

**Third Session – Forty-First Legislature**  
**of the**  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**Standing Committee**  
**on**  
**Legislative Affairs**

*Chairperson*  
*Mrs. Sarah Guillemard*  
*Constituency of Fort Richmond*

**Vol. LXXI No. 6 - 6 p.m., Thursday, October 25, 2018**

ISSN 1708-668X

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

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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS**

**Thursday, October 25, 2018**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – Mrs. Sarah Guillemard  
(Fort Richmond)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Greg Nesbitt  
(Riding Mountain)**

**ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6**

*Members of the Committee present:*

*Hon. Mr. Pedersen, Hon. Ms. Squires*

*Messrs. Altemeyer, Bindle, Mrs. Guillemard,  
Messrs. Lamont, Lindsey, Marcelino, Nesbitt,  
Wowchuk, Yakimoski*

**APPEARING:**

*Mr. Wab Kinew, MLA for Fort Rouge  
Hon. Steven Fletcher, MLA for Assiniboia  
Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights*

**PUBLIC PRESENTERS:**

*Ms. Courtney Tosh, private citizen  
Mr. Gene Degen, private citizen  
Ms. Alanna Phillips, private citizen  
Mr. Hank Venema, Strategic Community  
Consulting  
Mr. Ian Walker, private citizen  
Mr. Barry Prentice, private citizen  
Mr. Zach Fleisher, private citizen  
Ms. Molly McCracken, private citizen  
Ms. Jazmin Alfaro, private citizen  
Ms. Gloria Taylor, private citizen  
Mr. Matthew Lawrence, private citizen  
Mr. Edward Burgener, private citizen  
Mr. Zainab Mansaray, Canada Sierra Leone  
Friendship Society Inc.  
Ms. Angela Reeves, private citizen*

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:**

*Ervin Bartha, private citizen  
Deborah Judith, private citizen  
Alex Green, private citizen  
Jennifer Lukovich, private citizen  
Joseph Kornelsen, private citizen  
Robin Bryan, private citizen*

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

*Bill 16–The Climate and Green Plan  
Implementation Act*

\* \* \*

**Madam Chairperson:** Good evening. Will the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs please come to order.

Our first item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

**Mr. Kelly Bindle (Thompson):** I'd like to nominate Mr. Nesbitt.

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Nesbitt has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Nesbitt is elected Vice-Chairperson.

This meeting has been called to consider Bill 16, The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act.

I would like to inform all in attendance of the provisions in our rules regarding the hour of adjournment. A standing committee meeting to consider a bill must not sit past midnight to hear public presentations or to consider clause by clause of a bill except by unanimous consent of the committee. In addition, if necessary, the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs will meet again to consider Bill 16 Monday, October 29th, at 6 o'clock p.m.

We have a number of presenters registered to speak tonight, as noted on the list of presenters before you. We will therefore continue from where we left off last night.

Written submissions on Bill 16 have been received from the following persons and distributed to the committee members: Ervin Bartha, Deborah Judith, Alex Green.

Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting. Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Before we proceed with presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of

information to consider. First of all, if there is anyone else in the audience who would like to make a presentation this evening, please register with the staff at the entrance of the room. Also, for the information of all presenters, while written versions of presentations are not required, if you are going to accompany your presentation with written materials, we ask that you provide 20 copies. If you need help photocopying, please speak with our staff.

As well, in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from committee members.

If a presenter is not in attendance when their name is called, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If the presenter is not in attendance when their name is called a second time, they will be removed from the presenters' list.

Lastly, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process for speaking in committee. The proceedings of our meetings are recorded in order to provide a verbatim transcript. Each time someone wishes to speak, whether it be an MLA or a presenter, I first have to say that person's name. This is the signal for the Hansard 'recorner'—recorder to turn the mics on and off.

Thank you for your patience. We will now proceed with public presentations.

### **Bill 16—The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act**

**Madam Chairperson:** I have received a request from Courtney Tosh, No. 28 on your list. She has school early in the morning and has requested to present early. Is it the will of committee to hear from her first? *[Agreed]*

I will now call on Courtney Tosh.

Ms. Tosh, do you have any written materials for distribution for the committee?

**Ms. Courtney Tosh (Private Citizen):** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Tosh:** Good evening, everyone. First and foremost, I'd like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to voice my opinion here today.

I first heard of this opportunity yesterday morning. I read that there was a lack of youth participation, which was not a surprise. There aren't

very many young people who are politically involved. This is my first time giving a big speech and I feel that it is important for you to hear this from a youth perspective.

I'm here today to share my opinion on Bill 16 and my—believe that the—that government legislation is the first of many steps to reducing climate change.

Climate change is an undeniable issue. All of you have heard this before and are probably tired of hearing it, but it is repeated because it is important.

Transportation, agriculture, deforestation and all other sources of greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere are causes of climate change. The release of these greenhouse gases is causing the Earth to warm up and is harming our planet.

Since the end of the 19th century the Earth's average surface temperature has nearly risen by 1°C. Most of this warming occurred in the past 35 years. Since 1969 the top 700 metres of the oceans have warmed by more than 0.4°F. Sea levels rise every year; oceans are becoming more acidic and the albedo is continuously decreasing. The rate of Antarctica's ice loss has tripled in the last decade. We are using so much of Earth's resources that we are acting as though we have 1.7 planets.

Earth Overshoot Day is a day of the year on which humans' resource consumption exceeds the amount of resources that our planet can produce in a year. Our overshoot day for 2018 was August 1st. In 1971, Earth Overshoot Day was on December 21st.

Climate change is evidently an issue and our planet is clearly heading in the wrong direction. Why aren't we, the ones who caused this problem, trying to fix it?

It is clear that if our actions don't change, the planet will not be with us for much longer. Complacency is one of the most dangerous societal issues. People are absorbed into a daily routine that keeps them from questioning their actions.

They might hear about environmental issues and they might sometimes feel concern but they're always soon sucked back into that—the way that they think is reality.

Reality is the fact that our planet is suffering and we aren't doing anything about it. While complacency is major cause for the lack of actions that humans are taking to help the environment, another reason is because the Earth has a population of seven and a half billion people. Many people feel

as though they're so small and unimportant that anything they try to do and any change they try to create will never be big enough to make a difference.

We are all one in seven and a half billion, so our lives can easily feel insignificant. Imagine if instead everyone felt like they could make a difference. Everyone would do their part and Earth's environmental problems would be solved, but this will never happen.

