intent that a Speaker should have to do aerobics in a Chamber. So I would ask members to please show some respect for each other, stop yelling at each other across the House, because I don't think that effects a good sense of democracy for anybody, and please listen to the questions and answers that are being presented. I'm having some difficulty hearing, and I know that everybody expects me to be able to hear everything that's being said. So I need your co-operation in order to be able to do that.

So I would ask, please, stop yelling at each other, and let's conduct this with the sense of decorum that I think we had agreed to a number of years ago when we first started, that we were going to make better efforts towards that.

So I'd ask for everybody's co-operation, please.

Project Riverbank Criminal Property Seizure

Mr. Nic Curry (Kildonan): I can promise I will not yell or heckle the minister while he answers this important question.

Today the Minister of Justice, along with Mayor Bowman, the chief of Winnipeg Police Service and the assistant commissioner of the RCMP, sent a clear message to drug dealers and other criminals who are trying to destroy our city and our province.

Can the Minister of Justice please inform the House on one of the biggest drug busts and criminal property seizures in the history of Manitoba?

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I was happy to join Chief Smythe today, along with Assistant Commissioner Kolody of the RCMP, to witness the culmination of Project Riverbank. This was a 10-month operation that ended in the confiscation of \$2.7 million worth of illicit drugs, cash and property that would otherwise be used to hurt our families and communities.

We extend our thanks and congratulations to the officers with the Winnipeg Police Service organized crime division who initiated this complex investigation that resulted in 10 arrests across western Canada. I would also like to thank Manitoba RCMP and RCMP across western Canada, as well as Edmonton and Regina police forces. This—positive relationships have yielded positive results.

Madam Speaker, our government will stand up for Manitobans, and we will—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

*(14:30)

Climate and Green Plan Request for Government Plan

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): Madam Speaker, it's quite something when the leader of the opposition decides to side with the Premier and help give the Conservatives cover by bailing out on their climate change plan.

That's what happened when New Brunswick out-negotiated—[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont: —Manitoba. Even the Manitoba NDP is feeling sorry for the Premier.

I table New Brunswick's plan, and unlike the Premier's grab bag of wishful thinking which he cut and pasted—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont: —from the NDP non-plan, New Brunswick has legislated timelines, reductions, commitments and a way to pay for it, and it passed last March. New Brunswick, with fewer people and less wealth than Manitoba, has already started putting away \$168 million a year, every year, in a fund that they will dedicate to green projects.

Instead of complaining that he can't get no respect, why doesn't the Premier just follow New Brunswick's lead and come up with a real plan?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): A simple apology for Ottawa's conduct and his own—[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —would have been better, Madam Speaker. But the member continues to take the side of Ottawa parliamentarians as opposed to supporting Manitobans, which is what we will continue to do.

Madam Speaker, we made key commitments in our Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan and we will keep those commitments with or without the support of Ottawa.

The member should recognize that Ottawa is now adding insult to injury by threatening to withdraw over \$60 million of shared support for shared projects under the Low Carbon Economy Fund. And if he had any pretense to stand up for the best interests of our future climate or for Manitoba's future interests, he would be advocating very strongly against such a petulant and wrong-headed decision.

Ottawa is making this about fighting with the provinces. We're going to make it about standing up for Manitobans and for a greener Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member—the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Lamont: I've done my homework, Madam Speaker; I suggest the Premier do his.

Madam Speaker, the fact is New Brunswick did a great job of arguing their case. They have a large rural population. They already charge PST on fuel. They laid out a plan to reduce emissions and a way to pay for it.

The Premier keeps arguing the feds won't give us credit for hydro, but that's not exactly what he said. This government argued, on page 10 of its plan, that since Manitoba Hydro built dams instead of coal-fired generators, we should get credit for it.

So the Premier's central bargaining point is that he deserves credit for not building imaginary coal plants. There's no end of imaginary things all of us have not done, Madam Speaker.

Does the Premier recognize that not building imaginary things does nothing to prevent climate change and is—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont: —a bad bargaining chip to boot?

Mr. Pallister: Well, Madam Speaker, the member is really clever, and Brian Gallant better look out; he's got a successor going to run for that Liberal leadership over in New Brunswick for sure.

Madam Speaker, the member talks about imaginary things. One of those things is a job. He never had a job until this one, and it shows in his questions.

The fact of the matter is we are standing up for Manitoba on a serious issue. Manitobans do not want Ottawa's hands in their pocket. They've had enough of the NDP's hands in their pockets for 17 years and it's about time somebody stood up and defended Manitoba's interests.

So we'll do it, Madam Speaker, even if the member doesn't want to.

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

Mr. Lamont: Oh, no, I'm very happy to be working full-time, Madam Speaker. The Premier should try it.

One of the notable elements of the New Brunswick plan is that it commits \$168 million to a fund that will contribute to reductions year after year. It will reinvest in their province to help them reduce emissions. In contrast, Manitoba has committed to a one-time fund of \$100 million, which one expert presenter at public hearings said is a tenth of what is seriously required.

The Premier was going to use his carbon revenues to lower the deficit and cut taxes, with the biggest breaks to the highest earners. The New Brunswick plan is serious and credible, Madam Speaker. They started out in 2016; they passed it earlier—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont: —this year. A few months ago—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont: —this government was prepared to pass their bill, but it was held up for months by the NDP.

Did the NDP do this government a favour by delaying their bill, or would the Premier and his government have voted against it in the spring?

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

Mr. Pallister: Can I give the member leave to ask more questions?

Madam Speaker, the member clearly isn't interested in standing up for Manitobans. He wants higher taxes because he believes in higher taxes. He's stated that the NDP's problem wasn't underspending while they were doubling the provincial debt, but that they didn't spend more.

He wants the vote tax reinstated. He wants us to borrow more on the future of our children, and he is leading the fight to see taxes go up, because the first thing he said after he was elected was that there are all sorts of things we could do to generate new revenue. Now that's his vision for the future security of the people of Manitoba and he can live with it, but we believe in lower taxes, more money on the kitchen table and fewer hands in the pockets of Manitobans, except their own, of course, Madam Speaker.

Rural and Northern Manitoba Greyhound Service Withdrawal

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): This government—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lindsey: —abandoned the people of Churchill when the rail line closed. They abandoned them for two years—did nothing. Now—now—on the very day that the first train arrives in Churchill, this government does nothing when Greyhound quits running.

Well, that's not true. They did turn down a federal offer of some matching funds to help communities that would be without service. The Infrastructure Minister knew Greyhound would be leaving. He did nothing.

Where is the minister's plan to help people of rural and northern Manitoba who may have lost the vital link for things like health care?

I realize that they don't really care about that, but tell us what's the plan is.

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Well, I encourage the member to share his experiences at the door, going around Flin Flon telling everybody about the benefits of a higher carbon tax and leaving all the ore in the ground, Madam Speaker. I look forward to him sharing his perspectives on how his constituents think he's doing, standing up for their interests, with those two positions.

As far as the congratulations that are owed to the people of Churchill and the North, Madam Speaker, we want to offer our sincere congratulations to those people on the return of rail service to Churchill.

Madam Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

PETITIONS

Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The provincial government has announced the closure of three emergency rooms and an urgent-care centre in the city of Winnipeg—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Smith:—including closing down the emergency room at Seven Oaks General Hospital.

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

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

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

(5) The provincial government has failed to consult with families and seniors in north Winnipeg regarding the closure—closing of their emergency room or to consult with health-care officials and health-care workers at Seven Oaks to discuss how these closures would impact patient care in advance of the announcement.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to reverse the decision to close Seven Oaks General Hospital's emergency room so that families and seniors in north Winnipeg and the surrounding area have timely access to quality health-care services.

And this is signed by Merlyn Avano *[phonetic]*, Ramil Geli, Rosano Saros *[phonetic]* and many, many other Manitobans.

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

* (14:40)

Vimy Arena

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): All right. I'd—I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The residents of St. James and other areas of Manitoba are concerned with the intention expressed by the provincial government to use the Vimy Arena site as a Manitoba Housing project.

(2) The Vimy Arena site is in the middle of a residential area near many schools, churches, community clubs and senior homes, and neither the provincial government nor the City of Winnipeg considered better-suited locations in rural, semi-rural or industrial sites such as the St. Boniface Industrial Park, the 20,000 acres at CentrePort or existing properties at the Shriners Hospital or the Children's Hospital on Wellington Crescent.

(3) The provincial government is exempt from any zoning requirements that would have existed if the land was owned by the City of Winnipeg. This exemption bypasses community input and due

diligence and ignores better uses for the land that would be consistent with a residential area.

(4) There are no standards that one would expect for a treatment centre. The Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living has stated that the Department of Health had no role to play in the land acquisition for this Manitoba Housing project for use as a drug addiction facility.

(5) The Manitoba Housing project initiated by the provincial government changes the fundamental nature of the community. Including parks and rec uses, concerns of the residents of St. James and others regarding public safety, property values and their way of life have not been properly addressed.

(6) The concerns of the residents of St. James are being ignored while other obvious locations in wealthier neighbourhoods, such as Tuxedo and River Heights, have not been considered for this Manitoba Housing project, even though there are hundreds of acres of land available for development at Kapyong Barracks or places like Heubach Park that share the same zoning as the Vimy Arena site.

(7) The Manitoba Housing project and operation of a drug treatment centre fall outside of the statutory mandate of the Manitoba Housing renewal corporation.

(8) The provincial government does not have a co-ordinated plan for addiction treatment in Manitoba, as it currently underfunds treatment centres which are running far under capacity and potential.

