

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

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

**Vol. LXX No. 46A - 10 a.m., Thursday, April 27, 2017**

ISSN 0542-5492

**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	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Clifford	Emerson	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott	St. James	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
KLASSEN, Judy	Kewatinook	Lib.
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan	Selkirk	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Burrows	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MAYER, Colleen	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
PALLISTER, Brian, Hon.	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine, Hon.	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REYES, Jon	St. Norbert	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	Ind.
SCHULER, Ron, Hon.	St. Paul	PC
SELINGER, Greg	St. Boniface	NDP
SMITH, Andrew	Southdale	PC
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	NDP
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WHARTON, Jeff	Gimli	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Point Douglas	

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 27, 2017

*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.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

## House Business

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on House business, pursuant to rule 33(8), I'm announcing that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Thursday of private members' business is one put forward by the honourable member for Minto (Mr. Swan), and the title of the resolution is Extension of Care.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader that pursuant to rule 33(8), it is announced that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Thursday of private members' business will be one put forward by the honourable member for Minto. The title of the resolution is Extension of Care.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Maloway:** I move, that—[interjection]—or I ask for leave to move to Bill 220.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave to consider Bill 220 this morning? [Agreed]

## SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

## Bill 220—The Environmental Rights Act

**Madam Speaker:** We will do, then, second reading, Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act.

**Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley):** I move, seconded by the honourable member for Minto, that Bill 220,

The Environmental Rights Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto—I'll start again.

It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Minto, that Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I want to thank my colleagues for working on this very important piece of legislation with me—from our caucus—and their support in bringing this important debate forward this morning.

Members who were here previous to the last election will recognize this piece of legislation. It was introduced. It, unfortunately, did not get across the finish line before the election happened, and I'm very pleased to bring it forward.

By way of context, this legislation is a direct result of the excellent lifelong advocacy of one Dr. David Suzuki, a person for whom I have an enormous amount of respect for his tireless work to protect the planet and to engage not just Canadians, but people worldwide in one of the more fundamental challenges that our world faces, namely, finding a way to balance current human society with the limits of what the Earth can withstand. And his campaign that he launched through the David Suzuki Foundation was called the Blue Dot campaign in recognition that our planet is the only place that we have home, and in the big realm of outer space it is a very precious and beautiful blue dot and that we need to do far more to protect it and make sure that our actions are compatible with what it can sustain.

The Blue Dot campaign has been very successful at the municipal level. Numerous municipalities across the country have endorsed it. The government of Ontario, to their credit, dating way back to the early 1990s, has an environmental rights bill as well, and our government, at the time, was the first to endorse the David Suzuki Blue Dot campaign at the provincial level. Other provinces have since followed suit, but we were the first, and I was very pleased to have a chance to meet Dr. David Suzuki yet again. I had met him previously, but he was kind enough to come here for the formal announcement, and he had

very positive things to say about this legislation that we were bringing forward, and he was very hopeful that Manitoba's leadership would spur other jurisdictions in the country and around the world to follow suit.

In terms of the details of the legislation, it's very unique because what David Suzuki has recognized in—throughout his work is the crucial role that regular citizens can play in protecting the planet, that not everything can or perhaps even should be done by government, but that when a government empowers its citizens, gives them rights and capacities to be able to protect the environment, that everyone comes out ahead.

So this legislation does not change any particular environmental law in Manitoba; rather, it empowers citizens to be able to help the government enforce the law and report problems and violations of the law when they see them happen with a louder voice than they had before.

So there are four key components to this legislation, Madam Speaker. First and foremost, it compels the government to consider the impacts on the environment whenever the government is making a decision. And just to pick one example, for instance, if there is an industry which a government is keen to promote or expand and that industry is going to bring with it, inevitably, some additional amount of pollution or environmental damage, the government is required by this bill to consider that and take steps to address it.

Secondly, the—is a very important component. Citizens quite often feel frustrated by their inability to access information from governments in a timely manner, information that is comprehensive and accurate. And that's certainly true of our current circumstance here in Manitoba. So this legislation does require that all government departments would make environmental information publicly accessible to the public in a timely manner and to facilitate the public's participation in government decision making. That's the second key component.

\*(10:10)

The third key component, and the one which attracts the most interest, this legislation provides regular citizens with access to the courts when they are concerned about a potential environmental violation. So under this legislation what would happen is that a citizen who witnesses a violation of Manitoba law would now have the capacity to take

the offending party to court at—rather than it having to be only the government that could do that. If the government has been made aware of the violation of existing Manitoba environmental law and the government fails to take action, this legislation enables the citizen to take the government to court, as well, to compel them to actually enforce the laws that are already on the books. So this is the unique strategy that we came up with to empower citizens to be able to take this kind of action.

It is also important to note that the individual citizen does not have to be personally negatively affected by the environmental damage that is being conducted. It does not have to be impacting your land or your property or your personal health. You as an individual citizen, under The Environmental Rights Act, would have the capacity to take action on an issue that is not in your community at all, but where you are given the right to attempt to prove in court that, in fact, the violation has occurred, and the court, if they were to rule in your favour, would then have the power under this legislation to require that the violation be stopped and that the damages be reversed.

There is an additional provision in the act which enables anyone, whether it's a person or a corporation who has been charged under this act, they have the right to appeal to the courts and ask that the charges be thrown out. And this is an important provision to make sure that there aren't frivolous charges that are levelled which may have very little or no substance to them whatsoever. So we certainly don't want to create a circumstance where very good environmental law is being compromised because of, you know, frivolous attacks which do not stand up under the test of scrutiny or the evidence available.

So that is the very important component that governs access to the courts. Citizens right now can't do this. You can be very engaged as a concerned citizen. You can join any one of a number of progressive non-profit organizations that are working very hard to clean up the planet. But you as an individual do not, right now in Manitoba, have the capacity to take action yourself through the courts to protect the environment that you care so deeply about. And this legislation would empower you to do that through the mechanisms that I just described.

So the final fourth component of the legislation is it protects any employees, whether they be working for a government department or whether

they be working for a private corporation or a non-profit, anyone who is an employee who feels compelled to come forward and reveal their understanding that a violation of Manitoba law related to the environment is occurring. Anyone who steps forward who is an employee is, of course, putting themselves at risk and their personal employment at risk, and so this legislation protects those employees. It's, in simplest terms, it is a whistle-blower protection measure in the act so that an individual who wants to do that can step forward without fear of being revealed or of losing their source of employment just because they have stepped forward and done the right thing.

So, in concluding, Madam Speaker, let me just say that I am very hopeful that this legislation will meet with the government's approval and that we will see it proceed to the committee stage. I repeat, again, this does not change any existing or environmental laws in Manitoba; rather, it enables citizens to help the government enforce the laws that are on the books right now, which I would think would be of interest, hopefully, to any government that ever served in the Manitoba Legislature.

So, with that, I will take my seat and I look forward to the questions and to the debate that comes forward, and hopefully we can see this move forward for the betterment of all Manitobans, their empowerment and the safety of our environment that we all share.

Thank you very, very much.

### Questions

**Madam Speaker:** A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Questions may be addressed to the sponsoring member by any member in the following sequence: first question to be asked by a member from another party; this is to be followed by a rotation between the parties; each independent member may ask one question; and no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake):** The NDP government has made it clear by their actions that the responsible environmental and water management were not their priorities. After missing their own emission targets, neglecting the states of the provincial drains, Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba and flood-prevention infrastructure for four terms, why should anyone take this bill as genuine, coming from the NDP?

**Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley):** Well, that's not a very encouraging start, Madam Speaker. If the member from the Interlake is concerned about the quality of water and the quality of climate emissions and any of the other issues that he just raised, I would think he would be in support of this bill because it's going to empower his constituents to be able to step forward and say, hey, raise awareness with him as their MLA, saying there's an environmental law being violated here in the Interlake and we need you to take action on it.

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** In reading the bill, it effectively requires government departments to consider their decisions through an environmental lens when making decisions that might have an impact on the environment.

Could the member tell the House why it is important to consider long-lasting environmental impacts when creating new legislation?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** That's a fantastic question, Madam Speaker, and it really takes us to the heart of the bill. Every action that we take, of course, it doesn't exist by itself. Governments might well be organized in departmental silos, but the decisions in one area will absolutely have an impact on multiple other areas.

This legislation cuts through that and requires that governments think ahead of time. If we have this action take place, if we support this decision, if we bring in this law or if we bring in this budget program, what are the impacts going to be on the environment? And if there are negative ones, we have to address that in advance.

**Mr. Andrew Smith (Southdale):** Zebra mussel proliferation under the NDP government became so bad that Eva Pip, a retired University of Winnipeg biologist, said that reversing the infestation would be beyond the point.