We know with our complacent society and by looking at the past that humans on their own will not make the necessary changes in their lives to save the Earth. The changes need to start here in the government through legislation. Without it, people will not change.

There are many politicians who do not believe in climate change. It sounds ridiculous for people not to believe in something that is so obviously one of Earth's biggest problems. Politicians need to recognize environmental issues.

Although Bill 16 is an act with environmental concerns, it is a plan without actions. I would assume that prioritization is a major component of what is discussed and decided upon here at the Legislature, and making room on your list of priorities for the environment is crucial. Please demonstrate your priorities with your actions.

I understand that many of you will not be here to see the Earth reach its tipping point, but that does not mean that solving this problem is not your responsibility. We all dug this hole for ourselves and it's everyone's responsibility to dig ourselves out.

The people who aren't here with us today are the future generations who will suffer. It is important to hear from young people on this topic because we know that climate change will affect their future and they will need to have a say in how we go about handling this issue.

Severn Suzuki gave what I like to consider one of the most powerful environment-centred speeches 26 years ago. Suzuki stated: You don't know how to fix the holes in our ozone layer, you don't know how to bring salmon back up a dead stream, you don't know how to bring back an animal now extinct and you can't bring back forests that once grew where there is now desert. If you don't know how to fix it, please stop breaking it.

\*(18:10)

Today, we're still breaking our environment, and I believe that humans don't know near enough to mess with the environment. Did Suzuki's speech motivate people? Yes. But did anything change? No.

The Earth's conditions are far worse now than they were back then. Just like Severn Suzuki, the people who are going to be bravely presenting to you today may leave you feeling motivated to create change. You might have a feeling of hope within you. That feeling for most of you will be gone by tomorrow. Speeches like these will only make us temporarily care about the environment.

What you have to understand is that the Earth is reaching a tipping point. We are pushing our planet to the limit. I don't know what the future holds for me and my generation or the generation that will follow. As for the generation after that, well, I'm convinced that the Earth will no longer be here by then. You will have to find a way to keep this feeling of motivation and hope alive in you. Please take the following words into consideration. A sustainable future is an expensive one. But, without sustainable development, there is no future.

Thank you.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development):** Thank you, Ms. Tosh, for coming here this evening to present. And for someone who's had her first experience presenting at committee, I commend you for your words and your well-articulated presentation and for sharing your views.

You're absolutely right when you say that it's very important that government listens to the voice of your generation, and so I can't thank you enough for taking the time out of your busy schedule with your academics to come down here tonight and present, and I wish you all the best tomorrow in your exam. And please come back and present again and again, because we need to continue to hear your voice.

**Ms. Tosh:** Thank you.

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Thank you for your presentation.

Yesterday we heard a presentation from a parent who's very worried about her son and the legacy that we'll be leaving to the next generation. But I think your presentation tonight is so much more immediate, top of mind, relevant because you are the generation that is going to inherit this problem.

And so I want to thank you for taking the time, for being here, for composing your thoughts in such a cogent and elegant fashion, and also for speaking with bravery, because it's intimidating to come to the Legislature and give a speech, and yet you've handled yourself very well. So I want to thank you for all of that.

You're right that it is your generation that's going to inherit this issue, but it is up to politicians elected today to act. I think one of the recent conflicts that's sort of erupted between, you know, the government and our party and other parties is the issue of putting a price on pollution and carbon pricing. The idea being if pollution is free, then there'll be more of it, but if you put a price on pollution, then perhaps people will put—pollute less.

So I'm wondering—it sounds like you've done a lot of research—whether you have a view on the issue of carbon pricing and whether you think that that's something that the government should pursue. *[interjection]*

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Tosh.

**Ms. Tosh:** Sorry. I think if there's a chance that it will reduce pollution, then we better try it. And, if it doesn't work, we'll try something else.

**Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley):** Thank you very much. That was really well done. I hope this is by no means the last time this room hears from you, whether I'm here or not to hear it.

Can you—I mean, obviously we're all old. All right? Let's be honest. And you've got a—such a unique perspective to offer because the decisions made around this table tonight and later on are going to impact you way more than it's going to impact us.

What do you want to say to us to encourage us to do right by your generation, because it's not fair what you're inheriting? What do we need to do to make things right for you and your friends in your future?

**Ms. Tosh:** I guess you could either try to put yourself in the shoes of younger people and try to imagine what kind of world we would be coming

into. And also try to get us involved, just like how you did tonight and get us to share our opinions.

**Madam Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions, thank you very much for your presentation. Oh, Mr. Kinew.

**Mr. Kinew:** Yes, if there's still time, Madam Chair, for sure I'd like to ask another question.

Recently, there was a report by—you did recognize me?

**Madam Chairperson:** Yes.

**Mr. Kinew:** Okay, thanks.

So, recently there's a report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change just a few weeks ago, and it kind of basically said that the challenge of global warming is much more immediate than was previously thought. Basically, there's 11 years to pursue dramatic action to stop climate change. And they set out some very aggressive targets that we should all meet.

I'm wondering if you can maybe share your view of that matter and whether you think that the targets that these experts are putting forward are ones that we should aim for.

**Ms. Tosh:** Well, even if they are going to—hard to achieve, we should definitely be aiming for them. And, if we aim for them, and we don't get exactly all the way there, I think we're still going to at least make some big improvements.

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia):** Thank you for an excellent presentation.

You mentioned that many of us here will not be around at the tipping point. Perhaps everyone alive who has heard your words have already witnessed the tipping point already. So, if the tipping point has already occurred, I wonder if you have some observations or suggestions as we go forward.

**Madam Chairperson:** Before I recognize the presenter, I just want to let everyone know that our time has expired for questions and answer, but I will allow an answer, if it's brief.

**Ms. Tosh:** Well, if the tipping point has been reached, then I think it would be a little bit more obvious. And, if we did, if we ever were aware that a tipping point had been reached, I'm sure everyone would start to believe more that this is an actual issue and people would take action.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Gene Degen, private citizen.

Mr. Degen, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Mr. Gene Degen (Private Citizen):** No, I don't.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Degen:** Well, thanks for the opportunity to speak.

I'm a retired psychologist and now the identity that's most important to me is that I'm a grandfather. I take that role seriously. To me, it is one of responsibility and care for my family and for the community. Part of my grandparent role is to support our leaders in creating a healthy community for all. Right now, that means addressing the urgent threat to our species, climate catastrophe.