(9) The community has been misled regarding the true intention of Manitoba Housing, as land has been transferred for a 50-bed facility even though the project clearly falls outside of Manitoba Housing responsibility.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure that the Vimy Arena site is not used for an addiction treatment facility.

(2) To urge the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure the preservation of public land along Sturgeon Creek for the purpose of park land and recreational activities for public use, including being an important component of the Sturgeon Creek Greenway Trail and the Sturgeon Creek ecosystem under the current designation of PR2 for the 255 Hamilton Ave. location at the Vimy

Arena site, and to maintain the land to continue to be designated for parks and recreation activity, neighbourhoods and community.

This petition has been signed by Marie Scottie [*phonetic*], Kyle LeBoi [*phonetic*] and Marlo Watters and many other Manitobans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Concordia Hospital Emergency Room

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

This petition is signed by many Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Further petitions? Grievances?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

House Business

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): On House business. Despite the October 31st, 2018, decision of the Standing Committee on Private Bills to not report Bill 216, could you please canvass the House for leave to refer Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act, back to the Standing Committee on Private Members Bills so that the committee can reconsider the decision to report the bill to the House?

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to refer Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act, back to the Standing Committee on Private Bills so that the committee can reconsider the decision to report the bill to the House?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: Leave has been denied.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, on House business.

I'd like to announce that the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs will meet on Wednesday, November 28th, 2018, at 6 p.m. to consider the following reports: The Annual Report of Elections Manitoba for the Year Ending December 31st, 2016, including the conduct of the 41st Provincial General Election, April 19th, 2016; as well as the Annual Report of Elections Manitoba, including the conduct of the Point Douglas by-election; a proposal to modify the voting process annual report on the activities of the Commissioner of Elections for the year ending December 31st, 2017.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs will meet on Wednesday, November 28th, 2018, at 6 p.m., to consider the following reports: Annual Report of Elections Manitoba for the year ending December 31st, 2016, including the conduct of the 41st Provincial General Election, April 19th, 2016; and the Annual Report of Elections Manitoba, including the conduct of the Point Douglas by-election; a proposal to modify the voting process and a report on the activities of the Commissioner of Elections for the year ending December 31st, 2017.

Mr. Goertzen: Again, on House Business. Could you please canvass the House for leave to consider report stage amendments on Bill 16, The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act, in the following order: amendments sponsored by the member for Wolseley, followed by amendments sponsored by the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), followed by amendments sponsored by the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade (Mr. Pedersen), rather than in the order they were filed, and Madam Speaker this would be for today, only.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to consider report stage amendments on Bill 16, The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act, in the following order: amendments sponsored by the member for Wolseley, followed by amendments sponsored by the member for River Heights, followed by amendments sponsored by the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade, rather than in the order they were filed, and this would be for today, only.

Is there leave? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Mr. Goertzen: Could you please call this afternoon, report stage amendments on Bill 16, followed by concurrence and third reading on Bill 24 and concurrence and third reading on Bill 27?

* (14:50)

Madam Speaker: So, it has been announced that the House will consider report stage amendments this afternoon, followed by concurrence and third reading of Bill 24 and 27.

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 16—The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendments for Bill 16 is where we will begin. *[interjection]*

The—so moving, then, to report stage amendments for Bill 16, The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, in accordance with rule 139(11), I am requesting that you combine the debate, where possible, on the report stage amendments for Bill 16 listed on the Order Paper in my name.

Madam Speaker: Regarding the member's request to combine debate on his proposed amendments to Bill 16, as this is not a common occurrence, I would

like to take a few moments to explain this process to the House.

First, our rule 139(11) states, and I quote: "The Speaker may select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the Report Stage." End quote.

Second, as noted, the use of this rule is uncommon in our House and we do not have a lot of past practice to rely on regarding the implementation of this concisely worded rule. Our subrule 1(2) instructs us to be guided by the parliamentary traditions of the Canadian House of Commons in areas where our usages and customs do not apply.

Following that direction, on page 788 of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, Bosc and Gagnon note that the following—note the following regarding the grouping of report stage amendments, and I quote: Motions in amendment are grouped for debate according to two criteria: their content and their position on the bill. Motions which could form the subject of a single debate are grouped according to content if, once adopted, they would have the same effect in different parts of the bill or if they relate to the same provision or similar provisions of the bill. Motions in amendment are combined according to the location at which they are to be inserted in the bill when they relate to the same line or lines. These motions in amendment will then be part of a single scheme for voting purposes. End quote.

For future reference, and as your Speaker, when any member of the House asks to combine the debate on their own report stage amendments, I will follow our rule 139(11), guided by the practices outline by Bosc and Gagnon.

The member's first, third, fourth and fifth report stage amendments for Bill 16 meet the criteria of similar content and position in the bill, and I will be grouping them for debate today as we proceed through them

For the information of the House, we will proceed as follows: (1) the member will move the combined motions separately and consecutively; (2) I will put each one back to the House in turn; (3) there will then be one debate covering the combined motions with 10-minute speaking times for all members except leaders of recognized parties, who have 30 minutes; and (4) when that debate concludes, I will put the questions on the motion separately and consecutively; (5) the member will

then move his second, sixth, seventh and eighth amendments individually, and they will be debated and resolved separately.

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

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 1 of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by replacing the definition "carbon savings account" with the following:

"carbon savings and expenses account" means the carbon savings and expenses account established under section 5.

I also move that Bill 16 be amended in clause 4—sorry. Just reverting back to the initial one: en français, (* compte d'épargne et de dépenses liées au carbone +).

I move that Bill 16 also be amended in clause 4(3)—[interjection]

I was informed I was supposed read them all—[interjection] Oh, just the seconder. Okay.

All right. Let's try this again.

So I will move, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 4(3)(b) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by adding "and expenses" after "savings".

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 5(1) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by

- (a) *adding "and expenses" after "savings" in the section heading;*
- (b) *adding "and expenses" after "savings"; and*
- (c) *adding "and increases that occurred" after "achieved".*

And lastly, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 6(3) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by

- (a) *adding "and expenses" after "savings" in the section heading;*
- (b) *adding "net" after "applicable"; and*
- (c) *adding "and expenses" after "savings".*

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway)–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

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

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

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

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: And the last–*[interjection]*

So that it is clear what we're doing, I will start again so that we can, in Hansard also, indicate that the context of which amendment we are actually addressing.

So I will start with the first amendment.

It–moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 1 of Schedule A–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The second amendment has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: That has been dispensed.

The next amendment, moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 5(1)–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: That has been dispensed.

And that fourth amendment has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: And that has been dispensed.

Mr. Altemeyer: Thank you to the clerks for guiding us through this process. In the interests of time the suggestion was to group these amendments as they are similar, and I thank the House for their co-operation.

These amendments are intended to correct brutal flaws in the design of the so-called climate and green plan act; Orwell would be proud of the title given to this piece of legislation.

And, of course, later on today, if the government lives up to the amendments it has itself proposed on this piece of legislation, they will be gutting almost entirely what was a very deceptive piece of legislation in the first place. Manitobans will be left without anything resembling the legislative or policy or budgetary commitment to climate change that is required and, at the very least, thanks to our opposition, the government's true intentions will be well-known and on the record, appalling though they may be.

* (15:00)

Today I would like to ask anyone: Do you know of an accountant who only counts one side of the ledger? Do you know a bookkeeper who only counts one side of the page in a book? Do you know anyone in their own personal finances who are only going to look at the savings and not the expenses or just the expenses and not the savings? No. You have to do both in all cases, and this legislation was written in a way to deliberately mislead Manitobans by ignoring half of the books.

Under the proposed legislation, which these amendments will correct, and I had to go through this legislation in great detail to find each of these specific instances where the government got it wrong, but these amendments would correct that if they were willing to pass them. The government has initially proposed that they will only count emissions reductions when it comes to greenhouse gases. They will completely ignore any increases in greenhouse gas emissions in Manitoba going forward.

So, for instance, just to demonstrate the sheer lunacy of this approach, Madam Speaker, let's say a citizen of their own goodwill, with no additional support from this government whatsoever, decides that they're going to fix up their house a bit, at their own expense, and reduce emissions by, say, one ton of CO₂ per year.

Well, this government will gobble up that good effort by that citizen and claim that they did a great thing. Meanwhile, the government could be massively expanding the use of natural gas for space heating. They could be massively increasing the number of gasoline and diesel and fossil fuel vehicles on the road. They could be massively increasing the herd sizes in various agricultural sectors. All of those things will dramatically increase greenhouse gas emissions in our province.

This government's legislation ignores all of that completely. They are only trying—they're trying to get away with only counting one side of the ledger, and their counting is suspect in many instances already. But the very fact that they would think they could pull the wool over Manitobans and only look at one side of the ledger on a crucial issue like climate change or, really, any issue, shows you the utter contempt and disdain that this government has for the welfare of the citizens that it's supposed to be working for.

The government's behaviour on this has been erratic. The Premier's (Mr. Pallister) most recent hissy fit, of course on the national stage—a further embarrassment to all Manitobans, has led us to a very precarious situation where, of course, climate science is being utterly silenced in Manitoba.

I brought forward amendments at the committee stage for this legislation after all of us who were there for two nights listening to impassioned speeches from Manitobans calling on this government to heed the warning of the United Nations. The report that came out just a few weeks ago, Madam Speaker, for those who may not have heard, called on the world to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by 45 per cent in a little over a decade, and that's based on 2010 levels as a baseline.