Why did the NDP do so little over the last 17 years?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Well, I'm glad to see that the member from Southdale is listening to what Dr. Eva Pip says. She would be a person that I think many of us admire for her advocacy and long-time expertise on water issues, and the member, I would hope, would want more of his constituents to be able to share the same confidence and powers that she has demonstrated by enabling them to come forward and talk about environmental concerns.

The—Dr. Eva Pip said a few things about the manure management regulation that his government has brought forward. He may want to talk to some of his constituents or talk to her about that and bring an informed opinion to his government ministers.

**Mr. Swan:** Yes, as I understand this bill, it would require government departments to make more environmental information publicly accessible and provide reasonable opportunities for the public to participate in environmental decision-making.

Could the member speak a little bit about why greater public input would be positive for the environment?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Well, I thank my colleague from Minto for that very good question. Obviously, the public has two very important roles to play, which government should be encouraged to facilitate in any circumstance. One, the public quite often has really good ideas, really good expertise on how a government initiative can be amended to make it even better than what's been proposed, and secondly, it's the public, ultimately, that's going to decide whether or not they like what the government's doing.

So, if you talk to them in advance, if you provide them the information, you tell them why you're doing it, you have a much better chance of having that social licence to then proceed and move forward.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, my question to the MLA for Wolseley: In the United States it's my understanding that measures which were included in the environmental rights legislation going back, actually, I think more than 100 years, were very important in helping the Hudson River cleanup.

\* (10:20)

And one of the measures that was instrumental was, in fact, the ability, if there was a fine to a organization which had polluted the environment, that the group who—the environment group who is taking this case forward can benefit by getting part of that fine as a way—

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

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Yes, the United States history—I know a little bit about it because my folks are from there. It does have a very strong litigious aspect to it. Lawsuits and individuals stepping forward launching lawsuits is a far more common occurrence under

American law, and American law is written on purpose for that exact reason.

In Canada, the tradition's been a bit different. This particular legislation would not enable that particular scenario to happen, which the member brings forward, but it's not opposed to it either. This legislation helps citizens enforce the existing laws, and a government of the day could certainly bring in legislation to add that provision to other acts, such as The Environment Act or whatever else might be the case.

**Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River):** Does bill 20 look to implement an independent environmental commissioner—remains to be seen if this private member's bill constitutes a money bill. Can the member from Wolseley confirm that this in no way constitutes a money bill?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Well, I think the member might want to go talk to the staff person who wrote that question, because if he reads the bill, he'll find that there is no component for an environment commissioner proposed. That was in the original version that we brought in when we were in government, but precisely because I, as an opposition member, am not allowed to bring in any legislation which compels the government to spend money on something like a new office for an environmental commissioner, that part had to be struck out.

If the member for Swan River would like to help the cause, he could certainly talk to his Sustainable Development Minister, ask her to amend this legislation and move it forward to contain that provision.

**Mr. Swan:** It segues well into the question I do want to ask. I think the member for River Heights raises a valid point, which, I fear, would be a money provision, which private members can't bring forward. The member for Swan River apparently hasn't read the act, and I'm hoping that someone over on the government side has.

Can the member speak a little bit more about how this bill has changed from the earlier version that was before this House?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Yes, absolutely, Madam Speaker, and the biggest change is the fact that because, as an opposition MLA, I'm not allowed to bring in any provision that compels the government to spend money, the environment commissioner section did have to be struck from it.

As I just mentioned, this does not in any way prevent the government from bringing in this very same legislation and adding that component to it. They are the only ones that have the legal capacity to do that. Doesn't matter which party is in opposition or in government, that rule about money bills is in place.

And, very quickly, the only other change is the one I mentioned previously, which is that a frivolous charge can be taken to court in advance.

**Mr. Johnson:** The NDP government has a record of pushing through bills without consultation.

So the question needs to be asked: Who did the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) consult with in the preparation of this bill?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I think there would be a couple of short answers to that.

One is, when we were in government, there were quite significant consultations that took place.

But the second point, if the member reads the bill or has listened to our Q & As this morning, he will have heard me point out that we're not actually changing any existing Manitoba laws related to the environment here. What we are changing is the citizenry's capacity to help the government enforce those laws.

So I don't know if he's suggesting that I should talk to all 1.3 million Manitobans about whether or not they want more power to protect the planet. I'm reasonably confident what the answer would be. It would be yes.

**Mr. Swan:** I know that the member for Wolseley is knowledgeable and I appreciate the intervention of the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard); he talked a little bit of what some American jurisdictions are doing.

Are there other jurisdictions in Canada or elsewhere in North America that has a similar piece of legislation to what the member is bringing forward this morning?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Yes, indeed, there is. The most well-known of those is Ontario's environmental rights bill. It has been on the books for decades. It's been very successful, it's very robust, so this is not in any way a groundbreaking or new concept. It's something that the provincial government should be eminently comfortable with.

And as this is my last chance to speak to the bill, let me just tip my hat yet again to Dr. David Suzuki and his fantastic advocacy in helping our government see the wisdom of the legislation. And I encourage my colleagues across the way on the government side to please give this full consideration and move forward to pass this bill.

**Madam Speaker:** The time for this question period has ended.

### Debate

**Madam Speaker:** Debate is open.

**Hon. Cathy Cox (Minister of Sustainable Development):** Thank you to the member opposite for the bill that he brought forward.

I would like to speak on behalf of our government and say that we have some of the most robust environmental protection laws that are here in Canada. These laws protect Manitobans against harm to the air that they breathe, the water that they drink and the land that we share.

As the minister and mother and grandmother, I can tell you that there is nothing more important to us than planet Earth and this environment. It's important that we get it right, Madam Speaker. Obviously, we only have one chance to protect our environment and to protect the water that we drink, the rivers, the lakes, the streams, our environment and of course our wildlife, our forests and everything that we as Manitobans cherish so much. So it's a very important issue for us, the environment, and ensuring that we preserve and protect it as we move forward.

As Progressive Conservatives, we will work to ensure these laws remain amongst the strongest in Canada. We are increasing penalties regarding illegal drainage and are developing new watershed management planning based on the watershed to address illegal drainage. I have been out talking to people in Waskada, Deloraine, Boissevain, all over the province—Virden, Manitoba, and talking to them about issues that they face each and every day with regard to illegal drainage and we are working to address that. We're working to ensure that when illegal drainage is noticed, we encourage individuals to report that and there will be stronger, tougher penalties to ensure that illegal drainage is acted on.

Also, as part of that and ensuring that we protect the environment is—a key component will be the ALUS program, which is the alternate land use

services program, and that will encourage farmers to—provide them an incentive to actually keep water on the land. We know by doing that it will reduce flooding and it will improve water quality and reduce nutrients that actually flow into our lakes and streams.

You know, unfortunately, the former government introduced a bill, I understand, late towards the end of the session and, you know, failed to actually pass that bill. So, you know, I understand that the member opposite is talking about the importance of the environment and we agree with that, and that is why we are introducing new legislation that's going to be broader and is going to ensure that we do protect Manitobans by reducing the amount of nutrients that flow into our lakes and streams.

I've had the opportunity, actually, to talk directly to the federal minister and, you know, indicate to her the importance of this plan while we were at the meeting talking about our climate plan. So something like that is something that we know now, and into the future we'll ensure that we protect our lakes and streams and that we protect our environment. So that's just one of the things that we are doing with new legislation, new proactive legislation that unfortunately the members opposite had 17 years to implement, and they failed to address that very important and key issue. And now I know that the members are talking about the environment and we always encourage talk, you know, when it involves the environment and addressing these important issues.

We have produced more results in 10 months while we were in power than we've seen the government opposite actually introduce in 17 years. You know, we've—as I said, we've implemented more safe hunting—or, we are implementing a safe-hunting regulation. We've ensured that Manitobans are safe while they're in their homes in rural Manitoba and we're ensuring that, you know, they can get out into the wildlife, into their fields, into their farmyards, without having to worry about unsafe hunting practices.

\*(10:30)

So, you know, we are encouraging individuals to act safely with regard to hunting practices. We are encouraging farmers to retain water on their land to protect our environment and our lakes and streams. Those are just a few of the things.

And we're also encouraging recycling. I know that we had a very, very successful, actually, announcement just the other day, and it included, you know, individuals and organizations who are going to encourage Manitobans to do more recycling and encourage their efforts to keep those products out of the landfill. You know, I think that any time we can encourage recycling all across Manitoba, it's a win-win for Manitobans. And we know that when we reduce the amount of waste that goes into the landfill, it benefits Manitobans now and down the road. I mean, being able to get out and recycle when you're at—whether you're at the cottage, at a campsite, northern Manitoba or actually when you're at a strip mall, it's very innovative, and we are empowering those organizations to think outside the box. The status quo is no longer good enough, and we're going to encourage them actually to reach out to other individuals and ensure that the amount of waste that is directed into landfills is significantly reduced.

