

**Fourth 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*

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Forty-First Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
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, April 25, 2019

*The House met at 10 a.m.*

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

Please be seated, everybody.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, on House business. Could you please call for resuming debate at second reading, Bill 204, The Election Financing Amendment Act, brought forward by the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Lamont).

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced that the House will consider second reading of Bill 204 this morning.

#### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS— PUBLIC BILLS

##### Bill 204—The Election Financing Amendment Act

**Madam Speaker:** So I will call Bill 204, The Election Financing Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson, who has eight minutes remaining.

**Mr. Kelly Bindle (Thompson):** Madam Speaker, Manitobans need a break. Under the NDP Manitoba's political parties enjoyed the most lavish taxpayer-funded subsidies in the country. Our government believes political parties are not entitled to tax dollars to fund their election campaigns, which is why we quickly eliminated the vote tax subsidy shortly after being elected.

The vote tax subsidy—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Bindle:** —has provincial NDP and Liberals taking taxpayer money and giving it to their parties to spend. Our PC government refused the vote tax

subsidy in principle and refused to accept the vote tax subsidy.

When I tell my consistent—constituents that the vote tax subsidy was, their response is always the same: I wasn't aware the NDP government brought that in and I wasn't aware my tax dollars were going to political parties without knowledge and consent. The reason they weren't aware is because the practice wasn't accurately named. It was cleverly—and some would say sneakily disguised a vote tax subsidy, implying it was a rebate of some sort. However, it should have been named the NDP vote tax jack, because it wasn't the subsidy at all, it was a jack in taxpayers' gut jack.

As our government continues to fix Manitoba's finances with Budget 2019, we're lowering the PST as promised and are well on our way to putting an end to a political campaign subsidy that has been a burden to taxpayers, called The Election Financing Act. This act is also not well known to taxpayers, and when I explain it to them, like the vote tax subsidy, they are equally appalled that their hard-earned tax dollars are going to political parties. They believe they should have the right to choose which political party they want to donate to and that no party should get their money without their consent.

Under the current system, the excessive 50 per cent subsidy for election expenses for parties and candidates, including campaign advertising costs, it cost Manitobans more than \$3 million for the 2016 general election. This subsidy program forces taxpayers to provide \$125 in support for every \$100 raised and spent on an election campaign by parties and their candidates.

If a party receives a \$100 contribution from a citizen, the provincial government gives a \$75 tax credit directly to the donor and another \$50 subsidy to the political party when it spends the \$100. Not only is this subsidy costly to Manitobans, but it gives an advantage to larger parties with better access to credit to borrow money, take on debt and spend more than they have. That's not how government should run and it's not how political parties should be run, and our government is changing it.

The best way to support grassroots democracy is through the Manitoba Political Contributions Tax Credit which gives every Manitoba—every Manitoban

who contributes to a political party a 75 per cent tax rebate, regardless of the party's size or ability to raise funds. We believe political parties should raise their own funds from those who support their policies, and Manitoba's Progressive Conservatives—our party—continue to lead by example.

We never accept money from the previous NDP administration's vote tax jack, and we will continue to try to eliminate the campaign expense subsidy that we are reducing to 25 per cent. Eventually, we will eliminate it altogether to level the playing field between parties, and, in doing so, our party stands to lose more than \$1.5 million, the largest amount of any party.

If we had it our way, we would eliminate it altogether right now, but that suggestion didn't sit well with members opposite. The NDP needs money and they have become dependent on taxpayers to provide it for them. So dependent—they're so dependent that the mere suggestion of eliminating caused them to whine incessantly in the House and in the media.

I'm from the North, Madam Speaker. I've never been around cattle when they're being weaned, but after listening to the members opposite respond to the thought of losing their taxpayer-funded election expense subsidy, I now have a pretty good idea of what it must sound like when cattle are being weaned off their mother's teat.

Eventually, our government will fully eliminate the subsidy, but when we do, we will not change the existing 100 per cent reimbursement for candidates for child-care and disability expenses. This will ensure everyone has access to running, regardless of their financial and social position. It's only fair, Madam Speaker.

Some may ask: Why are we waiting to eliminate it? And we certainly would like to, earlier, but like I said about weaning cattle, there was a lot of resistance from members opposite. Enough of a resistance that they threatened the PST reduction, which we believe the NDP should never have jacked up in the first place, like they promised they wouldn't do.

To fight against losing their sacred election expense subsidy, the NDP have threatened to fight the PST reduction by designating the bill to lower the PST and holding it over 'til the fall and, with the possible early election, hoping it would fall off the Order Paper.

The NDP have fought long and hard to increase the PST and they don't want to see it lowered. They don't believe Manitobans deserve a break, but our party does, Madam Speaker. That is why we have agreed to lower the election expense subsidy to 25 per cent from 50 per cent, instead of lowering it to zero in exchange for allowing the PST reduction to pass.

In debates in this House regarding amendments to The Election Financing Act, members opposite have stated that all members in this House have collected the rebate in the past, and that's true. But, of course, they failed to mention that our caucus, the Progressive Conservative caucus members, are the only members in the House seeking to eliminate it.

The NDP and the Liberals can't fathom the thought of not getting a taxpayer-funded election expense reimbursement. That's why they were shocked and surprised by our suggestion of eliminating it. They definitely feel they are entitled to their entitlements and that includes taxpayers' money. During a decade of debt, decay and decline, the NDP never made a difficult decision. They made politically motivated quick fixes that resulted in unsustainable spending growth and massive debt.

Good governments make the difficult decisions necessary to ensure the protection of sustainable, quality services for their citizens. Our PC government has begun the hard work that is required to repair the damage, correct the course and move toward a balanced and sustainable way. We are focused on fixing the finances, repairing our services and rebuilding the economy and we are focused on real change to fix the electoral system, not gimmicks like this bill, Bill 204, The Election Financing Amendment Act, brought on—brought forward by the Liberals.

\* (10:10)

We've already taken significant steps to restore accountability to Manitobans in our electoral process by introducing Manitoba's first Referendum Act to ensure a clear and concise process. By restoring Manitoba's right to a referendum vote on an increase to the PST, payroll tax, or P—or any major taxes before they happen by requiring a by-election to be called within six months of vacancy and by abolishing the vote tax subsidy for political parties.

The Leader of the Liberal Party wants his name all over political ads and he wants the taxpayers to

pay for it. We know that the NDP and Liberals want to take more money for Manitobans; they want to take more money off the kitchen table and put it in their political pockets.

Both opposition parties stalled budget debate because they don't want our government to reduce the PST, but we're going to make it happen, Madam Speaker, because we care about Manitobans.

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** It's good to see that the member from Thompson can stand up and speak every now and again. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, he apparently hasn't spoken to his leader lately, that he—the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has come out and said, well, absolutely they're going to accept the rebate. The Premier's come out and said, well, his original plan to do away with the rebate, well, that just wasn't fair to people.

Perhaps the member from Thompson should have got this week's notes instead of last week's notes. But, then, he isn't necessarily paying attention anyway.

So what this particular amendment that was brought forward by the Liberal Party talks about is advertising. Doesn't really talk about rebates, but the member from Thompson has gone on for quite some time about rebates so we just need to clarify that really, what took place last week was a negotiated process between the political parties that allows the rebates to remain in place—a low—at a reduced level, but it is now afforded to more smaller parties or individuals providing they meet certain thresholds, which, really, that was our argument all along with what the Premier had proposed in doing away with the rebates all together, was that it really would limit smaller parties, individuals, people without money, it would limit their ability to participate in the democratic process.

Now, I understand that this PC caucus is all about limiting people's ability to participate as they're all about not really being transparent.

Now, part of the problem, of course, Madam Speaker, is I don't blame, in this case, the member from Thompson for being confused about what he's talking about because you've pretty much have to follow along behind his Premier every day to see which way he's gone on any particular issue: whether it was the carbon tax that he flip-flopped on, and now—from things I've read it's like he's almost kind of flipping back again—whether it's the election financing thing which, apparently, he's brow beat

into his caucus that that's a really bad thing to use taxpayer money to stand up for democracy. And then he flipped on that and said, well, no, the NDP was right, that doing away with that is undemocratic, and so, therefore, he agreed with us on making changes that will allow a broader section of society to participate in the democratic process. Now, clearly, the member from Thompson wasn't aware of that or didn't get this week's notes.

So, you know, when we want to talk about things that have been brought forward, the member of the—Leader of the Liberal Party brought forward this amendment suggesting that the printed advertisement must contain a statement that is authorized by the Leader of the Liberal Party, the candidate or the leadership contestant.

Now I realize that the Leader of the Liberal Party is relatively new to the game of politics, as am I, myself, Madam Speaker. I haven't been in this Chamber for a very long period, but I do know that having the leader authorize every word that comes out of a candidate during an election could be a bit of a logistical nightmare, which is why we have official agents, and their job is to make sure that advertising meets the legal requirements. Their job is to make sure, obviously, that if you're running for a political party, that your messaging is consistent with the political party.

So, really, trying to take that down and make the leader have to review every piece of paper that comes out during an election—and it's relatively easy for the Leader of the Liberal Party because he only has four members—well, maybe three. It depends on who's jumping ship at any particular point in time, maybe two. I don't know. Maybe the Leader of the Liberal Party will decide to run for federal government. Who knows? Who knows?