I want to speak to your relationship to the climate change section of the green plan. I've been very impressed by the presentations that I've heard here. Presenters have given a wealth of research-based facts, brought practical ideas of what actions can be taken and been eloquent in expressing their passion on the topic.

I'm encouraged and touched by the intelligence and selfless dedication of many of these people. But will it make any difference?

My concern is that climate catastrophe is just another file for this, and all governments, to manage. And all governments have many other ongoing responsibilities that are also important. Many of these responsibilities involve life-or-death decisions and have an urgency to them. The climate catastrophe file is just one more issue.

You individual members have overwhelmingly busy jobs, working until 12 o'clock some evenings, plus all other responsibilities of personal and family lives. Further, you have the ongoing need to get re-elected. With all of the competing priorities, with all of the competing priorities for your attention, how can you fit the climate catastrophe file in, in a meaningful way?

To add to the challenge, this is not an urgent, high-priority issue in the minds of most voters. You only need to look at the increase in the sales of SUVs and pickup trucks to see that, or notice the number of empty vehicles idling. In some groups, you will still

get a response of outrage by saying that we must take action or even make some sacrifice to deal with this issue.

\*(18:20)

As we all know, there are many powerful interests who are quick to attack any meaningful government action. It appears that the loudest voices and the most powerful lobbyists oppose meaningful action.

So it seems that many of the pressures that you members and the government are living with will make it very difficult, and unlikely, that strong action will be taken.

I've read the green plan, and it has some good ideas, but both the plan and the government managing of it show a lack of meaningful commitment. As an example of that, the government has decided to shun carbon pricing and prepare to do battle, because the federal plan would not be as good for Manitoba as the Manitoba plan. The government uses one analysis to estimate that the federal plan would slow the economy 0.04 per cent per year more than the made-in-Manitoba plan. That's 125th of 1 per cent, clearly less than any margin of error. So the government is turning its back on carbon pricing, a strategy that Nobel Prize-winning economists have shown is effective, because it might slow the economy less than the margin of error.

Another example of commitment is cutting the grant to Winnipeg Transit, while speaking in the green plan of how electrification of our buses is a triple win for Manitoba. We now know that the electrification is not happening, because transit lacks the dollars to handle the upfront costs. These are clear statements of politics as usual, but that's not surprising. Politics are important if it means keeping your job, and that's the cold reality for our leaders. But politics as usual is not good enough for this issue; this is not just another file. None of the rest of the issues provide a threat to our species. This issue trumps everything else. I hope that word hasn't been ruined.

Every year of treating it like another file is wasting the time we are running out of. We need leadership now, which takes a strong, science-based position and educates our population to bring it along. You need to be bold in facing the attacks that will surely come if you act. You don't have the luxury of waiting until the majority of voters demand

action on climate change. You need to put principle ahead of politics and truly lead.

It's not easy—an easy time to be a leader. Fortunately, just as there will come a tipping point for the electrification of transportation, there will be a tipping point of voter support for climate action. When it happens, politicians who have taken action may be given the rewards they deserve. The question is, will it be too late?

I expect my grandchildren to hold me accountable for what I did about climate change when we still had a chance to address it. I'm a little frightened about my granddaughter; she's really tough.

I expect historians to be ruthless when they deal with political leaders if they do not rise to the occasion. This is a time of opportunity for greatness or the risk of sinking into shame. I've had this image in my mind today of the Prime Minister in 20 years making an apology on behalf of the Canadian government to the generation of the day for what our government has failed to do.

Let's all look within ourselves for the strength and integrity we need to be a part of the solution. Thank you.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you very much for coming down here and presenting your views, and I really appreciated hearing your perspective. And I, too, have the joy of being a grandparent, and I know I look at my grandchildren and know that everything we do is really for them.

So I appreciate the perspective that you shared with us tonight, and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Degen—Mr. Kinew.

**Mr. Kinew:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you for your presentation. I will just add, you know, one of the things we've been doing over the past few days here at the Legislature is doing condolence motions where we memorialize former MLAs who've passed away. And, during some of those speeches, I've noticed that maybe not all politicians deserve to be tarred with the same brush. There are people, like Howard Pawley and Roland

Penner, who stood up and did things which were unpopular in the day, like supporting LGBTQ rights, and standing up for French language rights here in the province, and you know they staked their political careers on it. And they were not necessarily always rewarded at the ballot box, but they did the right thing. So there is reason for optimism, reason for hope, but perhaps greater reason to be feeling the urgency of the moment.

But that little soliloquy aside, I guess one of the things that we're grappling with in the Leg. and in the media and all that is around the issue not just of putting the science first but also of the IPCC standards. The IPCC came out with this report, called this to action over the next 11 years in a very dramatic way, very urgent way. And I'm wondering, in your view, if you can just share your perspective on whether we should be meeting those targets, aiming for those targets, and what the imperative is for us to do so.

**Mr. Degen:** I guess it really brings me back to the main point of what I want to say. This trumps everything. This is not something that we can deal with as another file. This science is giving us a very clear message and that's—there's very little time to act. We can't put this—kick it down the road a little farther and kick it down the road a little farther. If we don't take meaningful action now, then the action that we'd have to take in four years and eight years becomes impossible.

Now we're talking about inconvenience in trying to take action that will get us to where we need to go. But it's not inconvenience if we're up against the wall in 10 years saying, okay, now we have to make it all happen in the next year. Then it's social disruption on a major scale. The economy—we're afraid to have the economy affected by taking any kind of meaningful action. If we put it off, the effects on the economy are going to be much grander than they are today.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I couldn't agree more. And thank you for bringing that point home. Inaction on climate change would be far worse and, indeed, taking action on climate change could, heaven forbid, actually create good jobs, create more opportunity. I mean all of us could be living in homes that don't cost as much to heat in the winter. We could be riding on electric buses that cost a fraction of what a diesel bus costs. These are all, you know, part of the exciting part of the transition to a green economy that we don't hear about as often.



As my leader just pointed out, we believe very much that in order to make sure that this does trump everything else, we believe that the science of climate change needs to be embedded in legislation, and we will be bringing in an amendment tonight that hopefully will be supported that will require exactly that, that all future governments in Manitoba will have to act on climate change based on the scientific recommendations of the United Nations.

So I would ask you, if you were one of us sitting around this table tonight, would you vote in favour of that or would you vote against it?