I had the opportunity, actually, to go to Emterra just the other day and take a look first-hand. I mean, to see the amount of waste that is redirected, you know, out of the landfills and can be reused and recycled is just totally amazing, and it's such an environmentally benefit option. And we are leaders here in Manitoba, and we will continue to be leaders here with recycling, with the environment and with the changes that we are actually making.

So I look forward to having further discussions with the member opposite with regard to the environment.

I know that this bill that is brought forward is a recycled bill that was brought forward formerly by the government—by the members opposite when they were in government. And, you know, again, you know, it's an important issue; it's an important discussion. Why did the members not act and actually pass that piece of legislation? You know, I—they had 17 years. I mean, we have been here almost a year, and, you know, we are moving forward and we're actively moving forward to make positive changes.

You know, we do in fact value public input. We're developing a clean and green plan for—action plan with regards to climate change, and, you know, we did in fact allow Manitobans and continue to allow Manitobans to provide input on that. I know that we had, I think, over 7,000 individuals who responded to us with regard to the survey. And not only did we provide them the opportunity to provide



their input in a survey, we actually expanded the length of time so that we expanded the length of time from two weeks—because we knew that it's such an important issue—to actually four weeks. And we're now developing a framework so that we can move forward and allow Manitobans again to discuss and drive our climate and green action plan.

I think that it's important that Manitobans have the opportunity to always participate in legislation. You know, that's why we are here on this side of the House today. We believe in providing Manitobans the opportunity to provide input, unlike the former government opposite, you know, who didn't provide that opportunity to Manitobans and, you know, did increase the PST by 1 per cent. And Manitobans spoke very clearly about that. They believe in being provided the opportunity to be consulted in changes, and that's what we did, Madam Speaker, and that's just what we continue to do.

I have gone out and I have talked to Manitobans. I have talked to municipalities; I have talked to organizations; I have talked to people on the ground who tell me it's the first time that a minister has been here in our parks. It's the first time that a minister has been here to see our flooded fields and the infrastructure that was affected by the floods. You know, I am proud of that and I am proud of my colleagues who get out each and every day to talk to Manitobans directly. That is such an important part of what we believe in as Conservatives, and so I am very proud, Madam Speaker, of what we have done to date.

We do believe in empowering Manitobans, and we do believe that the steps that we are taking are the right steps right now with regard to the environment. We know that allowing Manitobans the opportunity to tell us what's important to them is important.

You know, we have—we've developed a plan to address the further spread of aquatic invasive species, specifically zebra mussels. And that is also something that the former government, you know, waited. They sat on their hands for a long time until we know, in fact, that it spread to the point right now that we can't stop it. But by raising awareness we are going to prevent the further spread and we're taking initiatives. We're going to have penalties that increase penalties with regard to that.

So we are working on ensuring that our climate, our environment, this—our Mother Earth is protected. That is a priority. It will continue to be a priority, and I look forward to working together with members on

this side of the House to ensure that our water, our earth, our lakes and streams are safe, preserved and protected for future generations. Thank you.

### **Speaker's Statement**

**Madam Speaker:** Before recognizing the next speaker, I have a statement.

I'm advising the House that I received a letter from the Government House Leader (Mr. Micklefield) indicating that the government caucus has identified Bill 218, The Red Tape Reduction Day Act, as the first of their three selected bills for this session.

As a reminder to the House, rule 24 permits each recognized party to select up to three private members' bills per session to proceed to a second reading vote and requires the House leader to provide written notice as to the date and time of the vote.

The Government House Leader has therefore advised that the question on second reading of Bill 218 will occur today, April 27th, 2017, at 11:55 a.m.

### **Debate**

*(Continued)*

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** I'm pleased to speak to Bill 220 this morning.

You know, I'm pleased the Minister for Sustainable Development (Mrs. Cox) got up and spoke to this bill, and I listened very closely to what she had to say, and I did not hear her give one reason or one problem with anything contained in the bill the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) has put forward.

I heard the Minister for Sustainable Development say that this is a very important issue and I heard—all I actually heard from her was disappointment that a bill very similar to this did not pass in the previous Legislature.

So what I'm hearing the Minister for Sustainable Development tell this House very clearly is that this bill should pass on to committee. Let's hear what Manitobans who may have some differing views have to say, and let's have that positive and open discussion at a committee of this House.

You know, Madam Speaker, I don't have to tell you or anybody else in this House that we have a small caucus at the current time, but each of the

members of our caucus bring to this House their own background, their own experiences and their own expertise. And I want to thank and commend the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), who's very knowledgeable and very passionate about issues dealing with the environment. And I'm very pleased that the member for Wolseley has taken the disappointment of not having a bill passed in the last Legislature and has now brought forward a bill to the extent of his abilities as a private member, and I believe this bill should go off to committee for a discussion.

The member for Wolseley talked about Dr. David Suzuki, who, I think, is an icon in Canada, and why is that? Because Dr. David Suzuki has taken difficult issues which aren't easily explained, which aren't necessarily a soundbite, but he's made issues of environmental sustainability and the importance of considering these choices accessible. He's made it understandable and he's made it count. I know he's had a profound impact on the member for Wolseley and I think all Canadians who've taken the time to listen to what he has to say and understand his expertise.

But I want to go back even before Dr. David Suzuki was well known. I want to go back to a book that was written back in 1962, a book called *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson, and Rachel Carson wrote a book talking about the indiscriminate use of pesticides in the world at that time. And people were very, very suspicious and they were very, very unlikely to consider what she had to say. And when that book was published in 1962 it actually took a long time. It took a long time for there to be the push within the general public to push legislators in the states and in the federal government of the United States and Canada to actually move ahead—and it actually took, I believe, nine years until DDT was banned.

\*(10:40)

But now we know, without a doubt, that what Rachel Carson was writing about in 1962 was right, and the point I'm making, Madam Speaker, is the choices that are made by governments or not made by governments have lasting impact on the air, on the water, on the soil and on the health of not only plants and animals, but the human beings who populate our jurisdictions.

And this bill is so important because it formally recognizes that Manitoba residents have the right to a healthy and ecologically balanced environment, and

that this government, the government of the day, whoever it may be, has an ongoing obligation to protect the environment.

There's four pillars to this bill. The first is to make sure that government does consider an environmental lens, and they consider certain fundamental environmental principles when they make decisions that might have a significant effect on the environment. It requires the government to think about it, to make sure they're getting the right advice, to rely on science, as we hear members opposite often proclaiming in the course of questions or in the course of Estimates.

This bill will also provide information and public participation rights. To help make the public participation more useful and to be more fully in environmental decision making, government departments would have to make their environmental information publicly accessible, which is an easy thing to do these days, and also provide reasonable opportunities for Manitoba citizens to participate in environmental decision making.

The third pillar of this bill is access to court: to give public access to the courts, to enhance public access to protect the environment, allowing a resident to commence action against someone who's contravened an act or regulation, i.e., breaking the law to try and protect against their environmental damage.

And, secondly, as a last resort, to allow an individual to commence action against a government if the government fails to enforce its own acts or regulations and that failure results or is likely to result in environmental damage.

The fourth pillar of this bill is effectively whistle-blower protection to allow an employee who uses a measure set out in the bill to protect the environment to be protected from any reprisal from their employer.

These are good pillars. This is a good basis going forward to make sure that we have the best environmental protection of any government in Canada.

All I've heard from the minister is that this is a good bill. All I've heard from the minister is that this is important. All I've heard from the minister is she's disappointed this bill didn't pass already.

So let's get together. Let's send this bill off to committee. Let's hear what Manitobans have to say, and let's get out there and continue to improve the protection for our environment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake):** I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to put some records—some words on the record.

As most people know, I live on Lake Manitoba, and prior to 2011, 96 per cent of the pollution for Lake Manitoba comes through the Portage Diversion. So, I'd hate to hazard a guess what percentage enters into Lake Manitoba since the 2011 flood. There has been more pollution in Lake Manitoba in 2011 than any other year.

Decades of mismanagement of the NDP government—it's clear that their actions—they're not responsible for the environment and water management. It's not their priority. We see it in Lake Manitoba on our shores, on the colour of the water. Fishermen see it on their nets. When they pull their nets out of the lake to lift for fish, there's a rusty-coloured, sticky coating on their nets, and it's a residue that's in the water from—it was not there years ago, but since the 2011 floods and the operation of the Portage Diversion, that's all pollution that's there now.