But, you know, really, that's the meat and potatoes of what the Leader of the Liberal Party brought forward, is just to change who's approving the printed advertisement.

Now, looking at the broader implications of the whole election financing bill that talks about doing away with those subsidies, clearly, that has changed since this amendment was introduced, and so we need to talk about the whole thing and the changes that have taken place since this was introduced.

And, really, we've talked a lot in this House about democracy, about transparency, about allowing people the opportunity to participate, encouraging

people to participate, and doing away with that subsidy was the wrong answer, as the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Pallister) has clearly said. He was wrong. His party was wrong—[*interjection*]

Now, clearly, the member from Thompson is offside or confused; I'm not sure which. But the Premier has said, no, what's been agreed to at this point in time does make sense, although he did allude to the fact that he might change his mind somewhere down the road, too, which is kind of a shame that he can't make up his mind which side of an issue he wants to be on. So it's very little wonder that the member from Thompson is confused, sitting back there in the corner. I'm sure that he's voiced his opinion voraciously around the caucus table.

But, you know, we are talking about how to engage more people in the democratic process. So, really, it comes down to, Madam Speaker, making sure that people who don't have the ability to contribute the maximum amount to a political party; it's making sure that people who don't have the ability to self-finance a campaign but still should be allowed the opportunity to participate in the democratic election process. And what the member from Thompson just put on the record is clearly showing that he's against people without means being able to participate in the democratic process, and, really, there's a lot of people in that member's constituency who aren't well heeled, who don't have the financial wherewithal to participate without these rebates being in place.

\* (10:20)

So, really, the member from Thompson should perhaps spend more time talking to people in his own constituency to find out what people really think. So, I realize that that probably didn't happen prior to this bill being introduced, and so he's got the opportunity now, Madam Speaker, to go home to Thompson in the coming break and actually talk to people and be seen out and about and find out what, perhaps, what poor people think, to find out what people in parts of the far-flung parts of his constituency think about their ability to participate in the democratic process.

He may—if he listens, he may realize that what he just put on the record was wrong, Madam Speaker. I hope he realizes that. I hope he comes to realize, as his Premier did, that safeguarding the democratic process, safeguarding people's ability to participate in the democratic process is the right answer and it's about time that he and his colleagues got onside with their Premier this week about what is

the proper way to conduct the democratic process in this province.

So thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to speak.

**Ms. Janice Morley-Lecomte (Seine River):** Good morning, Madam Speaker.

I want to thank my colleagues for allowing me the opportunity to put a few words on record with respect to the member from St. Boniface's Bill 204, The Election Financing Amendment Act.

Manitobans are very fortunate to be a part of a democratic system. The chance to voice your opinion, support political beliefs and participate in fair elections is not afforded to everyone around the world. Elections allow people to debate policy ideas, discuss current legislation and to meet with individuals and candidates alike in their constituencies.

When our government was elected, a lot of work was needed to be done to restore trust within our province. Manitobans had been lied to, had seen their taxes increase and had watched as their debt continually grew from year to year. Manitobans had lost trust in their government and they wanted a change. Our government faced a big task. We had been entrusted to stop the province's spiralling debt, all the while giving Manitobans more money in their pockets after a hard day at work. Manitobans lived through 17 years of uncontrolled spending and rising taxes under an NDP government.

The legislation introduced by the NDP was not supportive of all Manitoba citizens. The increase in the PST from 7 per cent to 8 per cent put an extra burden on families and individuals who are already struggling financially to keep a roof over their heads.

Our government has reduced the PST by 1 per cent. This represents a tax cut for Manitobans. Manitobans will benefit on almost all of their purchases. What does this do to the financial bottom line of a household? Well, Madam Speaker, it leaves more money on the kitchen table and can be used for school activities, family outings and, perhaps, for basic household expenses.

What else has our government accomplished? Well, Madam Speaker, we have worked quickly to restore accountability and strengthen democracy in our election process. When Manitobans go to the polls they will be required to present identification

to verify their identity and address before they can vote. This change introduced by our government will bring the provincial voting requirements up to the same standards required by federal and municipal governments. This change will ensure that voter fraud can be eliminated. This legislation had been opposed by the NDP.

In addition, our government changed legislation to enact a six-month time period in which the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has to call a by-election to fill a vacancy left behind by a departing MLA. This supports the democratic rights of the constituents living within the constituency which finds itself without an elected member. Furthermore, it supports the rights of all people by ensuring that they have fair representation for their electoral area in our Legislature. Previous to this change, residents in the constituency of Morris had been without a member in the Legislature for almost one year. Residents in The Pas had a similar issue. All citizens in Manitoba are a part of our democratic system, and each person is entitled to a representative who can advocate for their area whether they live in the North or southern part of our province.

Our government is being fair and will ensure that no region in Manitoba goes without a voice to represent the local concerns and citizens. The Election Financing Act was recently amended by our government. Manitoba is one of the most generous provinces when it comes to the financing of elections. Previously, party campaigns had been financed by three possible ways: there was the vote tax that was given to political parties and paid out on a per-vote, per-party basis; there was a rebate of 50 per cent on the eligible election expenses of a campaign that was returned to the political party; and, finally, the donors would receive a tax donation receipt for their financial contribution to the party.

When the NDP started to have difficulty raising money they introduced a new subsidy for political parties to be paid by Manitobans. The subsidy was calculated based on the number of votes that a party received in the previous election; in other words, a tax based on votes. The media quickly called it the vote tax. The NDP needed the vote tax and they were the first in line with their handout. Instead of just going to the people who actually voted for them and asking them for a dollar, they introduced legislation that would require all Manitobans, whether they voted for the NDP or not, to chip in and pay them the subsidy.

The Liberals joined in with the NDP to take their new entitlement. Manitobans who did not support either of these parties had to dig into their pocket and give their tax dollars to these two parties. The NDP cashed cheques from Manitoba taxpayers amounting to about \$1 million before the last election. The NDP received about 200,000 votes out of 777,000 eligible voters, or about 25 per cent. So the NDP vote tax was paid by 75 per cent of Manitobans who did not support the NDP.

The PC Party understood that the NDP vote tax was wrong on every level and did not take the subsidy. It was just the wrong way to fund political parties.

How the NDP and Liberals used the vote tax, Madam Speaker, was to take taxpayer money they did not earn to fund their campaigns. They did not need to actually raise any money to fund their central campaign. The NDP and the Liberals could then start to double dip. They took the vote tax and then piled on by claiming the 50 per cent expense subsidy on the election expenses. So the NDP ended up \$1.5 million of taxpayer dollars to finance their campaigns. Well, that is just wrong.

Our government did the right thing and eliminated the vote tax. Hard-working individuals should not have their tax dollars spent in this manner. Donations are a way for individuals to contribute money to a political party of their choice. This is the way that political parties should raise money to finance their campaigns. Individuals should make their own decision of who they wish to support.

The rebate on eligible election expenses has drawn great debate from the opposition parties. The rebate that was returned to the political parties based on eligible election expenses was 50 per cent. The proposed amendment by our government would have taken the rebate from 50 per cent down to zero per cent—to a zero per cent rebate on these expenses. This was met with great debate and resistance. Not one of the members of the two official opposition parties wanted to remove the 50 per cent rebate.

The NDP and Liberals were so worried about losing their subsidy that the newly announced PST reduction of 1 per cent was being held up from coming into effect for July 1st, 2019. These discussions were not to benefit the people that these parties were representing. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order. Order. Order. Order.

\* (10:30)

I would remind members that yelling across the Chamber is not going to serve any purpose in improving the debate here. Members may not always agree with each other, but members do have the right to, and often do, yesterday and today, say things that may—everybody may not always agree with. So, I mean, it goes both ways.

So I would just ask both members to please be respectful here of what people are saying in debate, and they have the right to say it in debate, as long as they're not breaking any rules.

**Ms. Morley-Lecomte:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

To continue—the NDP and Liberals were so worried about losing their subsidy that the newly announced PST reduction of 1 per cent was being held up from coming into effect for July 1st, 2019. The discussions were not to benefit the people that these parties were representing but, rather, to safeguard the NDP and Liberal Party entitlements. This is money that families could use for their own personal spending. Our government puts the taxpayer first. So, after many days of debate and stalling by the opposition members, our government was able to reach a deal that saw the PST reduction still get passed.

Our government agreed to a 25 per cent rebate on eligible election expenses. One must wonder if the price of democracy is truly at the expense of its citizens.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to say that our government has been transparent and open to the citizens of Manitoba and works to support all voices equally. We are allowing everyone to be able to participate in a fair and just democratic system.

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** I do appreciate the opportunity to rise on what I think is an important subject and it's a subject that is not only important here in Manitoba but it's something that is being discussed and debated in legislatures around the world.

And certainly it's coming into a clear focus because of some of the pressures that democracy has recently been under. I would go so far as to say that in our world, today, and in a way that I think most of us, of my generation and certainly those of many generations, would have never believed it would be in this state at all because we understand democracy

to be an absolute bedrock that our society is built on. But, of course, we know that it is being pressured in so many ways.

Now, first and foremost, obviously, is in the way of direct attacks by foreign nations. We hear about this in other countries; potentially pressures here in Canada with the upcoming federal election. There's certainly a lot of concern about influence of foreign powers. But I think it goes much—it's much deeper than that and I think that's an easy scapegoat for some, to simply blame those foreign agents, who are obviously trying to undermine our democracy.