There is no mention of that scientific target mentioned in this legislation. There was no acknowledgment that science had made a recommendation at all, according to Bill 16. This government is literally sticking its head in the sands

and hoping that reality does not take it out like the blind ostrich that they are behaving like.

It's sheer lunacy. I brought forward an amendment which would very simply require that this current provincial government and all future provincial governments in Manitoba would have to have climate action plans that met the science of climate change, that what the world scientific community is recommending at the United Nations under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, that that timeline, a 45 per cent reduction in a decade, that that's what we would then have to do here in Manitoba.

And the science keeps improving, and the recommendations are becoming more and more dire, even just in the last couple of years. The timelines that we are now hearing from global scientists on climate change are absolutely frightening, and this government is pretending like none of that is happening.

And in a province where, unlike almost any other jurisdiction in the world, almost a hundred per cent of our electricity is generated without generating greenhouse gases, where we actually have more of that electricity than we need for ourselves, this government cannot wrap its head around the fact that transitioning to a green economy so that young people will have the jobs that they need and deserve to clean up the messes of the past, this government, chief among them, they can't seem to understand that that's where we simply have to go.

And they're trying their best to deceive Manitobans and mislead them and misrepresent what is actually going on. And this is just one of many instances that I have identified where that's the case. If you are only going to count actions that you feel are reducing emissions and you're ignoring all the things going on in your province, all the things going on in your government, which are cranking emissions up, you are doomed to fail.

Under this government's legislation and under this government's so-called green plan—which, actually, more accurately, Madam Speaker, should be described as a scam—it's a green scam from day one. Never intended to actually do its job. Misleading data, misleading statements, misleading legislation from day one. That's where this government is headed and it is completely and totally unacceptable. So these amendments, should the government members choose to vote them down, they will, yet again, be demonstrating to Manitobans

that they reject climate science, they reject climate action, they reject the future that their kids and grandkids absolutely require if they're going to have an opportunity, like those of us alive now have had a chance to do it. And the government members voting these amendments down, as may well take place, they will be demonstrating, yet again, their utter contempt for honest accountability in just basic reporting on climate action in Manitoba. I very much hope that the government members here will take a different path.

We all need to be doing more to address climate change, and having a province like ours, poised to make the enormous gains that we could and should be capturing, actually taking us in the opposite direction, with the Premier (Mr. Pallister) jumping on the right-wing populist band wagon, stirred up by Donald Trump, opposed to any action on climate change, opposed to any recognition of climate science, opposed to doing anything other than, you know, pushing up coal plants in the United States. Well, that type of behaviour, the type of behaviour demonstrated by Premier Ford, now, in Ontario, that's the reason why the Premier has done what he's done. It's completely unacceptable. It's a betrayal of current and future generations. And these amendments would be a small step in actually putting something useful on paper in a piece of legislation that was deceptive from day one. And I very much hope that the government members will share their thoughts on this topic and vote in favour of these amendments. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: For the record, I will indicate that the report stage amendments are in order. Are there any further speakers on the debate?

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yes, I will rise. The government just doesn't seem to have any particular statement or defence of their plan, and I had hoped that they would take the opportunity to put a few words on the record with—in that relationship.

Part of what this is—these amendments are concerned about, as I read it, is the situation that we need to be able to take a look at all the emissions; not just where there's reductions. But, if there is an expansion of emissions in one area, that this expansion of emission is not neglected. And that—so that if the government just keeps track of where there are reductions in emissions, according to their plan, there could be expansions of emissions in other areas, and those expansions of emissions in other

areas would not necessarily be accounted for. And so, I think it is important that there is, you know, a more honest approach which looks at both reductions and increases—emissions, and looks at what the net impact is. That's a pretty important way of looking at this.

* (15:10)

It is, I think, imperative that we start doing a better job looking at areas where, in fact, we are sequestering carbon in Manitoba, as well as the areas where we are releasing carbon or nitrous oxide or methane into the atmosphere.

We don't have good reported figures, as an example, for the amount of carbon that's sequestered each year into trees in the boreal forest. We're not adequately measuring that sequestering of emissions. We are not measuring adequately the sequestering of emissions into water, wetlands, potholes, boreal lakes, swamps.

And I would suggest that, in the same token, that there's areas where—when we're—have forest fires, that I'm not sure that we're adequately recognizing the loss of carbon into the atmosphere.

And certainly, what is concerning is to have a plan which doesn't look at the complete picture. We don't know for sure whether Manitoba is a net producer or a net sequesterer of carbon—of greenhouse gases in total, including methane and nitrous oxide.

We know that there are—a lot of information that is out, needs to be gathered, and much better reporting. And clearly, given the urgency of what we're dealing with, that it is not good enough to be waiting for five years to have reports, which, in fact, may not come for a year and a half after. So we could be waiting six and a half years for certain reports.

When we're dealing with a time frame of having to make a difference, in terms of greenhouse gas productions, greenhouse gas sequestration, of achieving major results by 2030, that sort of time frame for reporting is not there.

I would add to what the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) has said in terms of the need for science. And clearly, there are considerable areas where we need, as part of any carbon plan, if it's to be workable, to be investing in science, the—investing in the science so that we're able to document the sequestration of carbon in wetlands. How much is

being sequestered, what's happening, what is the balance of sequestration and release of emissions from the boreal forest and how we can be better stewards of the boreal forest with regard to greenhouse gases and other matters.

How we can improve agricultural practices so that we're generating less nitrous oxide, and to the extent that we can do that, we end up with more of the nitrogen that is applied to the soil actually being used in the plants and helping to grow plants. And, you know, these are the sort of things that we not only need the science to back up what we are doing here in Manitoba, but we need that science to be able to get proper reading on the generation of emissions as well as the sequestering of emissions.

And, certainly, there should have been a much clearer plan for investing in science and how that would fit in to the targets that I think all of us had from—and that is to have a province which, on a net basis, releases fewer greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and helps with looking after the planet, showing an example to other places, other regions.

If we can lead by example, we can not only help what we're doing here, but we can help other agricultural areas, for example, other regions where they have boreal forests in showing, you know, what is a better way to have stewardship? How do we work with First Nations and Metis people?

These are areas where there's always, and will be, striking opportunities, but, sadly, the current plan doesn't do that. And these amendments would at least start to provide a better balance in terms of the plan and more accurate reporting of emissions as well as the sequestration and giving us a net overview not just if the government says, well, we plan to reduce greenhouse gases by one megaton by converting cars to electricity, but we plan to increase the greenhouse gases, methane or somewhere else, and we want to know both sides. We want to know; we need to know. Manitobans need to know both sides of the equation. They need to be able to understand what is happening clearly and concisely so that Manitobans will know that they have a government which is working.

It is difficult in this environment, particularly, perhaps in relationship to what's happening in the United States, perhaps in relationship to what we see here, that we have politicians not being given the credit that they should have, not being trusted because of deceptive approaches that have been taken or are being taken. And, certainly, this

approach, which is more one-sided, is deceptive; it doesn't paint an accurate picture.

I would hope that the government will review and support this amendment or this series of amendments so that we can move forward in a positive way and in a more accurate way when we're looking at the greenhouse gas situation in Manitoba at—our approach to climate change.

So I would hope the government would come back with a plan which is much improved from what they've given us today. I think we are all pretty perplexed at the government which has provided us with a whole series of amendments which eliminate large sections of the plan that they brought in not all that long ago. But wherever we are, let us try to do the best we can with what is left of the—this bill which the government is going to gut or planning to gut. Let us at least make some small changes which can improve the quality of this bill.

So I thank the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) for bringing this forward.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on these amendments?

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): I look forward to speaking to 'resport'—report stage, Bill 16. The—this is obviously a bill that is dealing with a very important issue of the environment in our great country and the world in general. However, Madam Speaker, any amendment to this flawed and misguided and pathetically drafted legislation is not going to save the legislation, not at all.

Madam Speaker, there are fundamental problems with this legislation which make it unworkable, and, certainly, I will be voting against the legislation because it does not actually address the issue of climate change. And I certainly appreciate the member from Wolseley bringing forward amendments to this legislation, but you can't amend zero; zero times any kind of amendment is still zero. And the impact that this legislation will have on the environment is zero.

* (15:20)

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

And speaking of zeroes, there is zero money to fund the made-in-Manitoba—whatever that is supposed to mean—made-in-Manitoba environmental plan. No money. The government said that they were going to introduce a carbon tax at \$25 a ton to pay for their various green initiatives. And now that

money's not there, nor is there support for these initiatives.

And then the government has the audacity to say, oh, well, now the federal government's going to take away \$67 million. No, that happened as soon as you flip-flopped on the carbon tax.

And yes, there shouldn't be a carbon tax. I don't think it's good public policy, especially the way Manitoba–Manitoba actually did it in the worst possible way: they agreed with the principle that was being brought forward by the federal government, but the only thing that—but they couldn't agree on price or the speed in which the carbon tax would be implemented. But the principle is there.

So the Premier (Mr. Pallister), by not taking a principled stand in the first place, has messed it up for all the—all Canadians, all the Conservative-minded people, including the Premier of Ontario, Doug Ford; Premier of Saskatchewan; the Premier of Alberta, who's NDP; the leader of the opposition in 'alber.' It is through this government's action in a spectacular failure of public policy—not only have they undermined the entire opposition to the carbon tax by agreeing, in principle—in principle—that the federal government had the jurisdiction and it was the right thing to do to reduce greenhouse gases.