The NDP government's overuse of the Portage Diversion has caused up to three billion cubic feet of water per day—per day—enter Lake Manitoba. I witnessed from the flood debris in Lake Manitoba and Lake Francis; these are pristine lakes. I've seen septic tanks, houses, cottages, decks, personal property, barbecues, boats, vehicles, gas tanks overtop all into the lake.

The member from Wolseley was part of this government when these decisions were made. He was also part of the government—it's made clear that their actions—that they're not responsible for the environmental and water management. They weren't their priorities.

I saw that in the West Interlake Watershed Conservation District, Madam Speaker, and we had some programs that we brought in there that were good for the environment: low-flush toilets to reduce the amount of waste; there is tree program to revegetate the shores of Lake Manitoba after all the trees had been flooded out from the overuse of the Portage Diversion; off-site watering systems—so this enables farmers to water their cattle away from a

source of water and a potential—potentially contaminate their home quarter with large manure deposits; did riparian fencing—excuse me—and this would allow farmers to fence off creeks or bodies of water so the cattle—their manure wouldn't enter directly into the streams.

We put in spawning shoals to increase spawning for fish, and that not only helps the fishermen but it helps the environment. There was things we would call fish stops. Looking at the problem, it doesn't look like a fish stop, but if any portion of water body flows more than four metres per second, it's deemed a fish stop, so the fish can't actually get through that. So we've, you know, we've—we worked on reducing fish stops in our local watershed. And we also implemented watershed plans. Each area has a plan to help reduce contaminants and stuff flowing into the lakes. This is all positive movements forward.

Members opposite had 17 years, and they've set targets, but they failed to meet them. They failed to meet their emission targets. They didn't have proper plans to address climate change. We're going to have a made-in-Manitoba plan to address that.

They failed to enforce laws related to unsafe hunting practices. They reduced aerial surveys for the moose hunt. They cut millions of dollars from the Conservation budget, now known as Sustainable Development.

Under the leadership from the previous NDP government, Lake Winnipeg became the most threatened lake in the world in 2013, and that's the—per the globe nature fund—excuse me. The blue-green algae blooms that we continue to see on Lake Winnipeg are toxic to the lake and hazardous to humans as well and to their health. Zebra mussels, under the NDP, became so bad, as my colleague mentioned, that Eva Pip from the University of Winnipeg—she's a retired biologist—has claimed that reversing this infestation is beyond the point of salvage; it's too far gone. So we're left with trying to reduce the spread, and our minister has a plan in place for that, to help with that. They've infested three more Manitoba's waterways and lakes since 2013: Lake Winnipeg, the Red River and Cedar Lake is also—has zebra mussels in it, and this was assumed that it's carried up there with plane pontoons. Something very, very simple could've been done to prevent that spread, and it's too late. Zebra mussels are now in Cedar Lake and they will spread from there.

They're an issue not only to the environment but also to clogging water treatment plants and other infrastructure for Manitoba. The NDP government spent half a—\$500,000—a half-million dollars in 2014 on a failed plan to use potash to sterilize four harbours in Manitoba, and it's just another example of the previous government throwing money at a problem. After the potash mission was initially declared a success, zebra mussels were rediscovered and have since spread, like I mentioned, all the way up to Cedar Lake. The NDP government neglected to take action sooner on these issues; it might've resulted in significant problems for our waterways.

\*(10:50)

So, under the NDP leadership, the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger) caused long delays in upgrades to the City of Winnipeg's water treatment plants, forced hundreds of millions of dollars in additional costs, including nitrogen removal as part of the process, despite recommendations from scientists to focus instead on the removal of phosphorus.

The NDP ordered the removal of nitrogen from Winnipeg's water treatment plants in addition to phosphorus. This resulted in cost overrun and was against the opinion of respected scientists who specified that phosphorus is the priority.

The previous government failed to proactively lobby the federal government to work with industry and ban microbeads in Canadian personal-care products. Under the NDP administration, Manitoba promised new emission targets in 2013. When it had to admit it hadn't fulfilled these obligations under the Kyoto Protocol to reduce emissions to 6 per cent below 1990 levels by 2012, although it had enshrined the goal in legislation in 2008, Manitoba emissions in 2012 were more than 20 per cent higher than they were in 1990.

They spent \$9 million in untendered contracts for Tiger Dam flood-protection equipment which provided to be ineffective, at least in my area. They—very, very ineffective. The NDP's water-management measures to address rising floodwaters were done at the expense of communities in the province, especially around Lake Manitoba—and that's near and dear to me, Madam Speaker.

NDP's mismanagement of the Shellmouth Dam in the spring of 2012 'negatively' affected over 40,000 acres of farmland. Farmers are the backbone to our society in Manitoba; all small businesses are.

Since 2006, the NDP have shifted blame on the state of Lake Winnipeg to the agriculture industry. Blame the farmers.

So, in conclusion, the NDP had four terms in power, mismanaged many floods, ignored rural-provincial drains and proper watershed-management practices. Madam Speaker, our government is working on these problems and we're going to do a better job for all Manitobans.

Thank you.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, I want to say a few words on this bill put forward by the MLA for Wolseley.

I want to thank the member from the Interlake for his eloquent talk about all the problems that we've had in the environmental area in Manitoba and all the good reasons why this bill should be supported. And, clearly, with the kinds of issues that we've had over the last number of years, it's time to have a measure like this because it can be helpful, you know, not just in dealing with issues related to business, but issues related to governments and help keep governments account.

You know, we've—member for the Interlake talked a lot about Lake Winnipeg, but we should also talk about Lake Winnipegosis where the fishery, the pickerel fishery, the walleye fishery has been depleted. For many years we've had report after report talking about the disaster state of the walleye fishery on Lake Winnipegosis and, you know, this might be a bill that would allow fishers on Lake Winnipegosis to finally hold governments to account and to say that, you know, there's an issue here that has not been attended to and it's caused many people their livelihoods. It's lost the communities around the Interlake—or around Lake Winnipegosis many, many millions of dollars in revenue because of the depletion of the pickerel fishery.

So it's an area where we can benefit our economy and we can benefit the environment at the same time. And being able to look after the environment, I would give another example where we could have had better holding of government's feet to the fire on orphan mine sites, an area where I have spoken up many times. Sherridon at Lynn Lake and in other areas we've had mine sites which are and continue to be problematic. Although, thankfully, after I raised this issue many times, there was action started under the NDP at Sherridon and Lynn Lake, but there is still a lot more to do, and

there is a need to make sure that there are tools to hold the government, as well as businesses and individuals—sometimes it's individuals—to account because that's pretty important.

I raised the other day the concern over the walleye fishery on Lake Winnipeg. The fact of the matter is that the numbers of walleye being harvested is going down. The size of the walleye, their growth rates has decreased. There needs to be an effort at least to make sure that the large walleye which produce—females produce so much of the eggs, and the future for our walleye are not overfished. And I think it's a significant concern.

Also when we're dealing with, you know, climate change, when we're dealing with a whole variety of existing and potential environmental industries and environmental concerns, you know, I think that there's a real opportunity here. And, you know, hopefully, with the support and the eloquent words of the member from the Interlake, there would be government support to enable this to go forward.

**Mr. Greg Selinger (St. Boniface):** I wish to rise to support this bill.

I've heard many comments about things that haven't been done to the satisfactions of members of the Legislature, and no matter who the government is, this environmental bill of rights will offer protections to citizens if they feel the government's failing in a regulatory matter, if they feel the government's not living up to a policy or a piece of legislation that has been in—put in place, they will have access to the courts to protect the environment.

And that will require them to follow certain environmental principles which have been laid out in this legislation, which I think will serve all Manitobans extremely well. The precautionary principle—and that means that if an activity raises threats of serious harm to the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if it has not been fully established scientifically that the activity is harmful. In this context, the proponent of the activity, rather than the public, should bear the burden of proof—that will serve us all very well, Madam Speaker. The polluter pays principle long established that a polluter should bear responsibility for 'remedying' contamination for

which the polluter is responsible and must bear the costs of remediation. The principle of sustainable development—that development should meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. And the principle of intergenerational equity—the current generation holds the environment in trust for future generations and has an obligation to use its resources in a way that leaves the environment in the same or better condition for future generations. And the principle of environmental justice—there should be just distribution of environmental benefits and burdens among all Manitobans.

And so, Madam Speaker, these principles, along with access to the courts, along with the ability to hold governments to account or polluters to account, will serve us all extremely well. And that will be something that will benefit all of us, regardless of how we feel about past actions and regardless of how we feel about future actions.