I think it also comes and is increasingly under attack by the right, whether that be in the United States or in other countries where populist leaders have been elected or have come to power. The undermining of democracy is one of the main focus that they undertake, in terms of trying to legitimize their own power and to be successful electorally.

It's frightening, I think, Madam Speaker, because it's shown just how fragile our democracy is and when we weaken those election laws, which have, you know, for so many years, served us well, when those laws come under attack, whether it's, you know, allowing big money to come into the electoral process, whether it's just the disrespect of the legislative process, you know—and I think, again, you don't have to look too far to see places where the legislatures or the bodies that govern are ground to a halt for no reason other than to obstruct and to show dysfunction. That's not what the designers of our democracy had in mind. And so it's a clear debasing of the political process and so that's where the frustration comes.

Now—and whether this bill is the be-all or—and end-all of that debate, of course not, Madam Speaker. But I think there is an important message being—trying to—that the opposition parties are trying to bring forward here, and that is that the democratic process should be respected.

We see a government here, however, that has not followed that path and, again, it's worrisome, because I think a lot of this is driven by the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) own ideological beliefs and I don't know that every single member on the other side would necessarily agree with him. I think there once upon a time was a thing called the Progressive Conservative in the province of Manitoba, and I would imagine that some of those silent majority—maybe, or minority, in this case—of Progressive Conservatives in the province don't feel that this



respects their viewpoints and strengthens democracy in a way that, I think, the Conservative movement as a whole generally does.

This is driven, as I said, clearly, by the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) own ideological beliefs, and it's unfortunate because I think there is a way to build a broad consensus around electoral reform and electoral rules. I think there's a way for us to talk about it that strengthens democracy rather than tears it apart.

So what has this government done? Well, luckily, they are happy to put on the record the steps they've taken to weaken democracy in this province and, of course, first and foremost, as I said, big money coming into the political sphere.

Now, members opposite may not think that \$5,000 is big money. I would disagree. I think for the average Manitoban \$5,000 is well beyond what they would be able to contribute to the political party of their choice if they had that option. And what that's done is it's minimized the impact that small donors can have and it's maximized the impact that those \$5,000 big donors can have.

The member opposite was just talking about requirements, enhanced in requirements for voting at the voting booth, talking about voter fraud. Again, Madam Speaker, this is language that's coming directly out of the United States, directly out of the Republican Party in the United States, and it's coming from a place that has no basis in fact and has no basis in reality. There's been no cases of widespread voter fraud in Manitoba; this is not an issue that has been brought to Elections Manitoba or to us as legislators. It just doesn't exist. So it's curious that all of a sudden, now, the members opposite want to make it more restrictive for people to vote and participate in our democracy.

The reduced rebate, Madam Speaker, once again, it just goes—it plays to the Conservative viewpoint that there should be more emphasis on the big donors and the Premier is happy to talk about it at every turn. He says, well, just go out and talk to your five rich buddies and they'll just give you the money for your campaign. It's pretty straightforward, is what he says. He says this is all—what, you know, what's—the NDP, what's wrong with the NDP?

Well, hey, listen, I'll tell you. We do our work and we are raising money. There's no question about that. But what is in question is the ability for those candidates who are marginalized, who are not part of

that social set, or that economic set and their ability to raise money. That's not something that's easy for every candidate to do, and we want to have a more diverse and inclusive Legislature. So I think that that injures that.

We used to be leaders in this country when it came to the fairness of our elections and there was—there—we actually were—we were looked at by other provinces of how can we get to where Manitoba was, whether it be taking union and corporate donations out of the mix when it comes to where people could donate, whether it be subsidies for parties who participate in the electoral process and want to give people choice. Again, it's about minimizing the impact of big money and maximizing the amount that people can hear a clear message from the political parties that they wish to support.

So we were leaders. We've now been moving clearly backwards and it's at a time, as I said, when we could be building broad political consensus around these issues.

\* (10:40)

Now, this is often one of these issues that is difficult for us as legislators to get a clear consensus within this Chamber and within legislation. Sometimes that is difficult. I will concede that point.

But there is another option and, in fact, it was an option that was presented by the leader for the official opposition and it was one that seemed to be asked for or welcomed, at least initially, by the Premier, and that was to strike an all-party committee to ensure that issues such as what we're dealing with here, The Election Financing Amendment Act that's before us today or other issues around financing or rebates or any other item, could be decided by an arm's-length group, an all-party committee, a committee that was not part of the everyday fray of political discourse that happens in this Chamber. And it could be taken out of that politicization and, again, we could build this consensus that I think is so very needed. And that offer was turned down by the Premier.

So, you know, I think this speaks to where the Conservatives of today under the leadership of this Premier are at, where their priorities lie.

And I'm, you know, I'm frustrated because, as I said—and I bring in students all the time to the Legislature. I go to their classrooms to speak and the first thing I talk about is how important it is for them to believe in the work that we are doing in this

Legislature. I tell them: You don't have to agree with everything I say. You don't have to agree with any of my viewpoints, in fact, but you have to believe that I, as the representative for our community and coming in every single day trying to make this province better and that every single member opposite and every single member in this Chamber is doing the same.

You have to believe that the process is there to work for you. And when the right comes in and they just want to break down the system at every turn—they want to debase the political discourse; they want to debase the electoral process—it only harms all of us. And I think it really does put democracy at risk.

So this is one step I could see as helping to restore some confidence in the electoral process. But again, if we're really serious about this, Madam Speaker, I would ask that there would be some support for an all-party committee, that we could come together as legislators; we could make the kind of decisions that make democracy stronger, rather than playing political games, rather than going back and forth over that. I think there's a way that we can build broad consensus, that we can make democracy stronger and we can support democracy here in Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Andrew Smith (Southdale):** I do appreciate the opportunity to rise today to speak to Bill 204. I do first want to, of course, congratulate the member from St. Boniface for his recent nomination. I understand that was just a day or two ago and of course—*[interjection]*—you know, of course, his birthday. So, again, happy belated birthday to the member from St. Boniface.

Madam Speaker, I know that this bill has—before the floor—being debated here and I—you know, looking through some of the provisions of this proposed legislation, I do ask a few questions. And I know I'm sure a few members here on this side of the House and maybe on the other side of the House, as well, would probably—would ask some similar questions in this regard.

You know, the bill explicitly states that it should have the name of the leader of a party on the signage—election signage—rather than the authorization by the official agent. And not too sure what the benefit to Manitobans is for this, in this case. I could see that there's a benefit certainly for the leader of a political party, but I don't know if there'd be any

benefit for the public. I'm certain that the public would know who the leader of that particular party is, and if not, then I don't think their fortunes are all that bright, Madam Speaker.

So I would think that any time that happens, I don't think Manitobans should be—I think Manitobans are smart to know who the leaders of each party are and I don't know that it's necessary to have the name of a leader of a party on the sign, unless it's in their own constituency and then, therefore, they are the candidate in that particular riding.

Madam Speaker, as our government is very proud of a number of things we've achieved over our term and, of course, most recently with respect to election financing, I know that we've—not necessarily election financing, but elections in general—we're very proud of some of the stuff that we have done.

First of all, requiring a by-election be called within six months of vacancy. I know it's the member from Morris, that's the reason why we have this legislation. As Mavis Taillieu was, as I understand, had stepped down and that vacancy hadn't been filled for almost a year actually—a year to almost the date, Madam Speaker. And so it does raise a few questions.

You know, perhaps the government of the day, the NDP of the day just thought that they weren't going to win Morris; I mean, it's conceivable that most ridings wouldn't have been won by them at that day after the PST increase in the night, the retail sales tax boondoggle that has led them to the official opposition status as we currently speak.

We've also created a standardized writ period with a fixed general election date and, you know, Madam Speaker, we do—also talked about abolishing the vote tax subsidy. Our side of the House never took the vote tax, and I know that members opposite—I'm sure members opposite have and maybe they haven't.

But, if that's the case, they should be—become clear with Manitobans on their stance on the vote tax subsidy. Nobody in Manitoba—I've never knocked on a single door and had somebody say, you know what, I really wish my hard-earned tax money would go to subsidize a political party. And, unless someone's hearing otherwise, I suspect that most Manitobans don't think that way and I am proud that our government stands on the side of the people on this issue especially.

Of course, with Bill 16, we introduced Bill 16, and one of the provisions of Bill 16 was the elimination of the 50 per cent election expenses subsidy. And, of course, that seemed unacceptable to members opposite. For some reason they just didn't want to proceed with that, so they used procedural delays to delay Bill 16. I guess they didn't want to see the PST reduction come through.

I mean, I'm sure it's part of it, but, you know, in all fairness, our Premier (Mr. Pallister) did negotiate with them in good faith and now instead of 50 per cent election expenses, it's 25 per cent. And, of course, you know, there's still work to be done on that.

But, you know, Madam Speaker, I do appreciate—

**An Honourable Member:** They're entitled to their entitlements.

**Mr. Smith:** Yes, the opposition seems entitled to their entitlements and they would prefer to get subsidies from a taxpayer rather than earn it and ask their own supporters for money. It's perhaps that's not something they want to do but, you know, in this new legislation they'll have to work a little bit harder next time, Madam Speaker. And I think that's incumbent upon all members of this House to—you got to ask for support and you got to ask for the vote at the end of the day. That's why we're here and that's how we got here and, in fact, in the last election and it will continue to be the case.