**Mr. Degen:** I would vote in favour of it. It seems like a good place to start.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call on—before I call our next presenter, we just received a written submission from Jennifer Lukovich on this bill, and staff is distributing copies. Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

Because she is registered to present, you can remove her name from the list. That would be No. 4 on your list.

I will now call on Alanna Phillips.

Ms. Phillips, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Ms. Alanna Phillips (Private Citizen):** I indeed have written materials. I've added a Web page for the sustainable development information from the Prince of Wales on there with my own writing, and I sign and whatever. Do I have permission just to sort of introduce myself a little bit, just from where I'm coming from? I just wanted to add that, because I have to speak very fast on this presentation, I have a lot there, as you can see. I'm going to—

\* (18:30)

**Madam Chairperson:** Okay. You can go ahead and start your presentation.

**Ms. Phillips:** Okay, I'd just like to add into it, you can find, on Wikipedia, 77 billion—77-point billion Euros being produced by tourism in France—2016. And 171 billion Euros by Italy and we can tell, just as war 2,000 years ago, our infrastructure could show us what war was doing to the community. Today they're having problems with pollution—our

beautiful architectures are showing what is going on. So we should be doing that.

So I'll just read this really quick for you guys; you can keep up.

Living under the Jacques Cartier Bridge in Montreal, tucked away in a beautiful little community, with all the 'anemities', why was the rent \$350 a month? When the traffic on the bridge simmered down at night, the pollution would drop onto the water and down onto the community. Every morning, the dust wiped off the kitchen counters, as it floated and settled into the waters around the city.

It's okay to run a vehicle in a closed space if you're suicidal. We are in a closed space. My uncle created our telecommunication satellites for, I guess, the Russians and NASA, to first put people out into space. So we have to consider saving our resources, not for war. I understand everybody's trying to get a hold of the resources so the bad guys don't get it and, you know—and the paperwork and the Xerox copying and the medians and, you know, do we have capital punishment? And, you know, it's crime. You know, we have to understand the chemistry. We also have to understand the chemistry of crime, and we waste so much time on our planet dealing with criminal activity that it is causing the disaster. So I believe our problem is crime.

We're not 'in-volving' into our highest potentials. For example, we could, as a government, create shoes that—with our Manitoba logos, T-shirts, shoes, leave a Manitoba footprint behind, right. That could go out and make us, you know, as much money as Nike. We don't have to ask for Imelda Marcos shoe collection, but we can add a shoe collection item into many of the people's foots—footprints. So there's a logical, viable, sustainably developed idea that could bring in money for anything that you guys may need to do. So that's one of the potentials we can have.

Another thing is the elections. We should have models, so that the people can go to the voting stations and know what they're voting for.

It's lovely. I've grown up with all of you. My parents are on both sides of the table, you know, in the political realm, so I'm like one of the divorced kids, you know, who wants to satisfy everybody and rebel, you know.

So we all, you know, can be relating to those directives, looking at all the people that we want to impress and continue our legacy for. So that's the models.

Global warming—oh, is this working? Sorry, somebody just bought me this computer so that I could get my work done. Global warming's no different. If we get it wrong here on Earth, we will not survive. We came from the waters, they say. Octopus, you know. We walk, we swing in trees, we build—we—the crows use tools to pull out grubs, you know, from the trees, you know. They make the hooks. It's like little crochet hooks, and we probably got the idea for crocheting from the crows.

So we're going into space. We have to study muscles. We have to study bone masses. We need to—you know, maybe we're all going to end up octopi again. You know, who knows what's going to happen? But this was created to get us to the North Star, right. So we are looking for resources to save in safe places for our expansion into the universe.

Clean, healthy food, shelter and clothing—I don't know if you notice my legs, but I worked hard on gardens and I have been working in community gardens. We have one left on Sherbrook and Broadway. It's the only one left from 1993, and—so there's other gardens. I'm not saying that's the only garden, but collecting the gardens. The criminal activity within our different administrations are stopping the people from actually being able to feed themselves with their own work. I know that there was people here speaking about food security yesterday. So they're not luxuries; they're necessities. We should be having workshops, places where the children can go and learn how to make their own clothing still—you know, we can't forget our legacies. We can't forget our indigenous pasts, and we have to bring all the best up.

We need to achieve equality so that we can have as many witnesses as is humanly possible to analyze these global warming issues—universal travel, getting through arguments such as whether the world is flat or not—you know, that was going on. It still is, you know. Did we get to space? Do we have telecommunications? How many people use a telephone? You can see in the Speaker's galley so many people looking like the Grahams who created the telephones. Practicum, better witness and simply memorizing text books—I believe that we should be having a universal universities offered so that we can have universal education available to everybody.

And this was sort of my deep breath, and relax: so we need to worry about oxygen, right. And we need to worry about what pollution we're challenging ourselves with. And, like I said, with war, we see

what happens on the outside of the building and we see the war through the pollution. And we know that it's war, and it's not anybody here that's causing wars. Jesus said forgive them if they don't know.

So, while you all do the jobs that you have won the contracts to achieve, build the models to scale so that the public knows what stage we are at in our collective governance. We should not be finding it difficult to make peaceful transitions into clean energy, clean lifestyles, clean surroundings and completely well-rounded society.

For 20 years, I've been—I put a proposal in 20 years ago. The last election I was hit by a truck, and I was hemorrhaging and I still delivered to all of the MLAs my proposals. So you can get my advice on infrastructure, through there, education.

So this day, itself, is expensive. We still have homelessness. We have the sex slave trade being our largest growing economy. We can't waste any more time arguing about constructing industries that cause our society to become more economically segregated before our people are educated enough to make educated votes concerning global warming.

Let us first expose the pattern of embezzlements that are causing the haves and the have-nots to be better segregated. Build the education that our government has been 'agendaed' to do. Why else would we be here?

Let us then see about creating more industrial productions that excel our 'exportations' of fun marketplace games. The marketplace is a race. You know, we're trying to get the best ideas and the best ever—you know, the Mad Men sort of theory in advertising. But don't let the race label our government and why we're all here.

Let's see, slackers creating meetings, meetings and meetings. I would like to invite everybody to spend a day a week—I would like two days a week—out building. This community was built on barn building, and lots of people came over here from all over the place without any money and they gathered one piece for a barn and then they built it and then they went and gathered another piece and they built it, and people had their farms, and from both political parties—three political parties—sorry.