For example, if we're concerned about the change from five to 10 years in water inspections, that's something we can talk about. If we're concerned, Madam Speaker, about issues of whether or not there should be stronger legislation on climate change, that's something that we can talk about. And all of those matters are something that we can address as we move forward.

But the point today is this legislation in no way, shape, or form will prevent us from doing the things that we need to do. It will actually help us do things better. And it'll put in place a low-cost, effective regime that will allow us to protect water, air, and healthy food, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Andrew Smith (Southdale):** I do appreciate the opportunity to rise in the House to put a few words on the record. I do want to thank the member from Wolseley for putting this proposed legislation forward. I know it is something that is quite, you know, close—near and dear to him.

But, you know, I myself had, you know, started my career actually in—

\* (11:00)

**Madam Speaker:** Order. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have nine minutes remaining.

## RESOLUTIONS

### **Res. 11— Provincial Government's Plan to Shutter Three Winnipeg Emergency Rooms Will Undermine Patient Care and Hurt Families and Seniors**

**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 provincial government's plan to shutter three Winnipeg emergency rooms will undermine patient care and hurt families and seniors, brought forward by the honourable member for Tyndall Park.

**Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the MLA for Minto,

*WHEREAS the Provincial Government has announced the closures of three emergency rooms (ER) in Winnipeg at Concordia Hospital, Seven Oaks Hospital and Victoria Hospital, as well as an urgent care centre at Misericordia Health Centre; and*

*WHEREAS this announcement means the Provincial Government has broken its promise to Manitobans to protect the front-line services families and seniors count on; and*

*WHEREAS the Provincial Government failed to make any new investments in the remaining emergency rooms, personal care homes or homecare and these closures will force more patients into fewer hospitals and place additional burdens on doctors and nurses; and*

*WHEREAS the Provincial Government failed to provide any details to Manitobans about the ER closures, including savings incurred, capital costs or how many front-line jobs will be cut, despite knowing much of this information since announcing the initiative; and*

*WHEREAS these ER cuts come on the heels of other closures and cancelled plans across Winnipeg, including a QuickCare Clinic, CancerCare Manitoba, ACCESS Centres, personal care homes, a new facility for Pan Am Clinic and the Concordia Wellness Centre; and*

*WHEREAS the ER closures have left families and seniors in many parts of Winnipeg without any point of contact with front-line emergency healthcare services and will result in them having to travel twenty minutes or more to access emergency healthcare; and*

*WHEREAS these cuts will place a heavy burden on the many seniors who visit the emergency rooms frequently, especially for those who are unable to drive or are low-income; and*

*WHEREAS Winnipeg has one of the fastest growing population rates in Canada and the Provincial Government's plan fails to meet the demands of growing populations, especially seniors, across north and south Winnipeg; and*

*WHEREAS the Provincial Government failed to consult with families and seniors in northeast Winnipeg before closing their emergency rooms or to consult with health officials and healthcare workers at Concordia to discuss how the ER closure would impact patient care in advance of the announcement.*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba acknowledge that the provincial government—that provincial government's plan to cut three emergency rooms and an urgent care centre in Winnipeg will undermine the health-care system and increase demand in existing hospitals without additional investments.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable member for Tyndall Park, seconded by the honourable member for Minto (Mr. Swan),

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba acknowledge that the provincial government's plan to cut three emergency rooms and an urgent care centre in Winnipeg will undermine the health-care system and increase demand in existing hospitals without additional investments.

**Mr. Marcelino:** I understand that the approach of the current provincial government was to reduce costs. The bottom line, it has always been a priority for them. That's their focus. And I refuse to accept that people and peoples' interests should be ignored and undermined by a concern for the bottom line.

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

I listed down some of the tools of the trade that the current Pallister government has, and No. 1 that came up—and it was suggested to me by my eldest son, he says, they're using scissors. I said, why, why do you want scissors to be No. 1 in the toolbox of the Pallister government? He says, well, from day one that the Pallister government came on board and became government, it was always the threat of cuts, and they were sharpening their tools. And No. 1 that

came up was the scissors. And then he says, there was also another tool that needs to be addressed. He says, they came up with it from the bottom of the toolbox, and it was the padlocks. The padlocks. I said, why? Why the padlocks? Do they have keys? He says, no, they threw away the keys. They are using the 'podlocks'—the padlocks to close down emergency rooms and urgent care centres. And those padlocks don't have keys. And it's amazing how that works. He says, they use them because they said they're trying to improve the system. And one of my sons, he said, how can that improve the system when my mom cannot be attended to in an ER that is most accessible. How can that be?

And then he moved on and he said there's another one that they're using quite often, which is the chainsaw. And that chainsaw makes a horrible sound and he says there is a massacre of employees that are planned and are happening right now. He says 900 from Hydro. He says, I have a lot of friends who are working in Hydro, at Hydro stations, some of them have been there and these institutional memories that they have while working for Manitoba Hydro will be lost forever.

And then he said that there's one more tool. My third son, he said. The third tool is the sledge hammer. The sledge hammer is the one with the big, heavy, iron and steel tool used to sledge-hammer everything in its way. And it is amazing how that has really painted a picture of what the Pallister government is doing. And this is quite amazing because it was never promised that there will be ER cuts, it was never promised that there will be an urgent-care centre at Misericordia that will be cut. It all came as a surprise.

And then I asked my wife, I said, give me your ideas about what the tools of the Pallister government are using. She said—and she's a little bit nastier than me—she said, smoke and mirrors. And the magic of it all is that my wife does not usually want to engage in politics. She hates it. She hates politics and I love it.

Now, the smoke and mirrors is that every time that the minister of the Crown of the Pallister government stands up and speaks, they say something but does another thing, and it is all smoke and mirrors.

And then she added, well, there's also the calculator. I said, calculator, how can that be? The calculator is the one where there was a promise

to at least tell Manitobans about the KPMG report—97 per cent. She says they have a very unique calculator, from 97 per cent that will be reported to the public for a \$750,000 performance or value-for-money review to zero. And the calculator works very well. She said, how can 97 per cent become zero per cent? I said maybe the battery is low or maybe 97 per cent, as far as the Pallister government is concerned, really means zero.

No transparency.

\* (11:10)

Then there were others that she said but they are just a little bit on the opaque—whiteouts that she said. There have been changes in so many things from—I'm reading this letter directly from a constituent, and I have been receiving this, and I'm quoting from what I heard yesterday. And there was that yelling or actually heckling from the side of the NDP, to which I belong, and we were saying, table it. And he said, no, I will not table it. And he said, I will not be intimidated by anybody from that side and also this side. And, I said, how can that be? There was never intimidation from anyone. And I'm sorry that I have to bring that up, because it's one of those things that really bothered me when emotional swings from being very nice and very calculating and very moderate in the voice and the elocution of words of the English language, he turns around and becomes violently opposed to anybody who tries to intimidate him. And I said to myself last night—gave me sleepless nights—I said, my God, help us.

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

### Questions

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** A question period up to 10 minutes will be held and questions may be addressed in the following sequence: the first question may be asked by a member from another party; any subsequent questions must follow in a rotation between parties; each independent member may ask one question; and no questions or answers shall exceed 45 seconds.

**Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, after 17 years of mismanagement of Manitoba health system, we know that our province

continues to come last in key performance indicators such as emergency room wait times.

Can the member for Tyndall Park explain why the previous government accepted the status quo and took no action to improve patient care?

**Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park):** I thank the member for Selkirk for that question.

Seven Oaks is the closest emergency room to the constituency of Selkirk and also Stonewall, and Seven Oaks is one of the busiest hospitals in the whole of the province. It has 308 beds and they have performed over thousands of surgeries. And part of the problem is that Selkirk constituents will have a problem travelling any place else.

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** Well, I'm surprised the member opposite in his preamble didn't get to the fact that record investments in emergency rooms, which now are enabling this reorganization to even happen, including QuickCare clinics, have made an impact on patient care and on wait times. And I'm surprised he didn't mention them. Maybe he'll get to that in his second question.

I'm just wondering if the member from Tyndall Park could talk about how these ER cuts are going to impact patient care.

**Mr. Marcelino:** I like that question, because the impact of the cuts to ERs is very insidious. It does not show on its face the padlock that was used to close down Concordia, Victoria, Seven Oaks, and then the urgent care in Misericordia don't have keys. And it's a big problem because it's a big move on the part of this government to close down those facilities—

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

**Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, according to the Canadian Institute for Health Information—CIHI—Calgary, Vancouver Metro and Ottawa each have four emergency rooms while Winnipeg has six. Although these cities have a larger population base, they have significantly shorter ER wait times—in most cases half of what we have here in the city of Winnipeg.