You know, back to the procedural delays that the NDP have implored—and, of course, I know the Liberal caucus has done some of this as well. They're trying delay the passing of BITSA and I remember a time when members opposite were crying across the floor, say, introduce BITSA, bring in BITSA, bring in BITSA, they sure bring in BITSA and now they delay it. So what is it, Madam Speaker? We don't know. Sometimes they want it, sometimes they don't. They have to at some point vote on it, of course, and—but they wanted to delay it. They wanted to make sure that BITSA was not passed.

I suspect, Madam Speaker, it's not that they did not like the bill; what they didn't want to do is they didn't want to see the PST reduction come through, of course. They—after campaigning in the 2011 elections saying they aren't going to raise the taxes, I believe it was Greg Selinger at the time who said, everybody knows we're not going to raise the PST; that's ridiculous, inconceivable, never going to

happen. And then they turn around a short year and a half later and introduced and raised the PST. And it's my understanding that members of their caucus didn't even know that was going to happen. So the premier of the day decide, hey, we're just going to raise the PST, no one's going to notice it, we'll sweep that one under the rug. And it didn't work all that well but, you know, I guess not everything always works out the way it's planned.

So, you know, I stand here today in the House and I do appreciate any action by any party to try and improve the electoral process but I do wonder about this particular bill and wonder why we're focusing on the leader of political parties and their names being attached to advertising, rather than other provisions that might actually improve the electoral process as a whole. I just say the elimination of the subsidy might be one of them but, again, Madam Speaker, it's a—I know there's a negotiation that happened and I'm very glad that all parties came to an agreement on this and we can move on with the good work that this government is doing, including the PST reduction July 1st, Canada Day. It'll be a great day for Manitobans not only because we're celebrating our nation's birthday but, of course, we're going to pay less at the cashier, less at the pump, less everywhere when it comes to the province, anyways, or provincial taxes.

Can't speak to the federal carbon tax, Madam Speaker; I know the federal carbon tax will certainly impact Manitobans, and it's very unfortunate that that's happened. We know that our government is actually removing the PST on the carbon tax; there was going to be a tax on a tax, as our government doesn't even support the carbon tax that the federal Liberals have introduced. We could not justify having a PST on top of that.

\* (10:50)

So, these—the PST decrease is going to be a great step forward for Manitobans, putting more money in the pockets of Manitobans rather than the government coffers, and certainly better than putting it in the hands of political parties that are not willing to raise money on their own accord and their own record and, rather, waiting for political handouts—rather, government handouts. And I know that is something that the NDP are ideologically in favour of anyways but, Madam Speaker, on this side of the House, we stand with the taxpayer, rather than political parties and their benefits.

So, Madam Speaker, when we formed government, our political parties enjoyed the most lavish taxpayer-funded subsidies in the country. We had a generous 75 per cent tax credit for contributions for political parties from Manitobans, a vote tax in the form of an annual allowance to fund political party operations in excess of 50 per cent subsidy for election expenses, including campaign advertising.

Vote tax, our Progressive Conservative caucus never took and I'm very proud to say that. Members opposite, I don't know if they want to stand there and say the same thing and I know they probably couldn't. And the member from Concordia definitely wouldn't say that but, you know, maybe's he changed his mind and maybe members opposite have changed their ways and want to support what this government is doing to protect the taxpayer, defend, stand up for the taxpayer. It is the responsibility of a government and all members in this Chamber to ensure that taxpayer money is spent effectively, efficiently and, of course, respected, and anything other than that is unacceptable, Madam Speaker, and I know that's why the NDP are in the position they're in right now, and I do look forward to further debate on this bill.

I, again—like I said, I thank the member for bringing this forward but I think there might be more productive ways of improving the electoral system here in Manitoba rather than just giving more advertising space or more advertising opportunities for a leader of a political party that has—that might believe they need increased—or increased profile, Madam Speaker. And I know that we, on this side of the House, are more concerned about what's the electoral process and making sure that taxpayers aren't on the hook for funding political party activities and making sure that the let-go process is indeed fair but also in favour of the taxpayer, making sure taxpayers are not funding political activities and that we're not sitting here making sure that our—

**Madam Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** Well, Madam Speaker, you know, we've said for time that Progressive Conservative backbenchers have no idea what's actually going on in this province or even in this Chamber, and today, this morning's debate has just made that so incredibly clear.

It is apparent from every word that's been spoken, using notes that apparently are out-of-date or perhaps for some of them, somewhat dangerously not using notes, not a single member has actually

spoken to the actual bill, which the Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Lamont) has put forward. And yet, we're joined by students in the gallery this morning. It's great to see students here.

I'll tell you, if they were as poorly prepared for an exam as these Conservative backbenchers are, to be debating The Election Financing Amendment Act, they would be getting a note home to their parents. I don't know what kind of sanction, short of the kind of lines that have been put on the record today by these Conservative backbenchers feeling miserably on the doorstep, I suppose, is the only recompense that can happen.

For the members opposite to now be complaining that somehow the budget implementations and tax statutes act is being delayed is so fundamentally wrong. It's actually sad, Madam Speaker, that individuals who are MLAs can stand in their place and put on the record something which is just completely untrue.

First, of course, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) said, well, you know, of course, the PST's going to decrease; it doesn't matter what the opposition parties do, this is happening. And just last week, I stood up and I asked the government, do they have a legal opinion? Did they have any opinion within their department that would support the new position put forward by the Premier and by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that somehow the July 1st date wouldn't work? And rather than provide that legal opinion, the—I guess the acting Minister of Finance, the minister for municipal affairs, got up and made it absolutely clear that the tax change would happen on July the 1st, whatever happened, and some members of my caucus were a bit more careful. They saw the Premier turn around and shake the head at that Cabinet minister, as the backbenchers just—as I guess they do every day in this House—just carried on, not really sure what's happening.

What is this bill about, Madam Speaker? Well, this bill will require every advertisement for a registered party, a candidate or a leadership contestant to actually be authorized by the leader of the registered party, the candidate or the leadership contestant, respectively. If it's a printed advertisement, this bill would require a statement that it's authorized by the leader of the party, the candidate or the leadership contestant, and if an advertisement's on the radio, on television or the Internet it would be

the leader, the candidate or the leadership contestant personally announcing they authorized the message during the advertisement.

And I don't know what world the Progressive Conservative backbenchers who spoke to this are living in. They have somehow managed to miss the entire purpose of this bill, and I do commend the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Lamont) bringing it forward. Because we happen to be living in an age—and, Madam Speaker, I don't think students who may happen to see advertising on TV, I don't think they would argue that we are living in a world where politics is getting nastier and nastier. Where many political parties choose rather than present their own positive vision, they will present attacked ads and they will go after individuals of other parties.

And if you're attacking someone's ideas, well, that's fair game. That's the way politics works. But when it goes beyond that and it becomes personal attacks, well, those things are disappointing and they're not a benefit for democracy.

So the idea that the member for St. Boniface had is not a new one. If you watch political advertising from the United States—which has its own issues with attack ads and negative advertising—in many states and federally it's a requirement that whoever is leading the party or whoever is the candidate actually has to have the bravery to go on and say, my name is such-and-such, and I approve this message. And the reason why that's done is to put some kind of control, some kind of limit on the negative kind of advertising that we know we've seen—frankly, from all parties.

But I would put on the record, quite fairly, in Canada it's mainly been the right-wing parties, although they change their names from time to time when all the members have to go to jail. Or like the BC Liberal party, they're not really Liberals at all; they're really Conservatives. The Saskatchewan Party, of course, is its own thing. Whatever it is that now runs Quebec is its own thing.

But generally speaking, the idea of this bill is to make sure that if a political party chooses to run a negative ad—or any kind of ads, for that matter—it's incumbent on the leader or the candidate to actually attach their name—or attach their face, if it's a TV advertisement—to that advertisement so that a party can't simply run a negative smear ad and not think that it—anybody's responsible for.

We know that when campaigns happen, leaders are very, very responsible for things that are said and things that are done, and I think it makes sense that we acknowledge that and this would be a good amendment. We do support legislation that 'incretes' transparency in electoral advertising, which this bill does, because fairness and integrity in campaign are important components of the democratic process.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm hoping that I can sit down, and we'll agree to pass this bill on to committee. Let's see what Manitobans have to say. The matter can go to committee. I know they'll be other bills going to committee in the month of May. Let's hear what Manitobans have to say, and let's see if we can improve democracy.

Thank you.

**Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Rossmere):** Madam Speaker, always a pleasure to stand in this House and today is no exception.

We're here to consider Bill 204 brought forward by the leader of the Liberals, and it is a fascinating glimpse into this member's mind and philosophy. Of all the things that could have been brought forward as bills to be discussed, of all the issues in our province, of all the challenges that we face, of all the things that he shares concern about, what one issue does he pick on, Madam Speaker?

He picks on the flyers that go out and the—that tiny little comment that is on these flyers, approved by—often in, like, six-point font—and currently it's the official agent. The member believes that it shouldn't say official agent, it should say leader. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

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

\* (11:00)

### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Speaker:** And, at this time, I would like to take a moment to introduce some guests that we have in the gallery. We have seated in the public gallery, from Dalhousie School, 75 grade 4 and 5 students under the direction of Spencer Pfahl, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Fort Richmond (Mrs. Guillemard).