So once we protect our people with the highest standards, then let us see which brothers and sisters have the best ideas and let us celebrate their accomplishments, reaching the highest standards in everything that we attempt to accomplish, including

creating the very best industrial economy, veering not from a legal economy, creating public spaces to have tangible workshops for our people with equal opportunity to analyze different COT—or CO<sub>2</sub> levels, different pollution levels, like, you know, the Children's Museum or something that adults can go to.

Here's my chastising. I'm not chastising anybody personally, I'm bringing us all into this as a collective group. I'm appalled that we are here arguing about who gets to have the money to provide our people with our living standards that are humane. Children are being sold into slavery daily, and no matter what anyone's opinions are, we must make the strictest regulations to provide the highest potential to any industry's requirements. You cannot allow children to be put at risk because people make money off of ghettos—not even a question.

Our city right now, you can go from Higgins to Redwood and see all the pharmaceuticals that were built from the embezzlement of human traffickers within our hospitals taking the medications. Then you have Xerox machines going for them, against them, with them, and it's taking money from our medicare.

Marijuana, the same. Injuries aren't being looked at now because you can just have weed and you won't feel it. So we need to get our, like, MPI, different things like that, producing food for the people without taking away our independence when we get put on the front of a truck at highest speed possible for the truck to go.

\* (18:40)

So reaching our highest potential again, we can get our jobs done by recording us in the annals of history as blatant human traffickers—

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Phillips—

**Ms. Phillips:** Oh, sorry. Is that time?

**Madam Chairperson:** Yes. You have reached the end of the presentation time, but it's been fascinating listening. We're going to start our—thank you for your presentation, and do any members of the committee have questions for Ms. Phillips?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you very much, Ms. Phillips, for coming here again today. I know you were with us last night until midnight, and then you're back again today, and I know that that takes an incredible commitment to carve out the time and to be here, but that is what makes democracy such a wonderful

system as it allows for full participation from everyone in society.

So I thank you for coming here and expressing your views and also for providing us with your written presentation.

**Ms. Phillips:** Thank you as well. I appreciate the work that you all have done to be here. I know, growing up here, how much work it is and how much work the children are doing at home and not everybody is being able to be appreciated for what they are doing, and a lot of people are getting much more slack than is necessary, and I hope that we can all just come together.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Zainab Mansaray, Canada Sierra Leone Friendship Society Inc. Zainab Mansaray? Zainab Mansaray will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Hank Venema, Strategic Community Consulting.

Mr. Venema, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Mr. Hank Venema (Strategic Community Consulting):** I do.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Venema:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I will start with four key messages. Climate resilience is an economic and technology development opportunity for Manitoba. Climate resilience in Manitoba requires a high technology water management strategy for distributed flood and drought protection.

Developing and implementing such a strategy de-risks Manitoba from disaster liabilities, will increase agricultural productivity and creates high demand technology and services.

Invest in a high technology water strategy to demonstrate technical and political leadership and attract infrastructure investment. Thank you.

Dear committee members, my name is Henry David Venema. Most people in the province know me as Hank. Thank you for the opportunity to present before committee.

I'm the chief technology officer at a clean tech company, Strategic Community Consulting, where we're focused on ways to energy and ways to fertilizer technology as well as resilience strategies based on high-tech knowledge, i.e. water resources management.

You've heard from many other colleagues regarding the merit and demerit of various carbon-pricing strategies. I'm here to discuss the risks of neglecting climate resilience and the economic and technology development opportunity associated with leadership on climate resilience.

I've previously held various directorships at the International Institute for Sustainable Development, including, most recently, as a director of the Prairie Climate Centre.

My shift to the private sector mirrors the broader trend of investment in climate resilience as a new growth sector.

In my previous role I was asked to endorse this government's climate and green plan discussion document released one year ago at Oak Hammock Marsh. I did so as I was impressed with the clarity with which that document expressed the real risk climate change poses to our society. Precariously situated at the bottom of glacial Lake Agassiz, among other impacts we can expect more floods and more droughts from climate change. What we used to think of as extreme events will become more commonplace.

The 2011 Assiniboine River flood is a foreshadowing of future climate risk. It caused over \$1 billion in distributed infrastructure damage: blown apart culverts, bridges and section roads, and if that were not bad enough, another billion dollars of crop losses resulting from flooding and drought conditions. Some sections of land were under both flood and drought insurance claims in the same year.

Unmanaged exposure to climate risk imposes a huge financial risk. Last year, Moody's Investors Service warned hurricane-prone US cities that their debt would be downgraded if they did not develop and implement a resilience strategy.

Conversely, two weeks ago, Bloomberg business weekly published a report entitled Climate Change Will Get Worse. These Investors Are Betting on It, which detailed how venture capital firms, private equity firms and technology firms are embracing the investment opportunities associated with climate resilience. In a very similar vein, I recently

co-authored a report for the Insurance Bureau of Canada on the use of natural infrastructure to reduce flood risk, and concluded that the investment case for the multifunctional storage system at Pellys Lake near Holland, Manitoba, had a net benefit-cost ratio of at least 2.8 and probably closer to 4. And this was vetted by the economists at the Insurance Bureau of Canada.

When the sum of flood and drought risk reduction, irrigation and ecosystem services values were considered, the project is reducing flooding, preventing nutrients from travelling downstream to Lake Winnipeg, storing carbon, creating new economic development opportunities associated with biomass and biomass processing. Projects like this are extraordinary infrastructure investment opportunities and need to be scaled up and designed for private sector co-investment.

The provincial investment in the conservation trust through a one-time endowment of \$100 million is a commendable commitment to natural infrastructure, but it is also at least an order of magnitude below the required level of investment. The major upside is that the necessary capital need not come from government alone, as resilience is such a good investment that the right planet investment model will attract private and pension capital pools. Infrastructure that creates climate resilience is exactly the investment that smart, patient money seeks.

For an investment of one half of 1 per cent of the capital cost of the Lake St. Martin channel—that is, \$2.5 million invested, compared to the \$500-million Lake St. Martin cost, local technology firms, in collaboration with the R & D community, can build this province a 21st-century resilience strategy based on high-tech water resources management that will attract private and institutional capital.

For Manitoba to seize the opportunity of expanded agriculture in a warming climate, we need a more reliable water supply. Moreover, the underlying technology that we apply will be extremely valuable and exportable to many other agricultural regions of the world also experiencing increased frequency of flood and drought risk. Our company is building resilient strategies for local governments for whom climate risk infrastructure is a here-and-now priority. The major innovation opportunity is taking these concepts to scale and leveraging previous provincial investments in artificial intelligence, high-performance computing,

big data, P3 models potentially. Manitoba has an opportunity to demonstrate leadership, foresight, innovation and do our forebears proud.