That was the government, like, a month ago, and now they flip-flopped. They flip-flop-flip. Manitobans are flipping because of the financial fiasco.

And that leads to these amendments. With all due respect to my 'learnered' colleague from Wolseley, these amendments aren't going to help the bill. The bill is flawed to such an extent that even the government is going to gut its own bill.

You know, they're going to bring forward amendments but to amend bad legislation. What should happen is the government should withdraw the bill and start again.

I'd like to ask the Chamber for unanimous consent to withdraw the bill, Bill 16. Can I canvass the House? *[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed to canvass the—is it leave for the House to canvass the amendment that the honourable member—the honourable member from Assiniboia wants to have leave to—I guess what I want to tell the member from the Assiniboia that he can't ask for the withdrawal of a bill that he hasn't put forward or he—that he hasn't put amendment for.

So I still have—the honourable member for Assiniboia still has four minutes remaining. So if he wants to use those few minutes, he can continue.

Mr. Fletcher: Mr. Chair, I believe the House can do whatever it wants with unanimous consent at any time—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order. I just want to remind the member for Assiniboia you're reflecting on the Chair. I made a decision that you have four minutes to—remaining to speak on this, but we can withdraw the request that was drawn and ask for leave from the House, so the honourable member for Assiniboia.

Mr. Fletcher: Anyone going to help?

Well, I'd like to, on principle, appeal that decision of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You know what, the honourable member for Assiniboia, you're not allowed to request for someone else to make that motion. This decision from the Chair is not challengeable, so the honourable member for Assiniboia, you still have four minutes left—remaining if you want to still speak, or else we'll go on to the next speaker.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

Mr. Fletcher: I will continue speaking on this motion, but I will note that the delays there were quite substantial and I hope that they don't eat away at the opportunity to reflect on the legislation, and next time, when I pursue this, I will make sure that the member from Steinbach is completely distracted as to allow for the freedom caucus to express itself through the—but in meaningful—withdraw of legislation.

And that is what the government should do. It should withdraw the legislation. The carbon tax is bad. They flip-flopped on that. The legislation is not funded. It has no backing in science. It is focused on irrelevant items that have no way of being—that are not transparent; they're unaccountable; they're not even part of a proper consultation.

Madam Speaker, let's accept the logic for one moment—and I don't—but let's accept that the Premier and the Prime Minister have agreed to, and that is, a price on carbon is a way to reduce greenhouse gases. Let's accept that. I don't accept it, but for this debate.

So the Province has completely failed in every respect, so the federal government is saying we're

going to impose a tax on Manitoba to reach our GHG emissions.

Okay, so it's done. Manitoba has made its contribution according to the federal government and the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) own logic. More so, even.

Madam Speaker, this amendment also deals with the issue of carbon banks and so on. Let me just make this observation, and if there was more time I would love to get into it deeper, but Manitoba has put aside huge amounts of areas the size of Ireland—has been set aside already through UNESCO and the proposal of a national park. All our carbon sinks all prevent other kind of economic development, so Manitoba should get credit for those carbon sinks, for allowing the protection of those whose parks—and that case needs to be made.

The government has failed to make the case on the carbon sinks. It has failed to make the case on Manitoba Hydro and, Madam Speaker, it has failed, period. And we're talking about amendments to a piece of legislation, and I guess I have to say to member to Wolseley that that's optimistic. I don't know how you can amend a piece of legislation that's so poorly drafted, that is not funded, it hasn't been scientifically or empirically supported. It is a public policy fiasco, adding red tape and bureaucracy for no outcome.

* (15:30)

And, Madam Speaker, who pays for it? The Manitoba taxpayer and, perhaps worse, the environment. The environment suffers when there's bad public policy, and this government should be ashamed of itself on this bill. Withdraw it.

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Are there any further speakers on these amendments?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the honourable member for Wolseley's (Mr. Altemeyer) report stage amendment to Bill 16 amending clause 1 of schedule A.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the 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.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, on division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

The next amendment, the question before the House is the honourable member for—the amendment is defeated on division.

Madam Speaker: The question now before the House is the honourable member for Wolseley's report stage amendment to Bill 16, amending clause 4(3)(b) of schedule A.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the 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: I declare the amendment lost.

Ms. Fontaine: On division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

The amendment is defeated on division.

Madam Speaker: The next question before the House is the honourable member for Wolseley's report stage amendment to Bill 16, amending clause 5(1) of schedule A.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: 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.

Ms. Fontaine: Madam Speaker, on division.

Madam Speaker: The amendment is defeated on division.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The next amendment, the question before the House is the honourable member for Wolseley's (Mr. Altemeyer) report stage amendment to Bill 16, amending clause 6(3) of schedule A.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

An Honourable Member: Yes.

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.

Ms. Fontaine: Madam Speaker, on division.

Madam Speaker: The amendment has been defeated on division.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Wolseley, on amendment No. 2.

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

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 4(1) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by

adding ", as measured by annual total emissions in Manitoba each calendar year" at the end.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Mr. Altemeyer: I want to highlight yet again the duplicity of the Pallister government in the approach that it has brought forward in Bill 16.

I bring forward these amendments not with any particular optimism that the government would allow them to pass; they are scared of accountability, quite clear. They are scared of the truth, and they are completely unwilling to accept the reality that climate change is happening, that it has been caused by humans and that people in leadership positions such as themselves need to radically change their behaviour.

With this particular amendment, Madam Speaker, I am attempting to leave on the record the correct analysis so that whoever replaces this government will have some information and guidance to work from as they attempt to correct the horrendous environmental record of the Pallister government.

Under this amendment that we are considering right now, it would address the phony language and the absolutely atrocious accounting system that the Pallister government has proposed for handling greenhouse gas emissions now going into the future.

To show just how far out of step this government is, there is no other government in the world that counts its greenhouse gas emissions in the way proposed by the Pallister government under Bill 16. If I were a nation reporting to the United Nations each and every year, I would report my total greenhouse gas emissions on an annual basis. Whatever had been emitted in my jurisdiction, from my factories, from my transportation sector, my agriculture, my buildings, all of that is counted up, following international protocols, and it is submitted to the United Nations. The key terms there, Madam Speaker, is that all of the emissions are counted, not just some of them, and that it is done on an annual basis.

What the Pallister government is proposing to do is count emissions every five years only, that they would only be counting emission reductions, hence the debate that we just had on the previous amendments where the government voted down improvements to the system. They would ignore any

increases in emissions that happened over the same period of time. And they are also proposing that under those meagre reductions which may occur, they're going to use what they call a cumulative accounting system.

This would mean, for instance, Madam Speaker, if you or I or anyone else took the initiative to reduce our own personal greenhouse gas emissions by one ton in a year or if a local business did the same thing, whomever, if that happened in the first year of the Pallister government's five-year plan, the Pallister government would not record that properly as a one-ton reduction; they would attempt to record that as a five-ton reduction. There's one ton in the first year, multiply it by five years. Nobody else in the world records their emissions that way. This is quite clearly designed to artificially inflate whatever meagre reductions might result from the actions of this government in future years.

And I have to mention, Madam Speaker, the government has very little, if anything, to point to in the way of actions it has taken to reduce emissions versus the things they've done, which are increasing our greenhouse gas emissions in Manitoba.

For instance, we used to have the single best incentive, financial incentive, for solar power in the entire country. This government killed it. We used to have the Power Smart program, which helped people in the scenario I just described, access some funding, access some supports, access some expertise or supplies to fix up their homes or their businesses, save money, put people to work, reduce emissions, win, win, win.

No, that's not acceptable to the Pallister government. They've frozen that program entirely. They've forbidden it from doing any more public advertising. They even hired a poor worker to climb up on scaffolding and paint over the Power Smart name on the Hydro mural at the intersection of Portage Avenue and St. James. And they promised all along that some new Crown corporation called Efficiency Manitoba would take over this work, and it's nowhere to be seen. And it's been nowhere to be seen for years now.

It has—well, it does apparently now perhaps have a board; I don't think it has a CEO yet that I know of. It doesn't have any budget. It doesn't have a plan. It doesn't have any programs. It's accomplished nothing. That makes the situation worse, because Power Smart was helping people reduce their emissions, save money and put people to work.

Pallister government froze the program. That's going in the opposite direction.

* (15:40)

And look what they did with public transit. Oh, my goodness. The Filmon government cancelled the 50-50 funding arrangement with all municipalities that had public transit services.

Well, when we came to office, we restored the 50-50 funding agreement for public transit because we believe in public transit. We believe that people who don't have as much money to own their own automobile, or people who choose to live their life without a personal vehicle, they should be able to get around Winnipeg and Brandon and Selkirk and any other community that has public transit.

The Pallister government fundamentally disagrees with that, because just like the Filmon Conservatives when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) was in that government, they killed the 50-50 funding agreement. What's that do? Well, prices goes up.

You know, for everyone who's saying that, you know, a carbon tax would have no impact, suddenly price doesn't matter, well lo and behold. You knock up the price of a bus fare 25 cents, you make the monthly bus pass a hundred bucks, that's going to negatively impact people who don't have much money. They're not going to be able to take the bus. It's going to make it tougher for people to make the right decision.

And to go a step further, Madam Speaker, this government also killed the electric bus. We partnered with Red River College, Manitoba Hydro, Mitsubishi industries and pulled together a new product that didn't exist before: an all-electric bus made, designed and built right here in Manitoba. Four of them on the road in—as a key, prominent part of Winnipeg's transit fleet.