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

## DEBATE ON RESOLUTIONS

### Res. 4—Winnipeg General Strike

**Madam Speaker:** The hour is now 11 a.m. and time for private members' resolutions. The resolution before us this morning is the resolution on the Winnipeg General Strike brought forward by the honourable member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux), and it is standing in the name of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Johnston) who—oh, pardon me—Interlake.

The honourable member for the Interlake, who has five minutes remaining.

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake):** I didn't want to take up much time here today.

So nice to see the guests in the gallery. I want to welcome you to—here today, nice big wave to you guys.

And we have a few people lined up that want to put some important words on the record, so I'm going to sit down and wish the member for Burrows the best of luck on this bill—resolution.

Thank you.

*Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

**Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I'd very briefly like to put on the record there are many union leaders in the Chamber today, in the gallery, who would like to see this resolution passed this morning. Any delays would effectively miss the opportunity to celebrate this momentous occasion, which is only 19 days away.

So I would kindly ask members to put politics aside this morning and partisanship, and allow this resolution to go to a vote.

**Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley):** I'm pleased to offer some brief comments in support of the content of this resolution. And it's very interesting that this type of language indeed has not become universal for all political parties already, not just in Manitoba but across Canada, and not just, you know, words in the form of a resolution but actually taking the further step of backing up those words with action. Actions do speak louder than words, as we all know, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This would be a radical departure from past Liberal Party policy when it comes to labour relations. I am always interested in political parties adopting better approaches than what they may have

had in the past. I take the member for Burrows' words at their value and encourage her in her own internal struggle or debate to bring these words into reality in the form of official policy statements from her party when it comes to labour law and labour relations, and for all of us to take a much more progressive approach and to look at the lessons that should have been learned 100 years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to labour.

It has always confused me why, traditionally, both the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party have been opposed to basic labour rights. Fundamentally, labour rights are about people wanting to be able to earn a living from their job. Fundamentally, labour rights are about people wanting to be able to go to work and come home safely, to know that the workplace where they are earning a living is not going to harm them, either with an immediate incident of trauma or over a long-term disability or exposure of some sort to degrade their health.

And their families very much want to know that when everyone heads off to work, that everyone is going to be in a safe environment free from any damages or harassments. And this is another fundamental tenet of labour rights, is better working conditions for the people who are working.

Who can be opposed to that? Why would we be opposed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a pension plan?

The single largest effort in Canada's history, the single largest initiative in Canada's history that has made the largest difference in reducing poverty amongst seniors in our country was the implementation of a national pension plan. Why is it so appalling to some political parties that when people reach a certain age that they cannot live on a pension afterwards? Why has that been opposed consistently by governments at the federal level and labour rights being opposed by this government right here and now?

The current legislative agenda of this government on the order bill has multiple pieces of legislation that directly attack labour rights.

And, if the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko) is getting off by heckling me while I'm putting some words on the record, I would encourage him to stand up and publicly state that on behalf of the Conservative Party of Canada, he is going to push for full labour rights and full labour legislation across the board. That will put him at

odds with his Premier (Mr. Pallister) and with all of his colleagues and presumably the vast majority of the Conservative Party membership because their actions do not back up these words.

In fact, what was one of the first decisions that this Premier made? Well, there was a strike happening—could even say caused by the Premier at the University of Manitoba. How did that work out? It turns out that the Premier violated Manitoba's labour code and his government was fined by the Labour Board.

If the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko), who thinks it's appropriate to try and heckle me while I'm speaking to this motion, if he's so concerned about labour rights, maybe he—

**An Honourable Member:** Point of order.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Yes, on a point of order and with the most sincere form of respect, I can't help but notice that there's a continuous stream of heckling interrupting my colleague from Wolseley's speech here this morning, so I'd simply request that the rules against heckling in this Chamber be enforced. Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable Minister for Crown Services, on same point of order.

**Hon. Colleen Mayer (Minister of Crown Services):** Thank you very much. I think that a good point has been made. I think that language from both members, perhaps the word, the comment, if the member for Lac du Bonnet gets off is probably an inappropriate and unparliamentary language to be used as well, so I think that we should all take heed to that and keep our comments to a proper forum. Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Second Opposition, on a point later—same point of order.

**Mr. Lamont:** I do want to support the leader of the opposition. It's clear there's a difference between the privilege and freedom of speech we have in this Chamber and the rules are that we have to go direct comments through the Chair, and frankly that this is an—in—a continual interruption of the member from Wolseley's speech. That's—we've often heard that this should not be happening so I would support the enforcement of the rules.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Yes, you know the—it is a point of order, and I just want to make sure that everybody respects each other when we're coming to having someone speaking. We do have to have decorum in this—at this House and I just want to make sure that everybody respects each other. So I will say that I just give warning that the heckling should stop and the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) will continue on his speech.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Altemeyer:** To be perfectly clear, I don't care if the member for Lac du Bonnet or anyone else heckles me.

\*(11:10)

I care about labour rights. I care about labour action. That's what we're supposed to be doing here. I'm merely pointing out that this government is diametrically opposed to improving the welfare of the vast majority of the citizens that live in this province. They care about the elite, they care about themselves, they're very consistent, but that's where they're coming from.

And I, again, want to applaud the member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux) for striking some very new turf, very new policy turf within her party, and I encourage them to make this official policy in the days ahead. And, who knows, maybe we can drag the governing Conservatives kicking and screaming into this century, since they are still supporting the strike committee that was formed in 1919 to suppress the workers of Manitoba.

#### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before we start with the next speaker, I just want to—we have a guest to my left in the loge. We have the honourable member of the—former member for Inkster—MLA—former MLA, Kevin Lamoureux, and now MP and of—also the father of the honourable member for Burrows.

Thanks for being here.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Blair Yakimoski (Transcona):** Thank you for a little bit of time to speak on the resolution from the member from Burrows. I congratulate you for bringing this forward.

I know that in Ottawa, a similar motion was brought forward by a young fellow who—I gave one

of his first jobs to, many years ago, the Member of Parliament for Elmwood-Transcona, Daniel Blaikie.

But it appears that motion was put on notice, and I'm not sure what being put on notice really refers to in Parliament. Perhaps we can ask the member in the loge there what it is. But I wonder if the member from Burrows could convince him that perhaps Daniel's motion could move forward so that yours might also move forward. I'm sure he would appreciate the support.

I know he brought it forth over a year ago, or somewhere around a year ago, and he wanted to bring attention to this momentous event in labour history. And I also wonder why the present provincial NDP chose not to bring this forward before a member of the Liberal Party—who they sometimes think is, perhaps, no friend to labour—well, it appears that they are. The NDP appeared, maybe, to drag their heels on bringing this forward.

It is important to recognize this historic moment. I know I, as well as all my colleagues—we support everyone's right, anyone's right to join a bargaining unit. We know there can be a need in society to create or strike a balance between the needs of business and the needs of labour, to discuss and negotiate how to create an atmosphere of success for employees and business.

I believe that all employees deserve the right to join or not to join a union. I know the member from Wolseley spoke about how no one should not come home from work. I would look—like to put on the record at this time the name of my childhood friend, Richard Schultz, who was killed in a workplace accident many years ago.

And I will think of him tomorrow at the National Day of Mourning. I will seek out my friend—who many of these gentlemen may know and ladies may know—Wally Skomoroh. Wally and I were friends and we used to play a whole lot of road hockey, and we will remember our friend Richard.

It is almost hard to believe, a hundred years ago, this historic event occurred. The conditions after World War I changed life for those returning and serving their country. Their jobs were replaced by many immigrants, who—many of them who came in the second wave of Ukrainian immigration, my forefathers—many of them were labourers.

The post-war economic landscape that—was experience a massive inflation, job losses, and we do—did not, at the time, have the safety nets we have

now. I know steaks in stores, I was reading, went from 10 cents a pound up to over 30 cents a pound. Imagine going to Costco and finding that three-pack of New York strips, and it's—the package is over a hundred dollars. That's quite the problem.

This action, which lasted some five weeks, changed our country. Out of that strife was born labour leaders, community leaders, who eventually became politicians that worked in this Chamber. The dark end to this unrest, on the Bloody Saturday, people dying, I know was not the desire for anyone, but it is sometimes through those horrible, dark historic times that society does change.

I do know that labour standards have been brought forward and standardized minimum wages came out of the event. But in reading about it, those that were on strike—as many strikes are labour actions, there was no winner. The economy experienced a downturn, wages for those returning to work were depressed and the chasm between our city was not bridged.

I am, though, looking forward to attending this summer's production of the Danny Schur musical, *Strike!* at Rainbow Stage. I can imagine it will be very well attended and receive glowing reviews, as read from the *Globe and Mail*, which said: a compelling piece of musical theatre.

And me, I am a fan of musical theatre. Perhaps this will be Winnipeg's own *Les Mis*, with similar themes of a love story set—set against the backdrop of civil unrest.

The *Saskatoon StarPhoenix* says it gives you everything you want: a love story, a suspenseful plot, a collection of good songs and a history lesson that teaches you something about yourself.

I hope I will see many of my colleagues spending a night under the stars, enjoying a uniquely Winnipeg production in a uniquely Winnipeg place.

I also know that the movie version of *Strike!*, which was renamed *Stand!*, has completed production last year and is looking to be released this year, hopefully just after their run at Rainbow Stage. Although I did refer to it as a *Les Mis*, they—Danny refers to it as much more of a *Romeo and Juliet*.