Does the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) believe that this broken system provides sustainable care for patients?

**Mr. Marcelino:** I think there is a comparison of apples to oranges.

The ease of transportation in some areas does not translate into ease of transportation in Winnipeg. Our population, some of them don't have vehicles and they have to take busses to go to the emergency rooms because they cannot afford the ambulance service fees. And that's the difference.

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

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Marcelino:** And we cannot compare apples to oranges.

**Mr. Wiebe:** I'm going to ask the member for Tyndall Park a question that I get all the time when I'm talking to people.

People ask me, they say: How is it that having less emergency room services, less investment in doctors and nurses, less access to urgent care—how will that address the already overcrowded emergency rooms? Maybe he could shed some light on how that plan makes any sense at all.

**Mr. Marcelino:** I could speak from personal experience.

Coming from this Chamber, I went to the emergency room at the Health Sciences Centre before I was given Voltaren, a suppository. Too much information? Fine. But it was for pain. And I stayed at the ER for 11 hours. And I understood why. There were four ambulances that came in during my time there, and there was an MRI done to me after six hours. It was the reading of the MRI results that really held me up—

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

**Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain):** The previous government poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the health-care system, though no improvements were achieved. In fact, most key metrics went backwards.

Five targets were set in 2013—

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

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** —that, if achieved, would slash patient wait times by—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.



**Mr. Nesbitt:** –by 2015. Two years into the plan, the WRHA released their 2014 results, revealing that no targets were going to be achieved in the prescribed time frame.

Does the member for Tyndall Park believe that throwing money at the problem is an effective and sustainable solution to repairing the broken system?

**Mr. Marcelino:** I really want to argue the preamble of the question, because the previous government poured hundreds of millions into the health-care system. How does that compare to improving the health-care system by cutting?

It does not make sense. It is not logical.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Well, just looking at my WRHA urgent care–emergency care app here, I see the wait time at Concordia is 15 minutes; Children's Hospital is 45 minutes; Victoria Hospital is 15 minutes; the Grace is 15 minutes; Seven Oaks, zero minutes right now.

I'm wondering: Could the member shed some light, if somebody has a critical-care issue and they come into the emergency room, just how long would the wait be?

**Mr. Marcelino:** It's a–*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Marcelino:** Some of the nurses from Seven Oaks were at the stairs of the Legislature yesterday, and they were telling me that patient care has started to suffer, No. 1, because of the closure of the ER.

And it is amazing how the Pallister government can justify cutting and still say that it is an improvement. It boggles the mind.

\* (11:20)

**Mr. Jon Reyes (St. Norbert):** Does the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) believe that doing nothing about emergency room wait times of six, eight, 10 hours is acceptable for the people of Manitoba?

**Mr. Marcelino:** I like that question. Actually, it's a good question because the wait times in our ERs, even up to now, relies or is dependent on how fast the diagnosis and the triage is done.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Well, I know the members opposite, many of them were at the Concordia Foundation gala just the other day when the Concordia CEO was happy to get up and talk about the dramatic reduction in wait times because of investments like QuickCare

clinics and other investments in our health system. So I'm happy to talk about that, absolutely, every chance that I get.

I know my friend from Tyndall Park would be happy to talk about that.

Can he–can the member for Tyndall Park maybe just talk about, what does he think this government is really prioritizing? Is it the bottom line or is it patient care, because I'm confused.

**Mr. Marcelino:** That question is leading. I think the focus on money is wrong. It should be people first, patient care first, not cuts, care. Care is not achieved by cuts.

**Mr. Lagimodiere:** I'm glad we brought up the question about the Concordia emergency room because under the previous government the emergency room at Concordia recorded some of the worst and longest wait times in Canada. Can the member for Tyndall Park explain why the member–

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

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

**Mr. Lagimodiere:** –for Concordia did nothing during this time while knowing that his constituents were waiting six, eight and 10 hours for care?

**Mr. Marcelino:** I think the question begs itself another question: How can cutting Concordia help that community?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Time for question period has now expired.

### Debate

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The debate is open. Any speakers?

**Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk):** Access to timely, quality and affordable health care is one of the most important concerns expressed by all Manitobans during the last election. Presently, Manitobans are waiting too long for care or staying too long in hospital and often need to visit multiple locations to access the care they need.

The past 17 years witnessed a severe decline in the health care provided for Manitobans while at the same time we spent more on providing health-care services than any other province.

One of the problems Manitobans experienced was that we had the longest ER wait times. This makes no sense to have an emergency room next to

your home if you are forced to wait six to nine hours to be seen and treated.

When elected, we were faced with some of the longest wait times in Canada for diagnostic workups and surgeries. In some 'casions'—some cases, patients would wait months to see a specialist. While they waited, the added stress placed extra burdens on an already compromised patient.

**An Honourable Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Lagimodiere:** Shame is right.

As a result, a comprehensive assessment of Manitoba's health-care system was undertaken: the Peachey report. This report was commissioned by the NDP government. The Peachey's report represents hundreds of hours of consultations with community representatives, regional health authorities, leadership and staff, unions and associations, indigenous organizations, clinical leaders and other important stakeholders all aimed identifying major opportunities for improvement in care.

The report states: It was impressive to witness the level of engagement by organizations, providers and members of the public. It brought people together from across the province. The purpose of a Peachey report, as reported, was to provide a planning tool to deliver a quality, expertly led, 'corlaborlively' developed services plan that is evidence-based, sustainable, equitable and detailed. The Peachey report clearly states their recommendations are patient-centric, maintaining the patient at the centre of the system and providing safe care. The context of the report values a safe and sustainable health-care system that is equitable and accessible.

The report goes on to say that some areas were identified as priorities and restructuring of our emergency room delivery system was one such sector.

The report further states that the areas identified as priorities were without argument from stakeholders and organizational leadership. The report describes the provincial health-care system, when they looked at it, as being fragmented, and Manitobans expressed concerns over the quality and access, the redundancy and the inefficiencies in this system.

When the consultants looked at the adult critical care program in Manitoba, they made some interesting discoveries and reported there is a legacy of ineffective reorganization in adult critical care programs. It made the following comments for consideration in support of their proposals: that critically ill patients require multi-disciplinary care and such care is not consistent across the six sites. The report states two sites had limited internal medicine support, three sites had limited general surgery support, three sites had limited after-hours diagnostic imaging, four sites had limited access to subspecialty trades. The actual ICU space at three sites is not adequate to deliver current critical care needs.

It is very concerning for me, from the medical profession, to hear that standardized care is absent across multiple sites. The bottom line was that the current state of acute medicine delivered was inefficient and could not be sustained by maintaining the status quo.

The concerns are that Manitoba patients being served by the current program have multiple diagnoses which often require the co-ordination and collaboration of several medical specialists and the involvement of a variety or multidisciplinary caregivers to address complex physical and psychosocial needs.

The central piece of the plan is the consolidation of services at specific locations to capitalize on the strengths of those sites and position them to deliver improved quality and timelines of care as well as permit the concentration of valuable resources such as diagnostics that are currently spread over multiple locations.

We have several quotes from people involved in the health-care system. Dr. Alex Chochinov, the medical director for the emergency program with the health authority, states—well, he states that what was clear from the beginning is that the status quo was unacceptable, that Winnipeg did not—did have too many emergency departments relative to its population and relative to other Canadian centres.

Ryan Woiden, the president of the paramedic union, Manitoba Government and General Employees' Union, local 911, states; We're hoping, in the end, that what this will do is get the right patient to the right facility, where it's—whether it's an ER, if they are required one, or an urgent care facility, if they require that.

The proposed solutions were to reorganize acute care critical beds into three hospitals, restructure internal and family medicine into three remaining and it was identified that currently all hospitals were considered acute care, all have emergency departments, all have critical care units, and they'll—all were striving to provide the same level of acute care. It was identified that it has resulted in—unsustainable model that was failing patients and could have resulted in patient harm.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I go into an emergency room, I want to know that the standard of care that I'm receiving in that hospital is the same as the standard of care I would receive in another hospital.

\* (11:30)

I want to state again that the report, the Peachey report, which was just released, was commissioned by the previous government. The previous government now tells us that the recommendations made in this report, recommendations made by the experts that they selected in an untendered contract, are made by people not knowledgeable in providing health-care services to Manitobans. If the previous government truly believes this, what criteria did the previous government use to select individuals involved to prepare the Peachey report?

Now completed, these studies have identified opportunities to increase patient efficiency, and they have made recommendations to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of the entire health-care delivery system. The report has focused on better results in health-care services provided to all Manitobans. This is what Manitobans asked for: better care for themselves and their families. This is what our government is delivering on.