Pallister government comes to office, they kill the program. The buses are sitting on New Flyer's lot apparently, and they're not even being used in active service. And each electric bus, according to a professor at the University of Manitoba, would save \$60,000 a year because they're so much cheaper to operate.

The Pallister government cannot wrap its head around the fact that doing the right thing by the environment can also mean you save money, employ Manitobans and clean up the planet. And so we end up in this ridiculous situation where they're now

trying to hide their horrible record, and they're trying to lay the groundwork legally so that their ongoing horrible record on climate change will be invisible to the public.

Because the way they proposed to count emissions is not true, it's not accurate and it's not honouring what they should be providing to Manitobans. To only count emissions reductions and ignore the increases, that's false. To try and count emissions reductions on a cumulative basis rather than an—on an annual basis is false.

To only report your emissions every five years and then to have, as my honourable colleague for River Heights highlighted just a little while ago, a time requirement of an additional 18 months. It would only be 18 months after that five-year period had expired, Madam Speaker. That's the first that the public in Manitoba will find out from this government what our emissions were in the current year of 2018.

Do you really believe and do you really think our children are going to believe that six and a half years from now is an appropriate timeline for honesty and reporting back to the public on how we're doing on climate change, when we have little more than a decade to cut our emissions in half?

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, everyone who votes against these amendments is going to have to have a very difficult conversation with their kids and a very difficult conversation with their grandkids, because those children are going to come to us and they are going to say, you knew. You knew what was coming and you did not act. You didn't do right by us, and I need to know why.

I don't know what these members are going to say to their family members. I will leave it for them and their conscience. But they cannot walk out of this room with the delusion that what their government has put forward and what they are about to do now and vote down yet another good amendment to a horribly flawed piece of legislation, they cannot walk out of this room believing they have done the right thing.

They are on the wrong side of the present, never mind on the wrong side of history. And I regret that situation very much, Madam Speaker. I honestly do.

We really do have to move much more rapidly in addressing climate change. This government is going to see emissions go up in Manitoba, not down.

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, I rise to talk on the series of amendments that the MLA for Wolseley has brought forward. I rise—I was hoping that there would be a comment from the government, in terms of their support or lack of support for these amendments, but that—the government has had its opportunity, and has chosen to be silent so far.

I want to comment on these amendments individually. First of all, the amendment which deals with measuring the annual total emissions in Manitoba each calendar year. It is vital that we are doing this, that we don't have corrupted data, as it were, data which is only partial. And so we are certainly in strong support of that amendment.

The second is that the information that is reported be broken down by sector according to—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Just a reminder to the member that we are only dealing with that one amendment that he just quoted. We are not doing block voting or block discussions on all of the rest of these amendments. So we're just still on amendment No. 2.

Mr. Gerrard: Sorry. I was under the mistaken impression that we were trying to do several at once, but I will keep my remarks, then, to the first one, which, in fact, we will support—is to make sure that there is a reporting of annual total emissions. This is an essential part of—one any green ban should have, and I think I will leave it at that.

Thank you.

Mr. Fletcher: I, again, like to thank the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) for bringing forward this amendment on this important bill, except, Madam Speaker, there's no point in amending the bill. The bill should be withdrawn. You can't fix this bill. And I'll provide some concrete examples utilizing the examples brought forward by the member who brought forward the amendment, the member from Wolseley.

The member from Wolseley talked about Efficiency Manitoba, this creepy creation of a new Crown corporation—creepy, creepy, creepy Crown. It is a organization that actually does a lot of really bizarre things like regulating potable water, the transportation industry. But when it comes to its goal of regulating electricity, it is particularly appalling. It's appalling because it will not help the environment. But it is further appalling because that is the main talking point of the government. The

government is saying, well, we're bringing forward this Efficiency Manitoba Crown corporation to replace Power Smart. Okay.

And it's going to do a bunch of other things that there's been no demand for or asked for—just add more red tape. And it's going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars in its operation and billions of dollars over time to Manitoba Hydro and, through that, Manitoba Hydro ratepayers, and it's not going to do a thing for the environment.

Madam Speaker, in Manitoba, we have almost a hundred per cent green energy. For all intents and purposes, it's a hundred per cent. Hydro power: renewable, I think everyone agrees. Why, then, would we bring forward a program to—with solar panels and wind power that actually will only displace green power?

* (15:50)

Now, in other jurisdictions, and, in some specific contexts, these are very reasonable uses of renewable resources. But, in Manitoba, in our context, in this province, solar energy and wind power do not make sense if the goal is to help the environment or the goal is to help the economy or Hydro revenue.

Madam Speaker, every kilowatt that is generated by solar power or wind power displaces another kilowatt that's already being generated through clean power, through Manitoba Hydro. The main difference between the two is the—solar power and the wind power cost way more than the Hydro power, of which this province has way too much of and no prospect of being able to have a domestic or out-of-province customers to meet the huge generating power capacity that we now have and will have in a year from now.

Way more supply, not enough demand, no way to export. And, in a spectacular irony—like, in almost any other economic situation, when supply exceeds demand, the price goes down. But not made in Manitoba; in Manitoba, the price goes up. Like, that is a spectacular failure of public policy. And then the government's going to bring forward a new Crown corporation to—with the goal of reducing the use of green electric power? That's crazy. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't even make sense from a—like, from an environmentalist point of view.

And, by the way, Madam Speaker, I think of myself as a right-of-centre naturalist on environmental issues. I am outcomes driven. I want to see—and I think most people are in this category,

want to see real results without wrecking the economy. And Efficiency Manitoba, which the member from Wolseley is dutifully and in vain, I'm afraid—is trying to at least bring to the public attention, through his amendment, is going to be—well, it's doomed for failure, as Bill 16 is doomed for failure.

I will not be supporting the amendments, because there's no amendment that will make Bill 16 palatable, especially in the context that we have talked about, be it the flip-flop on the fiscal side has increased the financial fiasco of the province—of Manitoba Hydro, combined with reducing the domestic demand, mandating that so our supply further exceeds the demand. I hope to have an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to talk about what we should do and what should be done.

Madam Speaker, I have an ongoing Manitoba citizen's inquiry occurring to look into Manitoba Hydro. The government refused to do that, but citizens have stepped up, and I'm happy to stand with them. Many people are disappointed. Many people are disappointed. There was a light of hope, in April of 2016—a lot of high expectations about Hydro and the environment. None of those have been met. And Bill 16 is an—is going to be known in history as an icon of public policy failure.

The government has already agreed with the federal government on principle. They have undermined everyone who's opposed to a carbon tax, federally and provincially, right across the country.

And in the same stroke, they have defunded Bill 16. They have undermined the market for green electric power generation in Manitoba. And the price for this green power is going up, up, up in spite of the supply going up, up, up as well. It is difficult to imagine a supply-demand curve where the supply goes up, the demand goes down, and the price goes up. Like maybe if you're dealing with nuclear waste or power or something that, like a plague of some sort of virus, but not green Manitoba hydro. We're already committed to the supply, and we're going to destroy the demand, and it's not going to do anything for the environment.

Bill 16 is beyond repair. The government should withdraw the bill and start again, and this time think about it.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on this amendment?

Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the second amendment—the second report stage amendment on Bill 16, moved by the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer). It is the pleasure—and I will rephrase that just for some clarity. The question before the House is the amendment on Bill 16 related to clause 4(1) of schedule A, brought forward by the honourable member for Wolseley.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: 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.

Ms. Fontaine: Madam Speaker, on division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

The amendment is defeated on division.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will move now to the next amendment, amendment 6 being brought forward by the honourable member for Wolseley.

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

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 7(2) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act)

(a) *in clause (a), by adding "*, broken down by sector according to the National Inventory Protocol" *at the end;*

(b) *in clause (d) by adding "net" before "greenhouse"; and*

(c) *by adding the following after clause 7(2)(d):*

(e) the total greenhouse gas emissions increases that occurred, broken down by sector.

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

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 7(2) of Schedule A—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

An Honourable Member: No.

* (16:00)

Madam Speaker: The—it has been indicated that there is a desire for the whole amendment to be read, so I will do that.

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 7(2) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act)

(a) *in clause (a), by adding "*, broken down by sector according to the National Inventory Protocol" *at the end;*

(b) *in clause (d) by adding "net" before "greenhouse"; and*

(c) *by adding the following after clause 7(2)(d):*

(e) the total greenhouse gas emissions increases that occurred, broken down by sector.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Altemeyer: Again, this amendment attempts to drag the Pallister government, kicking and screaming, into the modern era when it comes to environmental accountability, specifically related to climate change law.

Under existing protocols, there is something called a national inventory. That means that every province and territory—and the federal government—all must submit the emissions that come from their jurisdictions on an annual basis. This process is called the national inventory.

The Pallister government has instead proposed this ridiculous five-year reporting timeline which, as I have noted already, is completely inappropriate, with the additional inappropriateness of 18 further months before they would have to report on anything.

So the national inventory, I would imagine, would be one of the first things to go under the Conservative government should they ever have a say in things again at the federal level. They—as a national political party, they have been copying much of Donald Trump's agenda in—south of the

border. And one of the first things he did, of course, was to kill climate science, remove all reference to—of the word climate or climate change from the Environmental Protection Agency's documents, forbid scientists from speaking publicly and, of course, put a big clampdown on ever reporting accurately what's actually going on with regards to climate emissions.

By passing this amendment, Manitoba would then have that existing—the existing national inventory protocol on its books as law in Manitoba, compelling us to be honest, compelling us—this and all current governments to report the truth about our greenhouse gas emissions and where they have come from within the various sectors of our economy.