I wish Danny and all those involved in this summer's production and release much success and look forward to seeing our city's history on the big screen.



I wish the member from Burrows much luck on the passage of her first resolution in this House.

Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Any further speakers?

**Mr. Kinew:** It certainly is a pleasure to rise in the Chamber and speak on behalf of working people once again here in Manitoba and also, again, to reaffirm our party's commitment to solidarity with the labour movement.

This year, 2019, is a year of some important anniversaries. Of course, the anniversary, the centenary of the Winnipeg General Strike is coming up with a ton of social events and different commemorations, including the unveiling of a statue. And so this will certainly be an important occasion on which to mark all the sacrifices that were made and, indeed, lives that were laid down to fight for some of the basic collective bargaining and labour rights that working people in Manitoba now enjoy.

We also know that the 100th anniversary of the Winnipeg General Strike is a time for us to learn; to examine the history of that struggle; to learn about the great labour leaders, many of them who went on to become political leaders, one of whom was actually elected while incarcerated because of his actions in support of workers during the general strike.

And we know that as the NDP, we are the inheritors of that legacy. Those labour leaders who led in the strike paved the way for the CCF and the CCF, of course, paved the way for the NDP. So certainly a legacy that we're very proud of and we're very happy to support the labour movement in Manitoba as they honour all these celebrations.

Plus, I noticed a lot of people are pretty pumped up to see Bruce Cockburn and Ani DiFranco play that concert that's part of the Winnipeg General Strike anniversary, too, so that should be good times. And I know that goes beyond us politicians; there's probably other folks in the Legislature who are looking forward to that as well. So that should be a really good occasion.

It's also an important part of Winnipeg history generally. Even if you were to step outside what it means for labour, what it means for working people, it's certainly one of the, I guess, pieces of Manitoba history that many of us do learn about as we're growing up in this place, and so it's important to acknowledge this occasion.

This, of course, also, I guess kind of leads to the other big celebration that we're looking forward to in the first half of this year, which is the 50th anniversary of the election of the Schreyer government. So, it will be the—on June 25th, 2019, it will be 50 years since Ed Schreyer's election, to the day, as the first NDP premier in Manitoba and certainly that began a period in which Manitoba's labour laws and regulations and also the enforcement of those laws and regulations rose to become the gold standard across Canada.

\*(11:20)

And so, as under the leadership of premiers Schreyer, Pawley, Doer and Selinger, that working people in Manitoba and the labour movement was able to have their voices heard at the table, to have representation in the decisions being made to affect their lives when it comes to collective bargaining, when it came to pay and, very importantly, when it comes to health and safety, as well.

I know one of the things that I'm always reminded of when I meet with many labour leaders, in particular the leaders of the steelworkers' union, is that health and safety really is top of mind for a lot of those folks, and it makes sense. You know, health and safety in the workplace is about making sure that when mom or dad go to work in the morning, that they can come home safely at night, and certainly I would say that that's one of the really fundamental labour rights that people can enjoy.

It doesn't end there. It goes beyond just law and regulation. It also has to do with enforcement and accountability because we know that while you can have good law and good rules, that they are only as strong as the enforcement and the inspections that uphold those laws and rules.

We know that the current Conservative government has not only cut many of the inspectors and departments that helped health and safety, but they've actually now moved past that and they're now trying to legislate that. So not only would those services be removed from the budget, but they'd also be removed from the statutes here in Manitoba. And we say that's wrong, we say health and safety does matter and we'll continue to stand up for worker health and safety each and every day and every chance we get.

On a personal level, when we look back at the history of the labour movement, I'm also reminded

that there is an interesting and at sometimes conflicted history of the parallel journey for the fight for the rights of indigenous people, and we know that that history is sometimes conflicted and other times is very positive. But there is one story that I want to share about that journey that goes back to the mid-1960s in the city where I was born, in Kenora, Ontario.

So, at this time, Canada was a very racist country in its treatment of indigenous people. At this time, it was still the practice to remove every indigenous child from their families and put them into residential school, and after, you know, my father and uncle and aunt's generation left the residential schools, they were told that they were not allowed to work in many of the workplaces in town, they weren't allowed to eat in the same restaurants, they weren't allowed to stay in the same hotels. So they faced a de facto Jim Crow segregation in that part of the country at that time.

And so they resolved to try and change things for the better and they stood up to fight for their basic civil rights, civil rights that many of my colleagues and I now take for granted today, though of course we don't forget the sacrifices that were made for us to have those rights. And so, specifically what they did, and this was led by my Uncle Fred Kelly, whose Anishinaabe name is Kiizhebowse Makwa—he was a young soon-to-be activist growing up on the streets of Kenora and he resolved that he was going to organize a silent march through the streets inspired by Dr. Martin Luther King, inspired by John Lewis, inspired by the other leaders of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee then leading the civil rights movement in the States.

Could I rise on a point of order, just to pause the clock for a second?

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for—the honourable first Leader of the Official Opposition, on a point of order.

**Mr. Kinew:** Yes, I just wanted to clarify a rule as to whether or not I have unlimited speaking time in this session here or whether I have to wrap it up by two minutes, 30 seconds?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** 'Ish' basically, because it's private member's business, it's the 10 minutes.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Kinew:** Okay. So, again, he organized the communities around Kenora to come and march for their basic civil rights. But do you know who—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Kinew:** —it was who stood shoulder to shoulder with him? It was the carpenters' union in Kenora at the time; it was a building trades union that stood in solidarity with my uncle and they actually seconded one of their members to travel through all the reserves in the area to organize those communities.

And today, we sometimes complain, like, oh, organizing is hard work. But here's what those people had to do at that time. To get to a community like Grassy Narrows, they had to walk through the bush for a full day because there was no road to the community at the time. So my uncle and the carpenter walked through the bush for a full day. They got to the community; they went door to door; they went tent to tent to invite people out to the march. They stayed overnight and then the next day they'd walk out of the bush trail there.

The result was a march in the streets of Kenora in 1965 where 400 First Nations people wearing suits and ties and wearing their Sunday best marched silently through the streets saying, we deserve better than the way we are being treated; we deserve civil rights, and above all, we deserve our dignity to be respected. They had a list of demands, and every single one of their demands was met by those in power at the time.

So it was a pretty remarkable example of the power of solidarity and why it is important not just for labour organizations and social justice advocates, but again, people from all backgrounds, to stand together in solidarity. And so I'm very mindful that my role as leader of the NDP is to help forge that connection, not just with indigenous people and labour, but again, with activists from many different backgrounds, with the activists in the labour movement, with working people and, indeed, with all Manitobans. And I'm extraordinarily proud of the legacy that I've inherited and the work that I have before me to do to accomplish that goal.

And, to that end, I just want to close by putting on the record that in solidarity with the building trades movement, we have delayed the project labour agreement bill, not just this year but also for the past two years because we think having hundreds of unemployed electricians in Manitoba is wrong and

that this government's conduct to lead to that outcome is absolutely shameful.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Any further speakers?

**Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James):** I'm pleased to put some brief comments on the record in support of this resolution.

The General Strike of 1919 is a significant event in the history of Manitoba. Not only did it influence labour reform in Manitoba, it created recognition of workers' rights in all of Canada. The significance of over 30,000 workers protesting working conditions as well as employment opportunities just couldn't be ignored.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when reviewing the background of this strike, it becomes very apparent the passion behind this conflict. The pictures that you see resonate the conflict and certainly the passion of all those involved: the picture of the trolley car being pushed over by protestors and men on horseback trying to instill law and order as well as men marching together in demonstration. Those participating in the General Strike speak to the involvement of Manitoba's diverse 'multural'—cultural makeup.

When reviewing some of the history of the strike, you would note that the World War I vets returning from World War I were very frustrated with the lack of employment opportunities. Many Eastern Europeans, who migrated to Manitoba in search of a new life, brought forth their feelings of reform and philosophical differences with the influence of those returning or coming to Manitoba based on the Russian Revolution—were influenced by Communism and the beginnings of socialism. All of the new influences created and contributed to the historical involvement of what makes up Manitoba's rich heritage and diverse population.

\* (11:30)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think one could ignore the needs and essentials of workers' rights that the strike brought attention to. I respect labourers' initiative to form one big union. Conceptually, central negotiating entity certainly has merit, as our government has recognized. This, of course, would have been a major challenge for those individuals that were trying to accomplish it. Not only did they have to do it in 1919, when communications, of course, would have been very challenging, they probably also had to do it under a very secretive environment.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, today's labour practices are in place due to the General Strike of 1919. I personally have had some experience with collective bargaining, and I appreciate the practices which have—which the general strike have contributed in this general—in this day and age.

The introduction of conciliation, to conclude solution of an impact; binding arbitration, which ultimately will create a solution; and legal strikes, without violence: all can be attributed to the general 1919 strike. We've certainly gone beyond a bloody Sunday.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my constituency of St. James houses people with a wide variety of backgrounds who have benefited by the labour movement.

The West End was built by many employees of the CP rail line, the Weston Shops, all have benefited by equitable labour practices. The large industrial park, housing the third largest aerospace industry in Canada; those loyal workers contributed to the building of our community and the enterprise of our province. And I am pleased to see the recognition of the General Strike of 1919 by museum exhibits, docudramas put on by the CBC.