Each of Winnipeg's six hospitals will have a distinct, unique role in delivering specialized services, making it easier to provide the right care, the right place, at the right time. The measures being advanced are based on evidence from the provinces and from recent reports that support the need for system transformation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitobans need to know that, under the previous government, Manitobans spent more per capita than any other province on health care. Yet, as a province, we had the longest ER wait times, the longest wait times for diagnostic services, the longest wait times for surgery. All told, we ranked the worst in the country for health care

and yet we spent the most per capita. It was obvious that something was wrong. Given our level of spending, we should've ranked as one of the best provinces for health care in all of Canada.

Regional health authorities are already implementing some of the recommendations brought forward by previous commissioned reports. We are focusing our resources on areas that matter most, providing health-care services Manitobans need in a sustainable manner. We are providing record levels of investment to Manitoba Health, Seniors and Active Living.

Madam—Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear that from the onset, health care in Canada, in Manitoba, was focused on the patients. And I would trust that all those involved in our health-care system are there to help and put the interests of patients first and foremost.

Thank you.

**Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview):** I'm happy to rise today to thank my friend from Tyndall Park from bringing this really important resolution to the House today, and, of course, he has my complete and utter support, as he does on every member of our caucus because we stand up for publicly accessible health care for all Manitobans. And after listening to the member from Selkirk, I want to say I really miss the former member from Selkirk because he stood up for health care for Manitobans and not abdicating and abandoning his responsibility.

Now, I want to say three things really quite clearly about what the government's intention is here.

First of all, the whole idea of eliminating wait times, according to the government, is simply to eliminate the service. Nobody's going to line up for a service that simply doesn't exist anymore. That's no way to enhance the health-care system. That's no way to enhance patient care, and it's no way to ensure that people have emergency services when they need it.

Secondly, I want to say that I take great exception to the way in which our emergency services have been characterized by the government from the first day of this debate. I think the doctors and the nurses and the administrators in our emergency rooms do fantastic work, and every single day we have to listen to this government throw them under the bus, and I take exception to that. It's a rank insult, and it should be withdrawn right away.

And then, finally, I want to stand up as the member for Fort Garry-Riverview and say, as someone who has used the emergency services at Victoria General Hospital, who had excellent care from the emergency services at Victoria General Hospital, I'm going to advocate to keep that as an emergency room, and I hope my friend from Fort Richmond and I hope my friend from St. Norbert, who also represents that same community, will stand up on behalf of their constituents and the—and their members in their communities and ensure that there's emergency services available to all three of our constituencies rather than sitting on their hands and casting rank insults at our health-care system. Do the right thing: advocate on behalf of Manitobans and keep our health-care system strong, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris):** Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's always a pleasure to follow the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum), especially on a resolution of this importance and I will agree that this is an important resolution to debate. I think health care is obviously—is a larger—largest budget item, not just under our government but under the previous administration and going significantly back. It's an issue top of mind of all Manitobans, it's something that we need to have thoughtful and a fulsome conversation on.

But, as I listened to the member opposite—and I did, you know, pay attention to what he had to say, and all I heard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was fear. More fearmongering by the same government that actually perfected the idea of fearmongering. It's interesting that here we are rising on this resolution to debate it and we're just actually about—just past the one year anniversary of our own election of the historic mandate. And so, when we—I go back to that concept, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of what the member opposite was offering Manitobans and that constant fearmongering, that they need to be afraid as opposed to embrace the opportunities that exist under the Peachey report—a report, again, that members opposite solicited.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, allow me to reference The Globe and Mail—sorry—if nothing else, Manitoba's 41st election will be remembered for the desperate and often unseemly campaign tactics exhibited by the NDP premier, the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger). Should election day forecasts prove to be accurate—and, in fact, they turned out to be accurate—it will not be an exit from politics of which he will be particularly proud.

Consequently, the NDP helped make this one of the dirtiest, most personal political fights the province has witnessed in years. As the campaign hit the home stretch, the NDP said the Conservatives would cut funding for cancer-fighting drugs, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It gives you an idea, again, the fearmongering that continues even today. The NDP had absolutely no evidence of this but went with it anyway. The fact that the NDP has stooped to this level of attack certainly betrays the hopelessness the party is feeling. And again, that's an article from The Globe and Mail.

And so, I mean, it's that with the backdrop, that every time we debate and talk about health care, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my hope that the member for St. Boniface, the member for Minto (Mr. Swan), the member for Fort Garry-Riverview will use that, that backdrop of health care and debating health care—to actually apologize again to my predecessor, Ms. Taillieu, who left these Chambers in order to care for her cancer-stricken husband, who, unfortunately, passed away earlier this year.

But instead, they took her very personal decision—a decision, again, that any one of us would undertake if we had a spouse or partner that was diagnosed with terminal cancer, and they made it a political football. They shamed her on a daily basis for leaving and making that, again, that very personal decision. So, again, as I listen to the member continue his constant fearmongering, I would hope—I had hoped that every time he rises and the members for Minto and St. Boniface rise, it's my hope that they use this backdrop of a health-care announcement to, again, to apologize for fear, for apologizing for fearmongering, for apologizing the shaming of individuals and, again, to this individual, my predecessor. And I know their words wounded her and her family quite deeply, that right almost until the end of Wilf's passing, they continued to use her very, again, personal decision to be with him as political fodder.

But the report that the NDP are referencing—again, this is a untendered contract, a personal choice. They went through and they sat down in their cabal as they like to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they said, you know, who do we want to write a report? We have our PR system. According to CIHI we have the longest waits in the entire country—not just the longest waits in western Canada, not the longest waits, you know, in the top five, no, we have the longest waits in the entire country. We need to

give Manitobans the assurances that we, as an NDP government, are taking action, and so they hand-picked Dr. Peachey. I'm not here to question Dr. Peachey's qualifications—I mean he's got the D-r in front of his name, I do not. And so I will take—and, as a Canadian physician, he would have—and with—in Nova Scotia, that has some of the challenges that we have in terms of a population geographically dispersed. So you have rural pockets, a large urban centre in terms of Halifax, that we do comparably here in Winnipeg, but a scattering of smaller population centres throughout the province.

\* (11:40)

So the NDP sat down and they hand-picked Dr. Peachey to write this report. They gave him an untendered contract to say, help us fix the ER system.

So Dr. Peachey comes back with a report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, titled the Provincial Clinical and Preventive Services Planning for Manitoba: Doing Things Differently and Better. And it proposed that the remaining city hospitals be designated for convalescence and rehabilitation services. With all city hospitals possessing critical-care units and emergency departments, and I'm quoting, Mr. Deputy Speaker: "The system has evolved into an expensive, unsustainable model that is failing patients and could potentially result in harm." End quote. This is the NDP's consultant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am quoting.

Dr. Peachey goes on to say, and I quote: "The majority of patients in medical beds in the WRHA do not require this level of care, and in fact are at the level of convalescence or simply waiting for a non-hospital option." End quote. Again, this is the NDP's hand-picked consultant from Nova Scotia, Dr. Peachey, whom I'm quoting.

And yet now, so the government that hand-picks Dr. Peachey, that gives him the sole-sourced contract, that pays him to undertake a significant review of our ER system—because, again, according to CIHI, the Canadian Institute for Health Information, we do have the longest wait times not in our ERs—now they say the report is misguided. They say it's botched; they say it's a failure. Well, you know what? Perhaps they should have maybe not engaged Dr. Peachey. Perhaps they should have, you know, saved those tax dollars as opposed to giving Dr. Peachey that sole-sourced contract.

So what we need to look at, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is what are physicians saying, what are our front-line services saying, what are the people that actually have a far higher degree of expertise than I or most of us in these—in this Chamber do in terms of their constant interaction, their level of education, their interaction with patients on those front-line services.

So Dr. Alan Drummond, who is a rural ER physician, put out a series of comments, and I'm going to quote Dr. Alan Drummond: The recent announcement in Manitoba is not about health-care cuts; it's about improving timely access to quality care. The NDP have nothing to say about this. They had this file for decades and did precisely nothing except repeatedly study the problem. The reason the NDP failed was that they were pathologically fixated on the diversion of non-urgent patients away from the emergency department. That approach has never worked and never will. The status quo in Manitoba was unacceptable and could not continue. Did Brian Sinclair and Dorothy Madden die in vain? Manitoba has struck an emergency access working group currently involved in wide consultation. The Manitoba government has demonstrated a willingness to act decisively. Although I dislike repeated studies and reports ending up in the round filing basket, I think we should wait and see. The Manitoba NDP should just—and I'm quoting, Mr. Deputy Speaker—shut up. They have zero credibility on this issue.