This amendment also addresses the need for reporting on a net total annual basis, again addressing the flawed preference of the Pallister government for a selective cumulative reporting of emissions. And then, of course—as one would predict from a government with duplicity in mind—they are only looking for information on where greenhouse gas emissions have decreased in a particular sector. This amendment would bring honesty to the process and also require the government to report on increases in greenhouse gas emissions that have occurred across the sector.

Given the government's behaviour leading up to this moment, given their voting record already this afternoon, having voted down multiple amendments—which, I might add, had bipartisan support, and I certainly thank the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) for his words on the record today—the government has refused to stand up for environmental accountability. And that is extraordinarily regrettable. So I have no doubt that this amendment will likely also be rejected by the government—led by the Government House Leader (Mr. Goertzen), of course. And—but at least the idea will be on the record for that hopeful day in Manitoba when a political party which is actually committed to the future of this province and prepared to help our citizens, our businesses and our institutions transition to the sustainable world that our children deserve and need—these ideas, at least, will be there.

I also want to just briefly comment on the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) reference in question period earlier today on climate change regarding the \$67 million that he feels he is still entitled to. For any of us with children—or who have raised children—

the equivalent situation is that a child was asked to clean up their room, they refused to do it and then they still demand a cookie. I don't know how many of us would feel that that is the type of behaviour that we would want to reward, but that is exactly the two-sided approach that this Premier is taking with climate change.

His adversarial relationship with pretty much everybody these days, and it is just regrettable. It is really, really regrettable that just when the world needs a place like Manitoba to step up, to show leadership, to demonstrate that it is possible to grow your economy, lower unemployment, put more people to work, save people and businesses and institutions money and do right by the planet—it's all sitting there waiting to happen. And this Premier is taking us back to the Stone Age, which, unfortunately, in this instance, means he is ignoring the climate crisis that is looming.

It would be very easy for us to go in a different direction, but, quite clearly, we are going to have to get rid of the Pallister government first before that can happen.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes, Madam Speaker, this amendment would provide that the reported emissions—the net emissions be reported by sector. This would seem to be an important part of any climate plan, and we're happy to support this amendment.

Mr. Fletcher: Hi. Thanks, Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank the member from Wolseley for bringing forward the amendment dealing with accountability and calculation of GHGs.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is an interesting scientific exercise. Collecting the empirical evidence, I think everyone would agree that that is a challenge. Some countries do not have the integrity in their environmental regulations that Canada has, or Manitoba, and that brings into question the whole issue of: What do we do about climate change?

And, if we all agree that we want to accurately determine a country's emissions, as the member from Wolseley has indicated, okay, let's do that. So I would suggest, then, that hopefully the government will withdraw the bill.

But, when the Manitoba Party forms government, we can look at the total net of emissions from jurisdiction or the country, as a whole. So not accumulative, just on the—what is being emitted but

also what has been absorbed. Every tree, every bog, even the desks in this place are all carbon sinks. In fact, I guess you could argue that each of us are carbon sinks.

We all contain carbon, and so long as we exist, the carbon's not in the atmosphere. Now that seems unusual to think of ourselves as carbon units, with some water 'adda.' But it is, essentially, what everything that has grown and has decayed, and—from the stored carbon in oil fields or coal fields, to the stored carbon in everyone's house and in the trees in our boreal forest, in the tundra and so on. Even the wheat and oil seeds and canola that we grow is a form of a carbon sink.

* (16:10)

So, if that is true, why not include the boreal forests, swamps, other carbon storage methods in the calculation of total greenhouse emissions for Canada?

Now, if you—to apply that to Manitoba, I think we would do very well, and the fact that, rightly or wrongly, we've put aside for perpetuity huge tracts of land and forest that will not allow for mining or other development, at the very least, the world, using their own logic, should be compensating Manitoba financially.

If we want to use the Kyoto logic, well, it goes both ways. If we're not going to allow development and we're not—and same with—same for Brazil. You know, it goes both ways. So, to have an accurate calculation, as I think is the intent of the member from Wolseley, you have to look at not only the emissions, but also what has been absorbed, and then you take the difference and you come up with an answer or a range. That is legitimate.

And Manitoba and Canada—we have huge tracts of farming land, and every year every strain of wheat is cut down and put into a different form and is out of the atmosphere.

There are also nitric oxides and sulphur oxides and particulates which need to be measured, and I'm not sure if the member amendment would deal with the accounting of those, and I think that is fair ball. Like the—what was colloquially termed as socks and knocks, sulphur oxides and nitric oxides are pollutants and cause death in the millions of people each year through poor air quality and diminish the quality of life of billions of people. And I would agree that we need to track this properly. And I don't believe there's any sinks—carbon sinks—like nitric

oxide sinks or sulphur oxide sinks to the same level that there might carbon dioxide sinks or methane sinks.

I think this idea of accurate accounting of pollutants, greenhouse gases, is worthwhile and perhaps Manitoba could be the—you know what, Madam, I was going to say Manitoba could be the leader in this, but it can't, because Bill 16 is a public policy fiasco, a talking point to make the government members feel green, I guess, but, in reality, there will be no advantage to the environment.

There is no funding to support what the government is suggesting either to keep track of the emissions and absorptions, because the government flip-flopped on the carbon tax. That was supposed to be funding this made-in-Manitoba green plan. Then you combine the wackiness of the creepy Crown corporation known as Efficiency Manitoba—which, more accurately, should be inefficiency Manitoba—and then you combine the fact that no government member, Madam Speaker, no government member has stood up this afternoon to give their position on these amendments. They just vote them down.

Well, let's hear why. Let's see what the logic is, because they're going to pass amendments for the government's side. Looking forward to speaking on those amendments, but why won't the government speak on any of these amendments brought forward by the member of Wolseley?

Agree or disagree, but defend your legislation. And, if you can't defend it in this place, you won't be able to defend it out in the public. And, Madam Speaker, nobody is defending the legislation, and I think it's because everyone in this place knows the legislation is indefensible.

It is useless. It will have no bearing on the environment. It has been undermined by the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) flip-flop on the carbon tax. He—the Premier's already agreed with the Primer Minister on the principle of a carbon tax, and the price, well, they kind of disagreed on the price, but the principle.

Madam Speaker, again, we'll be voting against it, and it should be withdrawn.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on this amendment?

Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the sixth report-stage amendment related to clause 7(2) of schedule A of bill 6 brought forward by the—16 brought forward by the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the 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.

Ms. Fontaine: On division.

Madam Speaker: The amendment has been defeated on division.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will now move to amendment 7, being brought forward by the honourable member for Wolseley.

Mr. Altemeyer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe),

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by adding the following after Clause 9(2):

Mandatory meetings

9(3) The minister must meet with the council at least six times each year.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Mr. Altemeyer: Yes, Madam Speaker, I have a story for you on this one. Under this legislation, the previous legislation brought in by none other than the Filmon government, The Sustainable Development Act is going to be repealed. It'll be wiped out from the laws of Manitoba.

Now, under that legislation hanging in peril was a provision that required the government to meet with an entity called the Manitoba round table on

sustainable development a minimum number of times each year.

And this entity was one of many across the country. There was a national round table on sustainable development. Different provinces had the same type of advisory body put in place, and then wouldn't you know it? We came to power in 1999. We saw this was a good idea and we continued it.

And, somehow, after the Pallister government was elected, the legislative requirement to meet with the round table was completely ignored, completely dismissed, and I know because, technically speaking, Madam Speaker, I am still a member of the Manitoba round table on sustainable development.

* (16:20)

We were supposed to be meeting multiple times a year. We are supposed to be meeting with the minister, we're supposed to be meeting with a whole bunch of different ministers who sit on that advisory body, and that advisory body hasn't met since the Pallister government came to office.

So they've decided unilaterally to just ignore the law in Manitoba. And not just that, it was a law brought in by their own Conservative-striped government in the Filmon era.

It gets even more interesting, Madam Speaker, because one of the things that was established while we were in office, as a function of the round table, was not just to provide good advice to government, which they did on many occasions—I want to thank each and every one of the people who gave their time and expertise to participate on that very useful body—we also established a sustainability awards program where individuals and non-profits, businesses, municipalities, everyone, could be nominated each year to stand up and have a moment in the spotlight where we would all applaud the great work that this person or entity was doing for the environment. And that was done by the round table. It was done by the people appointed on the round table.

Well, somehow those awards have continued even though the round table hasn't met and none of the current membership has been consulted on any of the awards that have been handed out since the Pallister government came to office.

And now the cherry on the top on this duplicitous, deceptive behaviour is that—Pallister government has the temerity to establish a new advisory council to tell them what they should be

doing for climate change and the environment. Well, lo and behold, there's no requirement anywhere in Bill 16 to require the government to actually sit down with these hard-working Manitobans and listen to what they have to say. The Pallister government could ignore them for the entirety of their term in office, and it would not violate a single bit of the law if Bill 16 passes unamended.

All this amendment does—all it does, Madam Speaker—and it's going to be fun to watch the government vote this down. But all this does is require this government to sit down a minimum of six times a year with their own hand-picked advisors that they've appointed to a board to listen to what they have to say.

They're not going to pass it. It's quite clear. They're not going to pass it. And it means that the poor individuals who've been appointed to this board are going to have absolutely no capacity to compel the government to listen to the advice that they are providing, same as there is no recourse for the dozens and dozens of citizens who gave up their own time and came down to the Legislature to present when Bill 16 hit the committee stage.