Two generations ago, this party was led by Duff Roblin, who willed the Red River Floodway into existence—not because it was politically expedient or easy—because it was such an excellent investment that would allow future generations to survive and thrive in this environment. He believed the scientists and engineers. The benefit-cost ratio of that investment is now approaching 100 to 1. Let's build the 21st-century analogue: distributed, networked, intelligent, highly attractive to investors. Let us help you.

Thank you.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** That was a great presentation, Dr. Venema, and thank you so much for coming down here tonight. I appreciate all the work that you've done in your former roles as well, and the time that you've spent with our government talking about the importance of our natural infrastructure and how investments in our natural infrastructure can certainly be a key solution to climate change adaptation. And that's exactly what we're doing with moving forward on many green investments and starting with our conservation trust, which we certainly do think will reap benefits for rebuilding our natural infrastructure, that will be a key in climate adaptation as well as other benefits.

So I appreciate you very succinctly putting it together for us in your presentation tonight. Thank you.

\*(18:50)

**Mr. Venema:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The conservation trust is a great start. It needs to go to scale, and to do so requires the application of technology to make it attractive to investors besides government.

**Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I just—I was wondering, you mentioned droughts and floods, can you—do you have any information about wildfires or the increase that climate change is having on wildfires? And a response to that?

**Mr. Venema:** Indeed, Mr. Lamont, there is a large body of research that associates increased frequency of forest fire with climate change. The—basically, you increase the likelihood of spontaneous ignition, you increase the dry biomass on the forest floor, you increase the volume of that and its relative dryness. So when there is a lightning strike, it's more likely to combust because it's hotter and drier. The association, the correlation between longer, hotter, drier summers and forest fires is well established in the scientific literature.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thank you very much, Hank, for coming down. Very interesting presentation, as always.

For the benefit of the committee, can you tell us a bit more about the Pellys Lake project?

**Mr. Venema:** Yes, it was actually the current executive director of the Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation encouraged us to consider this project as a prototype of multifunctional natural infrastructure. And so we went and met with the La Salle Redboine Conservation District and the local landowners, all of whom recognized that there would be value in retaining water. There would be value in the release of that water, dewatering that site in the fall to increase ecosystem flows to prepare for the following spring freshet, and would allow us to harvest the biomass that was produced in this area thereby removing the phosphorus that would otherwise pollute Lake Winnipeg. So we have three, probably five, co-benefits because, in fact, in addition to the flood risk reduction, the drought risk reduction, the phosphorus removal, the biomass production, we're actually seeing better habitat quality there than was the case prior to management. So management, sophisticated management, can actually improve ecosystem services in habitat conditions, as well.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** A brief follow-up, if I may.

How replicable is that case study to other parts of Manitoba? And has there been any other project similar to it that has been implemented since Pellys Lake was, you know, initiated, measured, studied and reported on?

**Mr. Venema:** It has been well studied. We're very fortunate to—that there's been academic research on it that allowed me to document the economic case, the investment case for that project. We're currently working for the—under a Federation of Canadian Municipalities' contract for the rural municipality of

Norfolk Treherne on the application of those same principles for the investment case for the Treherne dam.

The Treherne dam is we believe likely necessary to mitigate water scarcity in south central Manitoba. We believe that the investment case for the Treherne dam is very good, and if we apply the logic of Pellys Lake and manage as a multifunctional natural ecosystem, the investment case will only increase.

It's an interesting point. There are many irrigators in south central Manitoba who could benefit from increased irrigation, increased water storage. Some irrigators were cut off this August because of drought conditions in the Stephenfield Reservoir, and the prior allocation necessary for the Pembina Valley Water Co-op. It's an example of water scarcity affecting agricultural production, economic development, rural economic development in Manitoba.

We believe that with intelligent water management, we can increase the water supply, increase our food security and allow rural economic development in Manitoba to flourish. But it will require investment. The investment case is high.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for questions and answers has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Before I recognize our next presenter, we received a written submission from Joseph Kornelsen, and staff is distributing copies. Does the committee agree to have this document appear in the Hansard transcript of the meeting? *[Agreed]*

He appears as No. 19 on your presenters' list, and you can remove his name.

I will now call on Ian Walker, private citizen. Mr. Walker, do you have written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Mr. Ian Walker (Private Citizen):** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Walker:** Good evening, Madam Chair, and members of the committee. Thank you for taking the time to listen to members of the community on this very important issue.

Climate change is the defining issue of our time. If we manage to lower our emissions, we may give future generations the same opportunities that many of us had. If not, we are condemning them to

a dangerous future with dwindling resources and frequent severe weather events.

I am speaking to you not only as a private citizen, but I'm also here to speak to you on behalf of my two sons, Owen *[phonetic]* and Max *[phonetic]*, and I'm speaking on behalf of the hundreds of students that I've taught and the hundreds more that will come through my class year-classroom in the years to come. I'm also here to speak on behalf of my friends and family who are unable to attend due to time constraints in life.

Climate change has become a very serious concern for many of my friends and family, and many of them are making personal changes to lower their own carbon footprints. Let's be clear: the IPCC is calling for dramatic cuts in emissions. By 2030, global emissions need to drop by 45 per cent if we are to remain at or below 1.5°C of warming. This is a monumental task, but one that I believe is possible using current technologies.

I've been concerned about climate change for the past two decades. In my teens and early 20s, I recall reading about climate change and the effects that scientists said it would have on our society. I was troubled by these findings and started on my journey to be a better steward of the environment. I started with the easy cuts to my emissions. I rode the bus and walked to avoid using my pickup truck when I started—sorry—when I started with—I reduced my consumption of meat. I eventually scrapped the truck and bought a succession of smaller vehicles.

When we bought our home, we decided to buy a home that was within a short walk or bus ride from my wife's workplace so we could be a one-car family. It worked out really well because we found a multi-family home that made buying a home in our neighbourhood more affordable and environmentally friendly because we were sharing space with other people in a former single-family home.

When my first son was born, I decided to start riding a bike so my wife and I could remain a one-car family while she was at home on maternity leave. I embraced cycling, and it became my primary mode of transportation year-round. I generally put 100 to 150 kilometres on my bikes on an average workweek. We take our kids to school on bikes, although now they're on their own bikes, and my wife and I both ride our bikes to work. My wife is more of a fair-weather rider, so she walks or buses on days when there is a lot of precipitation.