So I am happy to support this resolution during the 100th anniversary of the General Strike of 1919.

And I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on House business.

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Yes, on House business.

I was wondering if there is will of the House not to see the clock until all members who have wanted to speak to the resolution have had the opportunity.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there the will of the House to not look at 12 o'clock until everybody has spoken?

**An Honourable Member:** Agree.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** No? I hear a no.

The honourable member—

Leave is denied.

**Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview):** I certainly want to begin today by thanking the member from Burrows for bringing this resolution to the floor of the Legislature.

Certainly, it's worth pointing out, just in terms of a contrast to the Pallister government, this is a government that just came up with a budget in March. There was all kinds of stuff in there about Manitoba's 150th birthday, and that's appropriate, I suppose. Not a word: not a sentence, not a paragraph, not a point made about the General Strike of 1919, even though we're entering the 100th anniversary of that historic event which I said not just—hadn't—I've said before: not just had implications in Manitoba, or in Canada, but internationally as well.

And it needs to be respected for that on its very own merit. So I thank the member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux) for bringing it to the floor, just for the purpose of contrasting it with the Committee of 1,000 that currently is the government of Manitoba, today.

Now, in saying that, though, I have to say that it's a little difficult for New Democrats to hear Liberals suddenly trying to co-opt the labour movement in this country. Because when—the point—the reality is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that Liberals, like they always do, played both sides of the equation. And when they're campaigning, of course, they're on the side of progressive politics. They campaign from the left but, when they get into government, it's the same old thing. They govern for the right. It's the Tweedledums and the Tweedledees, and we don't know the difference between them.

So it's a little rich—it's a little rich for the member for Burrows to somehow try to come in here today and co-opt the labour movement, and co-opt the anniversary of the 1919 Winnipeg General Strike when, in fact, Conservatives and Liberals were part of the Committee of 1,000, and only one group of people that were labour leaders—CCFers after that, New Democrats after that—stand with working people, day in and day out. These guys never do it.

And I know it's quite nice, I know it would be great thing, I wish my dad could come sit and in the loge. He's not with us anymore. I wish my dad had been an MP and an MLA and he could come and sit in the loge. And I think that's a nice moment. Honestly, I really do. But it's a little rich for the Member of Parliament for Winnipeg North to come in here after just voting for legislation that sent postal workers back to work.

If—if they really believed, if they really believed in workers' rights, if they really believed in the right to strike, that legislation never would have seen the dawn of day. Instead, we had a full Liberal

majority stand behind that right to back-to-work legislation. That was outrageous.

My friend from Flin Flon was encouraged to see the member for—MP for Winnipeg North come into the Chamber today because he's still waiting for an apology for that particular piece of legislation. I'm sure Mr. Lamoureux and the member from Flin Flon can talk outside the Chamber, that Mr. Lamoureux will put forward his right hand and say to the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Lindsey): I'm sorry, I just did what I was told, I wasn't thinking, I don't really believe what the Liberal government did but I did it anyways and I'm ashamed of myself and I apologize not only to the member for Flin Flon but to postal workers and the people of Canada for that kind of nonsense.

I want to also welcome our friend from the—friends here from the—from trades that are with us here today and I'm glad you came, I really appreciate you showing up. And I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were under the illusion there was some kind of Kumbaya going on here today, that, in fact, we were all going to wrap our arms—ourselves arm in arm and vote for this resolution. That was never going to happen.

No member of the NDP today or yesterday or in the past would ever have thought of being co-opted by Liberals or Conservatives on issue of labour rights in this country, will never going to happen.

And there's only one party in this Legislature—and I want to say this to my friends up in the gallery today—there's only one party in this Legislature that when the Conservative government, the Pallister government eliminated—eliminated—the Department of Labour in this province, only one party stood up and protested, and that was the NDP. And when the Conservative government routinely brings health and labour legislation—safety and health legislation to the floor of this Chamber, that rolls it back into the 20th century, if not the 19th century. There's only one party that stands up with workers on their behalf and that's the NDP; it's not Liberals and it's not Conservatives.

Time and again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the past, this government has attacked labour and has really—is waging war on labour.

My friend from Lac du Bonnet is welcome, he's been already asked once not to do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Allum:** –he's got the opportunity to come up and have his say. He could be like my friend from St. Johns and pretend, you know, that he's really on the side of labour when it suits his purpose—  
[interjection]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Allum:** –St. James, I mean. St. James.  
[interjection]

St. Johns, yes. St. James. Almost mixed themselves up with somebody who's way better.

He can pretend, pretend he's on the side of labour today and try to look back on 1919 and this is this moment that we can all sort of recognize as being of historic significance. But make no mistake, his team now is the same team then, the committee of 1,000 that was waging war on workers in 1919 and nothing—and I mean nothing—has changed in the last 100 years, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Not one single thing has changed.

And so, only one party—only one party in this Chamber, in this Legislature, in this province stands with workers. That's the NDP. That's the way it was, that's the way it is, it's the way it's always going to be, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You know, I can guarantee the members of our party, New Democrats are going to be out supporting trades all the time. I think you'll recall that when we were in government, nobody supported the trades like our government and it was in terms of job creation and trades training and making sure there was opportunity to build a good life here in Manitoba for people with high skills and high abilities. We desperately need them and only one party, only one government has ever reached out to deal—to address and work with the trades, and that's been the NDP in Manitoba.

\* (11:40)

Again I say: only one party.

We actually built, as Education Minister, and I can attest to this, that we built shops all across this province in schools to make sure that a next generation of tradespeople have the opportunity to have a good job in this province.

We built schools all across the province—up north, in rural Manitoba, and in the city of Winnipeg—to make sure that there was an incredible amount of opportunity for tradespeople now to get a good job, and in the future to have a good job. And

I think our friends from the trades will recognize that, that only one party has stood with them time and time and time again.

So don't be mistaken—and I'm sorry you were invited under false pretenses. It wasn't true. It was never true. No New Democrat worth their salt would vote for this and be co-opted by the Liberals or the Conservatives, the Tweedledum and Tweedledee of Canadian politics. It's not going to happen, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So I'm proud to say, with the women and men that I work with every single day, we stand up for workers. We stand up for good jobs for Manitobans. We stand up for good wages, good health and safety legislation. All of the things that make it worthwhile for a tradesperson to get up in the morning and go to work has been the result of our partnership and our comradery together.

That's never going to change. I'm telling you right now: even if I'm not around in the future, I know my sisters and my brothers are going to stand with workers every single day. We'll never be co-opted. We'll never roll over. We'll never lay down. We're going to stand with workers now and into the future.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Any further speakers?

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** I have to say that the member for Riverview certainly gave a impassioned speech on the subject, and it will be certainly hard to beat.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I mean, I know that this is a Liberal resolution. And I know that the Liberals are arriving kind of late to the party here, but you know, historically, had the Conservatives and the Liberals been doing their job for workers in this country over the last 100 years, there would have been no need for parties like the NDP, and prior to the NDP, the CCF and the ILP, going way, way back.

And, you know, we tend to think that everything changed in Manitoba when Ed Schreyer was elected 50 years ago, and to a certain extent it's true. You know, we look at our legislative agenda today and we see, you know, just a handful of bills being brought forward by this government.

But, when we look at the first year of the Schreyer government—and this was a minority government, by the way. This wasn't a majority

government with 42 seats, but it was a government with minority situation, and it got, like, I think 100 pieces of legislation—a record number—brought in in its first year.

And a lot of the legislation that the Schreyer government brought in was, you know, labour legislation and legislation that was positive for workers. But before that, there was 100 years of struggle.

And when we didn't have the government of the province to introduce legislation, the old—in the old days of the ILP and so on, there were only a few members that were being elected to Legislature. And they're the ones that deserve our admiration for what they did because they stood up against the governments of the day to promote workers' rights when it wasn't so popular.

You know, it's very easy today to be supporting because most of this legislation is supported and is appreciated, even by members of the Conservative Party. Member for St. James (Mr. Johnston), you know, made comments a little bit earlier about this. So now it's easy, but in those days it was not. There was—it took a lot of courage on the part of a lot of people to step out.

You know, in—we talking about election financing early today, too, and I noticed some of the comments there. You know, way back in—50 years ago when Ed Schreyer got elected, there was no rebates. There was no public financing system. I mean, you know, members basically of the CCF, before the NDP and then the NDP in those days, you know, they had members of their executive that went out and signed for bank loans, you know. We have stories of people that mortgaged their houses just to run, just to put up signs in the North End.

Back in David Orlikow's day—there we had some pretty good locations in those days, but we had to pay, you know. People, businesses wouldn't let the NDP put up a sign. We had to pay to put these signs up, right? So it's been a long road to get what we've got right now. So it's, you know, it's great to see the—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Order.