This is just basic governance—not even that, Madam Speaker. It is basic decency that you would actually sit down and listen to the people who have said yes when you asked them for help. And the government's going to vote it down. I don't understand how they can do that, but I'll leave that for them to wrestle with. And maybe, as others have mentioned, both the honourable member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) and the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), we've heard nothing from the government side of the benches this entire afternoon debating all of these amendments. None of them has anything to say.

They're just going to follow like sheep. They're going to follow the orders that have been passed down from on high, and Manitoba, once again, is going to be worse off. So we'll listen to what the flock decides.

Mr. Gerrard: Having accountability in place means that that accountability must be regular, and that is one of the reasons why we are—have—bringing an amendment later on dealing with quarterly reporting. I think I would favour quarterly meetings as matching the quarterly reporting, but, you know, I think that having frequent meetings, whether its four or six, is the important thing and, so, certainly

willing to support this effort to improve accountability.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Assiniboia. And I would ask him—I have given him quite a bit of latitude this afternoon in his debates, but I would ask him to specifically deal his remarks—address his remarks to this amendment, please, because that is what we are discussing.

Mr. Fletcher: Again, I appreciate the optimism that the member from Wolseley has in presenting these amendments, though I hope the member from Wolseley doesn't take it too hard when the government doesn't accept his amendments.

Now, the member from Wolseley may be shocked, and I'm shocked that the member from Wolseley is shocked, that he's shocked that the government does not want to listen to anyone. I wonder if the member of Wolseley—and I think he has been paying attention and certainly tried to get his point across, but why would the member of Wolseley think the government would meet for six times with a board on environment issues when it won't even meet its own board that it appoints for Manitoba Hydro? And what is the member from Wolseley thinking? Why would he say—like, come on. They're not meeting the board of Manitoba Hydro, so why would they meet with this other board at all, never mind six times a year?

The member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) might as well say 365 times a year, the same effect: the government won't listen, won't listen once, it won't listen 365 times or to any Manitobans because, as we know, they don't listen.

Well, it's not they; I shouldn't—it's the—it's one person, and we saw this the other night. The member from Wolseley raised the issue of Bill 16 and the number of presenters and the fact that that was an opportunity for the public to report its ideas. I'll note on the record that the leader of the second opposition party was able to extend the timelines for that meeting so more people were able to attend.

So we had just—we had over 50 presenters by simply delaying the meeting a few days. Instead of 48 hours' notice, people got a few days' notice. And that ended up with a huge net gain of presenters and more time for people to write their submissions and provide submissions and discuss the issues with their MLAs and so on. And I was happy to provide and

assist in that because the tactic of little notice for a meeting is almost the same as not meeting at all.

And, when the member from Wolseley suggests an amendment of six mandatory meetings as per the amendment, I have to ask the member from Wolseley, why even bother with the amendment? You know that they're not going to support it. Well, we know—though, Madam Speaker, the government won't say a word. They could say, well, we won't meet, or we don't support this amendment because of X, Y and Z, but they won't.

And they won't do it for any of these—they won't defend their legislation. They won't propose positive alternatives. They're just silent. The sound of silence—do you hear that? No. The first time the government has been quiet since I've been here. *[interjection]* Oh, good, at least we got a heckle there. The silence is over. It was nice while it lasted because we know that the government will—has no intention of listening or even entertaining the amendment of six meetings, one meeting, 365 meetings, maybe even half a meeting. Maybe the member from Wolseley should suggest a half a meeting; half is more than none.

* (16:30)

An Honourable Member: That's their Hydro meetings.

Mr. Fletcher: Well, yes, half a meeting. What a—you know what, I see the expressions of the people in the gallery and so on of their blank looks, like what is he talking about. They won't meet with their own Hydro board. So why would they meet with anyone?

Like, the caucus isn't even informed about a carbon tax flip-flop that will make a huge difference in the financial planning. Like, it doesn't matter. You know, when you look at financial planning, you got to accurately just even pretend to accurately estimate your revenue and your expenses.

The government won't do that. And there's no way of them knowing how wrong they are because they won't meet with the environmental round table, as this amendment is suggesting. Or the Hydro board. Or Manitobans. Or anyone. And certainly won't talk to their own caucus. So at least Manitobans know they have one thing in common with the MLAs in the government caucus. And that is their boss won't listen to either the MLAs or Manitobans. Or the Hydro board. Or political appointees. Or—well, I'm not sure that there's a lot of friends in this place.

Like, nobody is able to meet. I think this amendment is—with all due respect to the member from Wolseley, I think this amendment is ridiculous because it is ridiculous to even think that the government would accept it. It's ridiculous to accept that the government will not meet. And this bill is ridiculous. Any amendment to this bill will not save the bill.

So, Madam Speaker, I will be voting—the Manitoba Party will be voting and at least half the freedom caucus will be voting against this amendment. Because we know that the amendment is ridiculous.

And perhaps the member from Wolseley's trying to make a point. I don't pretend to understand or—well, I understand, I think, but not necessarily accept many of the statements the member from Wolseley says. But sometimes amendments are introduced to make a point. Well, that might be the point of this pointless amendment.

And what would the point of this pointless amendment on this pointless bill with no spine and no financial backbone have? Perhaps the member from Wolseley is simply trying to demonstrate through this amendment that the government does not listen. Maybe they—through this amendment, the member from Wolseley is simply highlighting the fact that the government will not defend its own legislation, not even on amendments. Not even ridiculous amendments—the government can't defend their legislation.

A ridiculous amendment on the number of times they meet—the government can't even get its act together to meet, to dispute or say, hey, member from Wolseley, that's a ridiculous amendment—because it might not be so ridiculous if the point of the amendment is to point out how ridiculous the legislation is in the first place.

Madam Speaker, my point in this is Bill 16 is unrepairable. No amendment's going to change that. The government should withdraw Bill 16.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on this amendment?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the seventh report stage amendment on Bill 16, related to schedule A, The Climate and Green Plan Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the 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.

Ms. Fontaine: Madam Speaker, on division.

Madam Speaker: The amendment has been defeated on division.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will now move to the final amendment being brought forward by the honourable member for Wolseley.

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

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Schedule B (The Industrial Greenhouse Gas Emissions Control and Reporting Act) by adding the following after Clause 16:

Allocation of revenue

16.1 All revenues received must be allocated to the Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Fund continued under *The Climate and Green Plan Act*.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

Debate can proceed.

Mr. Altemeyer: I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this amendment. It is the last one of many that I have brought forward. Not particularly optimistic that any of them were going to pass, Madam Speaker. They did, after all, call on the government to honour climate science. This is a government that's sticking its head in the sand when it comes to climate science.

These amendments called for government honesty and accountability in reporting the emissions that come out of Manitoba now, and into the future.

This government is running away from its obligations to provide honest information and accountability to its citizens.

And this amendment here is specifically targeting duplicity on the government's part when it comes to what it originally proposed with large final emitters. Now, the government has introduced an amendment itself, to its own legislation, to remove this entire section of the bill. And cut it on to the shop floor, as it were. But it is important to note that this government's proposed treatment of large final emitters was flawed from the start. And this amendment was looking for at least some small way that the original proposal could've been improved. I do not disagree with the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) when he says that Bill 16 is fatally flawed, and has been fatally flawed from day one and that the honest thing to do for this government, quite simply, would've been to withdraw it altogether, listen to Manitobans and do right by ourselves and our kids, when it comes to a sustainable future.

The honourable member for Assiniboia, though, probably has even more knowledge than I do that this government is not going to do that. They have, instead, chosen to gut their own brutally inappropriate and weak legislation. And one of the sections they have removed was the very weak section related to large final emitters.

* (16:40)

They have to understand, Madam Speaker, that in Manitoba we have a thriving manufacturing sector. We have a very diverse economy. We do not actually have very many large final emitters. A large final emitter, by definition, is a single entity that emits more than 50,000 tons of greenhouse gases every single year.

We only have about eight or nine of those in total, and 'sevel' of those are landfills. So these are not factories of any sort; this is where we have in the past put our garbage. It's where we are still putting our garbage. And so those are—would need to be considered in an appropriate way under legislation, which was failed here.

The other types of large emitters that we have would be a fertilizer plant operated by none other than the Koch brothers, famous internationally for funding pseudo science when it comes to climate change, funding the Tea Party in the United States, and really setting the tone for the right-wing

populous movement that is now running amok south of the border. They're making who knows how much money a year selling their product in, from their factory in Brandon. And that fertilizer plant is the single largest large final emitter in our province.

The Brady landfill used to be the single largest emitter, but our government passed legislation requiring the former Katz administration to capture the landfill gas escaping from Brady, and that has dropped its annual emissions accordingly.

Then, of course, there's also the making of cement and smelters in northern Manitoba. That's about it.

Well the government's proposal was what is called an intensity target. That means that for a large final emitter they would be able to actually increase the amount of emissions that they're putting into the atmosphere so long as they weren't doing it even more than they were before on a per-unit-of-production basis. And the simpler way to describe that is that large polluters were being let off from doing their job.

The planet is running out of capacity to absorb more carbon and greenhouse gas emissions. The planet is not going to say: Oh, well, you know, this company increased the amount of emissions it was producing, but it did so more efficiently. So, well, that's okay, you know, we can absorb that.

It doesn't work that way. We are running out of the amount of emissions we can emit full stop. And, by adopting an intensity target like this, the government has again abdicated its responsibilities to current and future generations and ignored climate science.