While I didn't cycle much in my 20s, getting onto a bike to start commuting was easy for me. I had a great role model to teach me what I needed to commute successfully in Winnipeg's climate. My father had cycled for decades as a primary mode of transportation. When he rode his bike in the winter in the '90s, there weren't nearly as many people doing it as there are now. But that didn't stop Dad. He wanted to ride a bike because it was the most economical way to get around, and it allowed him to stay in good shape without having to visit the gym.

Unfortunately, my dad had to hang up his bikes last December when he was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer. Fortunately, his bikes have both been given new homes, and I'm proud to say that my city councillor and one of my city planner friends will be taking up winter cycling this year on them. My dad was pleased to know that they will be going to good homes. I know he misses the freedom that he had when he was able to ride a bike.

After becoming familiar with a lack of cycling infrastructure in Winnipeg, I decided to become involved with a local cycling-advocacy group called Bike Winnipeg. Bike Winnipeg is an amazing organization that is made up of some very talented volunteers with a variety of backgrounds. We have had many successes over the past couple of years with the adoption of the pedestrian cycling strategy and with the construction of many dedicated bike lanes in our downtown, Exchange District and in Winnipeg's suburban neighbourhoods.

\* (19:00)

I would appeal to your government to inject some much-needed funds into the City of Winnipeg to help us develop our cycling network at a faster pace. There are already a significant number of people that cycle regularly in Winnipeg. A survey commissioned by Bike Winnipeg and CAA earlier this year found that 21 per cent of Winnipeggers are already cycling daily or a few times a week for transportation.

We also found that 45 per cent of people said that they would cycle a few times a week or more if the conditions were optimal. When asked to consider and rank options that would get them moving, literally and figuratively, from an aspiring cyclist to an active user, one improvement quickly rose to the top of the list: more protected bike lanes on major routes.

Cycling isn't the only place that my family has made cuts to carbon emissions. A few years ago, our furnace broke down and we decided to install a geothermal heat pump to heat and cool our home. We accessed two grants from the provincial government to help pay for it and have been able to depreciate a portion of the heat pump through incentives on our taxes that we pay on the income we generate from our tenants. Switching from a gas furnace to a heat pump lowered our emissions by approximately eight tons a year. Our home is also very comfortable throughout Winnipeg's cold winters and our increasingly hot summers.

Our most recent change has been the purchase of an electric vehicle. In March, we found a used 2015 Nissan LEAF at a local dealership and we purchased it. It is an excellent car to get us around town. We generally use it on evenings and weekends to take our kids to activities that are too far away to reasonably cycle to.

When we leave town, we trade the electric car with friends and use their cars to travel longer distances, as there are no fast chargers available outside of the city of Winnipeg. We will rent a car should our friends' cars be unavailable.

Now, all of the changes that we have made are great, but they are only a drop in the bucket when we look at overall emissions in Manitoba. If we want more people to make the necessary switch from fossil fuels to renewables, we need to provide incentives to switch to lower emitting forms of transportation and home heating and cooling. This is where a carbon tax fits in.

Paul Romer, a Nobel Prize-winning economist, was recently interviewed on CBC's *As It Happens* and he says that this crisis can easily be averted through economic policy.

The policy is very simple: if you just commit to a tax on the usage of fuels that directly or indirectly release greenhouse gases, and then you make that tax increase steadily in the future, people will see that there's a big profit to be made from figuring out ways to supply energy where they can do it without incurring the tax.

Please listen to the experts. Scientists are ringing the alarm bells. They're telling us that if we don't act now, we risk our children's future. Economists say that the best way to deal with greenhouse gas emissions is to put a price on them, so act now.

Put a price on pollution. Let people figure out innovative ways to reduce their own emissions. My kids and my students are counting on you to get this right. Please don't let them down.

Thank you.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** I want to thank you for coming down here tonight and making your presentation, and I want to commend you. And I have to say that I'm in awe of you for your commitment to sustainable active transportation and modifications that you've made to your lifestyle and your family's lifestyle to transition to a low-carbon future. And, of course, none of what you've outlined is easy, but I applaud you for the steps that you've taken.

I'm probably more along the lines of—and the classification of your wife—a fair-weather cyclist. I do find it intimidating to cycle in certain weather, certain climates that we have in Manitoba and in the dark, but I commend you for your commitment to cycling and for being a leader. You're influencing many people throughout your community and in your role as a teacher.

So thank you very much for your commitment to the environment and for being a leader in our province.

**Mr. Walker:** Thank you, Minister.

**Mr. Lamont:** Did you find a place to put your bike today? Did you miss the meeting last night because you couldn't find a—

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Walker.

**Mr. Walker:** I didn't miss the meeting last night. I found an alternative place to lock my bike up, but this evening I drove my electric car because there wasn't adequate bike parking outside the Legislature because on October 23rd, they removed the bike racks so that they can do winter snow-clearing.

So I would ask the folks at the Leg. here if you could find an alternative space for people to lock up their bikes. I have quite a few friends that ride bikes through the wintertime.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** That's an excellent suggestion. I hope we can take note of that. There is a very small bike compound that I use here. It'd be nice to maybe

make that more accessible to the public or some side of it.

Certainly, I want to echo the minister's comments. Many of the changes you've made or changes I've made—you've managed to get to the electric vehicle stage, which I hope to do in future. My question for you is, again, kind of riffing off the minister's comments, is—when she said all of this is hard. We need to change that, don't we? So that more people can do more of the things you've done already more easily. And we have to do it really quickly, as the IPCC report that you referenced says.

So let me ask you this: What are the main barriers for the people in your community? What's preventing them from doing what it is that you've done? Is it information? They just don't know. Is it motivation? They just don't care. Is it financial? You know, they'd like to do it, they know about it, but they just—they can't make the numbers work. Or maybe it's something else altogether?

I'd be interested to hear your thoughts on that.

**Mr. Walker:** Thank you for the question, Mr. Altemeyer.

I think there's multiple aspects to it. Education's a big one. Being an electric car owner now, I frequently have questions about vehicle range, how I charge it, how long the battery pack will last. Folks think, you know, with our cellphones only lasting a couple of years, that the batteries will need to be replaced every three or four years at a great cost to them. And they find that that's an impediment to owning a car. But I understand that the batteries in our cars should last the lifetime of the vehicle, and, if they do need to be replaced over, you know, a longer period of time after the eight-year warranty's up on it, it's still less than the cost of replacing a transmission or a motor in a vehicle.