**An Honourable Member:** Point of order.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on a point of order.

**Ms. Lamoureux:** Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order—relevance.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable opposition House leader, on the same point of order.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader):** I do just want to point out that the member is referring to facts that have happened in respect of our history and our connection and our commitment to labour, and it is absolutely relevant for the discussion in respect of this resolution right now.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On that same point of order, I just wanted to—it's about relevance, and I think it's important that the honourable member from Elmwood stay on relevance of the bill. And we'll continue with the honourable member from Elmwood.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Maloway:** Well, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And, you know, it's been accepted in this Legislature—all legislatures, that a certain, you know, latitude be given in speeches. And, you know, I was a Member of Parliament at one time and I know that, you know, members of Parliament, you know, have their speeches—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** —all typed up for them, which, you know, is against parliamentary rules, too, you know, because you're not supposed to be reading a speech, but they do it. But nobody complains over there, you know, in Ottawa, about a member's relevance. It seems like, you know, in a Legislature like this, we tend to see a little more questions about relevance. But I would tell you that everything I've said up 'til now is absolutely, totally relevant to the issue, and, for the last number of years, I was the member in our caucus who used to address this issue of the 1919 strike. I would do a member's statement every year, predictably on this subject.

So, you know, I know there haven't been Liberals here for that long in recent years but, you know, when I was here making my speeches, I didn't hear any speeches by any Liberals on this topic, or Conservatives, for that matter.

The member for Riverview talked about how this government, this Conservative government's basically eliminated the labour minister. They don't even have a labour minister in—for the first time in, like almost for—forever.

So, you know, there's a lot of celebrations going on this year. The labour movement has expanded. It's not—no longer just a one-day event. It's going on for like, a week, and so I'm sure people are being invited to go out and to attend a number of these events.

And I don't fault the Liberals for being, well, like, to come to the party, but I don't fault them for bringing out a resolution. I mean, that's fair ball. But it should have some sort of basis in history. They should be able to recognize that, you know, Liberal leader himself. I mean, the Liberal leader's been—the Liberal Party has been split over the years. Matter of fact, they call themselves in Ontario, they're called Liberal labour, you know.

So there was some—there's been some support for Liberals over the years, but, you know, whenever there's a back-to-work legislation being drafted, the federal Liberals just tripping over themselves to get legislation done. Like they don't—it doesn't—forget the process here. It's just like, bang, it's done in a matter of hours. And I think that's all we're saying here is that we have the history of the Liberals, when it comes to labour, their actions, you know, is one of very—being very arbitrary.

\* (11:50)

So, I mean, the Liberal leader here can, you know, stand up and make speeches—but he doesn't have any experience—and say, well, we're going to do this and we're going to do that. But that is not what they've done; they don't even read their own history. And, once again, as I've explained before, there wouldn't even been an NDP, a CCF or an ILP if the Liberals had been doing their job in the first place. You know, if they brought in legislation that was helpful to workers and friendly to workers and supportive of workers—but that isn't what happened.

In opposition, the Liberals are great about talking about how they're going to do progressive things, but the history of the Liberal Party is when they become governments, they govern like Conservatives. You can't tell the difference. You can't tell me the difference between a Liberal government over the long haul and a Conservative government over the long haul. Matter of fact, you could maybe even argue the point that in some exceptions, maybe the Conservatives have done even a better job than the Liberals, but it doesn't—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** —it doesn't deal—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** —with the fact that we have a organized political party that is supported by the labour movement for a number of years for a very good reason, and this is not just that Manitoba is right across the country.

And, as much as the Conservatives want to play with the election rules that we've had for quite a long time now and the rebate system, which, by the way, they take—the Premier (Mr. Pallister) of this province has taken election rebate every election he's ever run in and won and then lost too, by the way.

But I mean, he first got elected in 1993, I think, in the by-election. Well, he took his rebate; then 1995, he took his rebate; 1997, he took his rebate. Then he ran federally; he quit, he ran federally and he lost. He lost his first federal, but he took his rebate then too. And then he ran the next time and he actually won, and he took his rebate. And then he ran again and he took another rebate, and again—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** —and then he didn't get put in the Cabinet, so he quit the federal—right? And then he came over here to run again and take his rebate again in 2012 and then again last time.

So, you know, the—well, you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker—*[interjection]*—I don't want to respond to comments—yes, from the—from other caucuses.

But, anyway, thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think I'll conclude there.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there any other further speakers?

**Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas):** It gives me great honour to stand up in the House today to put a few words on the record about this PMR, the 1919 Winnipeg General Strike.

I just want to begin by pointing out, the Liberal Party has a long history of not supporting labour rights. You know, in fact, in 1921, the then-Liberal premier of Manitoba, Tobias Norris, voted against Bill 72, a bill to regulate the hours of labour brought forward by the Labour Party.

Fast forward now to 2018 and the current federal Liberal Party passed back-to-work legislation for Canada Post workers—Canada postal workers, forcing them to go back to work. And the Liberals are bringing this here today?

You know, we have the Liberal MP from Winnipeg North in the House today. He was actually one of the MPs who voted the postal workers back to work. So I find it ironic that a Liberal would be bringing this forward into this House and, you know, trying to—I don't know what they're trying to do—trying to become friends with labour and act like they care about labour all of a sudden when, all of these years, since the beginning of 1921, they've been voting workers back to work. *[interjection]*

And, you know, I hear the member from—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Smith:**—Steinbach piping in and, you know, in fact, his government is doing the exact same. They are forcing workers to work under unsafe conditions; they're forcing project labour agreements. You know, this PC government is no different than the Liberal government.

So I find it ironic that the two are now coming together to, you know, support labour. One way they can support labour is by, you know, making sure that workers are safe in this province, by not forcing workers back to work and actually honouring agreements that are made by the unions themselves.

You know, I'm super proud of my two children that actually are a part of unions.

One of them is the pipefitters' union, you know, he's a sprinkler system guy that puts in sprinkler systems. And you know, he loves working for a union. The union protects him, gets him good wages, good working hours and keeps their workers safe.

My other son works for Unifor. He works at Boeing; he makes planes. He's been there for about 10 years now, super proud of him. Again, supported by a labour group; a union that is taking care of their workers.

So I want to put another few words on the record just about, you know, a hundred years in the strike—the Winnipeg General Strike—that actually helped bring labour issues and the importance of labour rights into the forefront of our social conscious.

Over 30,000 workers took to the streets in this very province. The banks, street cars, mail, telephone, food delivery, police and fire services were all cut off, Deputy Speaker: these workers demanded a collective bargaining agreement, a living wage, an eight-hour workday and improved

conditions. Which all, I'll add, that unions made happen.

So, with those few words, and you know, I just want to give a shout-out, of course, to our union brothers that are in the House today. That we—you know, the NDP—we're on your side, we're fighting for you. We've been fighting for you every day and we'll continue fighting for you.

Miigwech.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** I'm pleased to get up and just put a couple of words on the record.

Let me just begin by acknowledging the member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux) for bringing forward the resolution. I think that it's been made pretty clear here that we respect and honour the fact that the member brought forward a resolution.

But, Deputy Speaker, in good conscience we cannot support a resolution brought forward by the Liberals in respect of the 1919 strike.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on a point of order.

**Ms. Lamoureux:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, yes, on a point of order.

We have many guests from different unions who have joined us in the gallery today. The NDP are very clearly politicizing this. We would like to move to a recorded vote this morning.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On that—anybody else on the point of order?

The honourable member for Burrows, on that point of order: it's not a point of order. The opposition has rights to speak this out. So.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Fontaine:** Let me just clarify, respectfully, for the member for Burrows. I know that the member for Burrows is shaking her head, and that's okay.

She actually should be shaking her head at her father. Who, actually, just a little while ago, stood up in Parliament and voted in favour if—of legislation forcing Canada Post union members back to work. And not only did they—not only did he stand in the House and support that legislation, they actually forgo—*[interjection]*—they voted as well, in forgoing all of—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.



**Ms. Fontaine:** –the different three processes, so that the legislation would actually pass exponentially, instead of just forgoing all of the processes that we have.

So the member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux), again, respectfully, I respect the sister for bringing forward a resolution. But, in good conscience, if you were a member of the NDP, you cannot support a resolution that the Liberals bring forward when only a couple of months ago they forced workers back to work who were actually asking for better time, better pay, better pension. We cannot—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** –in good conscience get up on this side of the House and vote in favour of that. And while—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** –the member—the Liberal leader says that for—if this resolution doesn't pass, somehow all of the activities supporting 1919 aren't going to happen, clearly he hasn't been paying attention to the many, many activities that are going on.

For the Liberal leader, I will—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** –point out, and I will—I'm having such a difficult time hearing, I don't know why they're heckling. If they wanted to—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** –get up, they could've gotten up.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

I know this is a passionate topic here, but you know what, we have to respect each other—when we're speaking.

**Ms. Fontaine:** So let me just—for the Liberal leader, because he seems to think that activities aren't going to happen—let me just lay out a couple of things that are 'happening'.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** There's the—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Order.

When this matter is before the House, the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine) will have seven minutes—eight minutes remaining.

The hour being 12 p.m., the House is recessed and stands recessed to 1:30 p.m.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**

**Thursday, April 25, 2019**

**CONTENTS**

<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>		<b>Debate on Resolutions</b>	
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS</b>		Res. 4–Winnipeg General Strike	
<b>Debate on Second Readings– Public Bills</b>		Johnson	1560
		Lamont	1560
Bill 204–The Election Financing Amendment Act		Altemeyer	1560
Bindle	1549	Yakimoski	1561
Lindsey	1551	Kinew	1563
Morley-Lecomte	1552	Johnston	1565
Wiebe	1554	Allum	1565
A. Smith	1556	Maloway	1567
Swan	1558	B. Smith	1569
Micklefield	1559	Fontaine	1570

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings

are also available on the Internet at the following address:

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