The government did have a provision in its proposal that if there was a company that somehow did end up increasing its emissions and becoming even worse than it was now on a per-unit basis, well, then, that company might have to pay the \$25 per ton carbon tax that the Pallister government has initially supported and now, of course, vehemently denies that it ever wanted it in the first place.

So that is where this amendment comes in. It would have required any revenues that were collected from a large final emitter to actually be put back into the climate fund here in Manitoba so that those revenues could be used to actually do something that might reduce emissions in Manitoba.

Now, of course, this amendment is going to be overwhelmed by the backtracking of our Premier (Mr. Pallister) and the really regrettable decisions of this government. They are not going to have any provisions related to large final emitters in Manitoba because they have proposed an amendment which would wipe out any new restrictions that would have been placed there, presumably that government-sponsored amendment is going to pass. They are removing any mention of \$25 a ton from any of their speaking notes, of course.

And, so the idea, though, I still think is valid that if we have large final emitters that are not doing their job, are not doing their part to build towards a cleaner, a greener future, there should be a financial consequence for that. There should be a fee that they have to pay, and monies collected from that should be used to address climate change issues in Manitoba.

Why on earth should the people living on, you know, Balmoral Street, just down the way from the Legislature here in my constituency, why should they have to be paying more in a carbon tax while this government would be letting the largest emitters off the hook? We are all part of the problem, all of us. We all have to be part of the solution, all of us.

This government proposal was brutal from the start. I am only glad of a few small things in the course of this entire debate. First and foremost, I am so proud of the individual citizens who came down and gave their impassioned speeches at committee, you know, dozens and dozens of them. It took us two nights, staying 'til midnight both nights, practically, to hear all the submissions.

I am also, you know, regrettably pleased that the deceptive nature of Bill 16 has been exposed for the falsehood that it always was, and I very much appreciate the bipartisan support that my ideas are receiving here today.

Once again, I was never under the illusion that this government would have the courage to actually acknowledge its mistakes and do right by the planet and do right by this province.

But it is encouraging to know that what I've brought forward, at least, is these ideas will be on the record, and hopefully they can be implemented when a government which actually cares about the future will be in power.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, this is an amendment with regard to schedule B. The government, in doing a complete about-face of the whole legislation, is bringing in an amendment which will completely eliminate schedule B.

And so this amendment really won't be—do much with the amended bill. I await yet further debate, which we haven't had, on the government's amendment, but I will, rather than comment further at this point, just note that the amendment, sadly, probably would not achieve very much in this bill as the government intends to bring it forth.

Thank you.

Mr. Fletcher: I'd like to thank the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) and the member from River Heights for participating in the debate this afternoon. And it has been interesting how this debate has evolved.

The member from Wolseley began, I think, with a sincere amendment—or amendments, and then, seeing that the government had no reaction, the member from Wolseley seemed to move to use satire with some of these amendments.

He used ridiculousness as a tool when it came to the meetings, because he knows full well that the government doesn't meet with anyone.

And now he's using irony to try and make the point—and I think the point is—that the member is trying to—is there is no revenue when it comes to this made-in-Manitoba climate plan. The revenue is coming from the carbon tax, the \$25 a ton—right off the bat, 250 times what the federal government wanted. That's where the revenue was coming from.

It is so ironic that the—and I appreciate the irony. Like, the member from Wolseley has just been hilarious this afternoon with trying to amend the bill on the revenue side to make the point that there is no revenue and then have the government not even dispute that.

* (16:50)

So the government's not disputing any of these amendments, so we can conclude, (a) that the government supports the member from Wolseley; we can conclude that the government doesn't support the member from Wolseley, or we can conclude the government doesn't understand what the member from Wolseley's trying to make—the points he's trying to make in his amendments.

That's probably the most likely and the most disturbing, because in order to have a good public policy debate—be it on the environment or on the economy, greenhouse gas emissions—it's important that all sides participate and all sides understand, at least a little bit, or pretend to understand.

The government's not even pretending to understand. Like, they're not even pretending that they consult with the board of Manitoba Hydro or the Metis Federation.

It's a pattern, Madam Speaker, and a pattern that is very relevant to this bill in this member's amendment, because Bill 19, or Bill 16, in this case, bill 60, is not being funded appropriately due to the spectacular flip-flop the government has made on the carbon tax.

And then the government, agreeing with the feds on principle, wants to price carbon more than the feds even want it, and then they flip-flop, so all those arguments the Province had been saying with undying rhetoric can now be used against the Province.

And, rightly or wrongly, the federal government case on the carbon tax has been made by this Premier (Mr. Pallister), which is just ironic, which is I think what the member from Wolseley is trying to highlight, is the irony.

If you don't plan public policy well initially, you're going to cost Manitobans and the economy big time and harm the environment. And that is what is happening now.

The member from Wolseley, with these amendments, has used a variety of debating techniques, from humour to satire, to tongue-in-cheek, to simply sincerity—simple sincerity. Why can't the government be sincere on this issue, a Bill 16, on the carbon tax, the fact that it's incurring—either they incur expenses that were not budgeted for, with no revenue, or they don't incur the expenses, which undermines the made-in-Manitoba plan in each case.

So which is it? We're going to do a little bit in cost or none or what? So the member, with this amendment, is simply pointing out the revenue in this bill is irrelevant, the way the government treats these amendments.

We haven't heard a word from the government all afternoon. Serious bill—lots of people are

concerned. Perhaps we can come up with some common ground.

I find it interesting that the member from Wolseley, who is perhaps left of centre on a lot of issues, and myself, who may be right of centre on some issues, have come to the same conclusion on this bill from two different perspectives.

And I believe the Liberal Party has made the observation that—or they should, if they haven't—that Bill 16 is such a fiasco, by anyone's standards, and the flip-flop was such a fiasco that the Prime Minister of the federal government just said, okay, Manitoba, you're so messed up, we'll just do what we need to do here and we'll give all the money back to Manitobans anyway.

So what—where does that leave us? We—it leaves us with a plan that has no revenue, a budget with a huge whole, \$67 million that the Province was supposed to get and will, of course, not get it because the Premier has undermined any legal or moral or ethical or whatever authority when it comes to this issue in a spectacular flip-flop—and I think this is what the member from Wolseley is trying to highlight—is the bill from—regardless where you fall on the specifics of the bill, it's useless, it's pointless, should never have been introduced. There should have been more consultation.

And having the entire bill, the bulk of it, the key centrepieces of the bill—the keystone of the bill was the carbon tax, and as we look at the arches around this place, we know, without a keystone, everything falls down. Manitoba's the keystone province. The government should get the metaphor. Without the foundation, it will collapse around them.

And people in Manitoba will—may be deceived in the short term, but in the long term, we'll all see that this is a public policy fiasco, a fiscal fiasco, an environmental fiasco, and the world, the environment, Manitobans will all pay the price for this government's ineptitude.

And I would just like to say to the government: they should've listened to me in the first place. I told you so.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on this amendment?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the eighth report stage amendment on Bill 16, related to the amendment in schedule B, brought forward by the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the 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.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Deputy Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Madam Speaker: The amendment has been defeated on division.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will now move to the amendments being brought forward by the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard).

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, in accordance with rule 139(11), I'm requesting that you combine the debate, where possible, on the report stage amendments for Bill 16 listed on the Order Paper in my name.

Madam Speaker: Regarding the member's request to combine debate on his proposed amendments to Bill 16, his second, third and fifth report stage amendments for Bill 16 meet the criteria of similar content and position in the bill, and I will be grouping them for debate today as we proceed through them.

For the information of the House, we will proceed as follows: (1) the member will move his first amendment individually, which will then be debated and resolved; (2) the member will then move his second, third and fifth amendments separately and consecutively; (3) I will put each one back to the House in turn; (4) there will then be one debate

covering the combined amendments with 10 minutes speaking time for all members except leaders of recognized parties who have 30 minutes; and (5) when that debate concludes, I will put the questions on the amendments separately and consecutively; and (6) the member will then move

his fourth amendment individually and they will be debated and resolved separately.

The hour now being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, November 1, 2018

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Committee Reports		Accessibility for Manitobans Act	
		B. Smith	4013
		Stefanson	4013
Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development		Lead Contamination in Soil	
Fifth Report		Lamont	4014
Smook	4003	Pallister	4014
Standing Committee on Private Bills		Family Conciliation Services	
Second Report		Fontaine	4015
Nesbitt	4004	Stefanson	4015
Tabling of Reports		Project Riverbank	
Schuler	4005	Curry	4016
Fielding	4006	Cullen	4017
Ministerial Statements		Climate and Green Plan	
Domestic Violence Awareness Month		Lamont	4017
Squires	4006	Pallister	4017
Fontaine	4006	Rural and Northern Manitoba	
Lamoureux	4007	Lindsey	4018
		Pallister	4019
Members' Statements		Petitions	
Jackie Ratz		Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room	
Morley-Lecomte	4007	B. Smith	4019
Allan and Dorothy Smith		Vimy Arena	
T. Marcelino	4007	Fletcher	4019
Reynold Reyes		Concordia Hospital Emergency Room	
Reyes	4008	Wiebe	4020
Shining Star Productions Manitoba			
Lamoureux	4008		
Nancy and Robert Wheeldon			
Lagassé	4009		
Oral Questions			
Manitoba Hydro			
Kinew	4009		
Pallister	4010		
Education Review Committee			
Wiebe	4012		
Goertzen	4012		
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		<i>(Continued)</i>	
		GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	
		Report Stage Amendments	
		Bill 16—The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act	
		Altemeyer	4021
		Gerrard	4025
		Fletcher	4026

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>