That is all direct quotes from Dr. Alan Drummond, a rural ER physician, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, again, who are we to question his comments and his observations? But, of course, members opposite like to do that. They believe that fear is the only option. They believe that that is the only way to galvanize individuals. So they continue to run down their own report; they continue to talk about their own report.

You know, and I go on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it's interesting how they make the report sound that it was written on the back of a napkin, but I'm going to quote from the letter of introduction in the report—and a report that's widely available, even to members opposite, should they choose to actually read the report—quote: Using an adjusted population needs methodology, this report has progressed through phases of a project charter, qualitative and quantitative acquisitions and analyses and a

detailed environmental scan, underpinned by a data 'commendium' that has been provided by a companion document. End quote. This is a well-researched project, a well-researched project that took months and months of completion that involved multiple stakeholders and, again, was initiated by the former Selinger government.

Again, I'm quoting the actual report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quote: "Throughout, stakeholders have urged boldness." End quote. Making progress will be incremental in the full engagement of stakeholders across the system will be inevitably staggered. However, policy persistence and unwavering dedication to our system will lead to a successful end point.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** This resolution by the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) is coming at a timely moment. We have had Doctors Manitoba writing with concerns. We had about 600 nurses from all over Manitoba come yesterday and express their concerns about what's happening, that the proposals have not been as well thought out, that there's a lot of concern about exactly how their going to work and how workable they are.

I had the opportunity yesterday to meet and talk with nurses who'd come from The Pas, from Killarney, from Deloraine, as well as from our various institutions in Winnipeg: Concordia, Seven Oaks and Victoria hospital. I talked quite a bit, for example, with individuals who are at Misericordia and working there, and they point out that they have a really good team there, that—yes—there are people who come from outside the local area, but a lot of those people are coming because adjacent to the urgent care centre is the Buhler Eye Care Centre. And so if people have eye issues that they want to have a look at, they can come to the urgent care centre and, if they can't be looked after there then it's very easy for them to be looked after at the Buhler Eye Care Centre. So there's a synergy here.

I also heard that the government wants to move the intravenous therapy program from—I believe it's Lions over to the Misericordia. Well, it turns out there's plenty of room to accommodate the intravenous therapy program without having to dismantle the urgent care program. There's room for both. And just think what kind of synergy you could create if you had the intravenous therapy program, the urgent care program and the Buhler eye centre there all at once.

And so I would suggest to the government that they should have another look and that this resolution should be taken as an indication of the sort of concerns that are out there.

And so I thank the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) for bringing this forward and, hopefully, we'll get, you know, some support for this.

Thank you.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** I'm very pleased to speak to the member's excellent private member's resolution today.

And I must say that this whole announcement that was made a few days before the budget took a lot of people by surprise, certainly not only in this House, but certainly in our constituencies. And, you know, I've watched the political system and been involved in it now for quite a number of years, and I have to say that this is probably the biggest issue that is not resonating very well with my constituents in the Elmwood constituency.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of Concordia Hospital's emergency room, it serves the northeast and Transcona and, actually, into the rural areas, as well Roughly over 150,000 Manitobans in northeast Winnipeg and, with the provincial government eliminating the Concordia ER, what you are looking at here is approximately 30,000—just slightly under 30,000 patients per year making their way to St. Boniface ER and the health sciences ER.

Now, everybody knows already that both of those two hospitals are pretty much maxed out. There's waiting lists there as well. And so all you are going to do is compound your problem by having more people arriving at these two centres and having to wait in line even more. So this is clearly a cost-cutting measure on the part of this government.

\*(11:50)

In addition to that, we have the Seven Oaks centre which is 40,000—even more patients—and you have Victoria hospital having 30,000 patients, and you add these all together and you get—I believe it is 100,000 people. So 100,000 people in a year are going to now be converging on St. Boniface and Health Sciences Centre.

And I had occasion just a few weeks back to talk to a person from St. Norbert who said, well, you know, I'm not too concerned about this I go to Health Sciences Centre anyway I bypass Victoria. And when I explained to her, in fact, now she was going

to be competing with those 30,000 Victoria patients who are now going to the Health Sciences Centre, she started to take a different view of that because it was going to increase the problems for her.

Anyone who's had to, you know, fight their way to the Health Sciences Centre or St. Boniface, but particularly Health Sciences Centre, knows that parking is an issue there. It's hard to find parking; parking is expensive; cars get towed away. Doctors have reported that when they're talking to their patients, particularly cancer doctors, that they find the patients aren't listening to their instructions because they're too worried watching—keeping track of their watches because they have to go out and plug their meters.

So, you know, you have to—before you start rationalizing the system in this way, you have to develop what the alternative would be. And there's no way that they're going to be able to take, you know, the Grace Hospital and expand it to the required levels in the short period of time. It's going to take a huge amount of time to complete these additions and different construction that have to be done to accommodate a closure of even one of these ERs.

Now, to that end, what we have done in our area—I mean, there have been—the member—my colleague, the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe), has been conducting meetings, has had a petition that's being presented in this House. I have set up a website and I'm doing a survey of the area, and I have to say that in only seven days, we had a response rate that's just slightly under a thousand people at this time. Like, this is huge. Probably the biggest response rate I got for an issue—a local issue, a regional issue—was the Disraeli Bridge situation and we produced, like—got 7,000 responses. We thought that was a lot at that time, and the campaign was over a—perhaps a six-month period.

Well, we're talking almost a thousand responses in only seven days, and we haven't even started. So, you know, I think the government—these government MLAs have certainly drank the Kool-Aid here, because in the—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** —in the Filmon government, they did—*[interjection]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** —they did try at that time to close the Concordia Hospital and Misericordia. And, guess what? There was such an uproar in their own caucus in those days that the Filmon government backed off in a month or so.

But this is a different group. These guys don't stand up. These guys are defending the indefensible here and trying to sell the idea. The member for Transcona (Mr. Yakimoski) is actively trying to sell it in his article in the Herald magazine. That is unbelievable. But what Bonnie Mitchelson did 20 years ago, she actually fought her own government and got them to reverse their decision.

So thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe there's more speakers who want to speak to this resolution.

**Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain):** It's unfortunate that the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) who's a—I call a friend—and his colleagues can't see that our government is taking this action to make changes to health care to provide for quicker access and better results for patients.

That's not the case in rural Manitoba. In my town of Shoal Lake—

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

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

**Mr. Nesbitt:** —we lost our two doctors—

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

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

**Mr. Nesbitt:** —lost our doctors in 2015 and we still don't have permanent doctors. The emergency room is closed.

He talks about 20 minutes to get to a hospital in here. Try living where I live.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

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

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS— PUBLIC BILLS

### Bill 218—The Red Tape Reduction Day Act

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In accordance to rule 24 and as previously announced, I am interrupting debate

on—to put a question on—for the first selection bill for this section for the government caucus, Bill 218.

The question before the House then is second reading of Bill 218, The Red Tape Reduction Day Act.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

#### **Voice Vote**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour for the motion, say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion, say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

#### **Recorded Vote**

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

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

*Mrs. Colleen Mayer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

**The Acting Speaker (Colleen Mayer):** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 218, The Red Tape Reduction Day Act.

#### **Division**

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

#### **Yeas**

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

#### **Nays**

*Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Kinew, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.*

**Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish):** Yeas 38, Nays 12.

**The Acting Speaker (Colleen Mayer):** I declare the motion carried.

The hour being past noon, this House is recessed and stands recessed until 1:30 p.m.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 27, 2017

CONTENTS

<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>		<b>Resolutions</b>	
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS</b>		Res. 11– Provincial Government's Plan to Shutter Three Winnipeg Emergency Rooms Will Undermine Patient Care and Hurt Families and Seniors	
<b>Second Readings–Public Bills</b>		T. Marcelino	1664
Bill 220–The Environmental Rights Act	1653		
Altemeyer			
Questions		Questions	
Johnson	1655	Lagimodiere	1665
Altemeyer	1655	T. Marcelino	1666
Swan	1655	Wiebe	1666
Smith	1655	Martin	1666
Gerrard	1656	Nesbitt	1666
Wowchuk	1656	Reyes	1667
Debate			
Cox	1657	Debate	
<b>Speaker's Statement</b>		Lagimodiere	1667
Driedger	1659	Allum	1669
Debate		Martin	1670
(Continued)		Gerrard	1672
Swan	1659	Maloway	1672
Johnson	1661	Nesbitt	1673
Gerrard	1662		
Selinger	1663	<b>Debate on Second Readings– Public Bills</b>	
Smith	1663	Bill 218–The Red Tape Reduction Day Act	1673

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

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