And one of the motivations to purchasing an electric car for us was that we don't drive our vehicle as much as most people, and our gas car was breaking down frequently because it sat a lot. So the electric car is nice, because you can just leave it until you need it and you know that it's always going to work.

In terms of installing the geothermal, it's a technology that not very many folks in town know about. I learned about geothermal by visiting rural folks that had installed it in their homes when they didn't have access to natural gas, because it would significantly drop their energy costs. So I had some



friends that built a house out of town, and they put geothermal in their house. And I thought, boy, I sure wish I could do this in town. So I did a lot of research, and I phoned a lot of companies before I could find someone that was willing to come do it in the city, because of the size of our property. But we did end up finding a company with a drill that could come in and drill the two wells that we needed on our property.

Unfortunately, that drill has left the province in the last year, and I don't know of any companies that would be willing to come and drill in the city now.

**Madam Chairperson:** We have 10 seconds left on our question and answer time.

Mr. Altemeyer, if you can make it brief.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I can do that.

As an educator, how do we reach the people who don't know about the crisis that we're facing? At—is it government's job? Everyone's job? How—as—you're an educator. How can we support the work that you do? What do we need to do more of?

**Mr. Walker:** I would like to see a lot more top-down information coming from the government mandating education in classrooms. A lot of my colleagues aren't very aware of climate change. The colleagues I work with directly are—because they see me coming into the school, in January, on my bike and frequently ask me why I do it. And, when I explain my motivation to them, they understand it.

But what I'm trying to do in our school division is I've been reaching out to superintendents and colleagues, and we've been forming our own groups of climate leaders so that we can educate our colleagues. So, in the last couple of years, we've been putting on professional development for teachers, so they can come out and find out what the problem is and what the solutions are. But it's not happening fast enough, so I really do feel like it would be something that I'd like to see coming from the Department of Education.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for questions has now expired, but thank you for your presentation.

I will now call upon Dr. Barry Prentice, private citizen.

Dr. Prentice, do you have any written materials for distribution?

**Mr. Barry Prentice (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Prentice:** In the interest of time, I'm going to confine my comments to only the economics of this issue, and I'll leave the other sides apart, which I know you're well 'bersed' on.

\* (19:10)

My first comment is that from a 'provincial' strategy point of view, Manitoba has a lot to gain from having a very high fee on carbon emissions and asking for this to be done nationally. Obviously, it has to be done nationally because if one province does not, then they have an advantage as a free rider and firms might locate there to make investment.

But, in our particular case, and there is a typo, by the way, in the first line. It should read: the largest per capita producer, but I think we're the largest per capital producer as well with the cost of our dams and transmission lines and we've invested a lot in the production of green energy.

Having that green energy as our resource, it's in our interest to maximize their benefit for having that, and it's all about relative costs.

So, as a result, if other places are imposed, are paying carbon taxes, and our industries have less of that because they have access to green energy, we're a more attractive place to invest and to grow.

So I would say that from Manitoba's perspective, where I live here, I would say maximize a national carbon tax and get on with it because we have a lot to gain from that provincially.

The second point I'd like to raise is economic efficiency, and we know the Nobel Prize winners who endorse the notion of charging carbon directly. It's always best to charge directly, and there's two types of pollution, or carbon emissions, if you wish. There's what they call point source and non-point source. The big emitters are the point source, so you could identify there's a coal-fired thermal plant letting go a lot of carbon. You can attack that one or you can attack a fertilizer plant or whatever.

The non-point source are the tailpipes of thousands of vehicles, and they're very hard to initially to actually cause to recognize the pollution that they're making. That's why a charging for the actual consumption of the carbon makes sense. It's the most efficient. It's the easiest and least expensive way of administering a charge that applies to everybody and most fairly.

I'd like to point out the notion of the economics of a nudge. This is a growing literature on this idea, that you can get people to change their behaviour with a very small nudge in the right direction. You don't have to hit them with a sledge hammer to get their attention. You only have to have a small nudge, and in terms of the pricing for the consumption of carbon or non-carbon fuels, a nudge is all you need. It's relative prices that matter, not absolute prices, so if there's incentives for people to make a switch from one use of energy to another, then that small nudge will cause them to do that and then it starts to feed upon itself. And, of course, it really comes down to altering behaviour, purchases and consumption.

The Manitoba solution: Letting the federal government impose a carbon fee upon us, and, again, maybe the government will be successful in defeating that. I hope not. I think it's something that's really necessary, but it's also not in our interest. Having the federal government collect a tax and then just hand it back to consumers without making any effort to try and reduce the causes of carbon emissions and/or take opportunities from there seems like a lost opportunity for Manitoba.

So I would highly recommend Manitoba to take advantage of this, collect the tax and then direct it to where we can actually reduce our carbon emissions for our future efficiency because there will be a competition worldwide in this matter. It's only just a function of time.

So, again, I would encourage the Province to stick with its previous plan and to actually have our own carbon emissions' fees, collect the money and spend it as we see fit to spend it.

Obviously, you've heard before, climate change is real. This is a big problem. It's a real problem. And you don't have to look very far. I've been studying the ice roads in Manitoba for now some 20 years, and what I've observed is that they're getting shorter all the time, even notwithstanding the efforts of the Province, and good efforts in many cases, to put in wooden bridges over rivers to try and move off the lakes onto the land. But, notwithstanding that, we're still seeing problems, and the problem is not the opening and start date or the closing date; it's that week of warm weather in between that knocks out the road and the time to get the road back in, and it's getting worse. And I don't think it's ever going to get better again.

So there's a cost to Manitoba to allowing that to happen, both a social cost, but also there's a cost

that's going to be there in terms of trying to deal with not having a road, having to fly everything in to those locations, so everyone will be worse off if we don't take action sooner rather than later.

Finally, I'd like to close on one of the opportunities, I think, we have in Manitoba that I haven't heard discussed very much publicly, and that's the notion of a hydrogen economy. We're moving towards electric power; we're moving towards hydrogen and hydrogen fuel cells. This is no longer a technology in its infancy. This is a technology that's now well developed, and we're seeing it in many places.

Most new warehouses being built have hydrogen fuel cell forklift trucks. We're seeing great advances in this and in many places: China with hydrogen-powered buses; Europe has a hydrogen-powered train. I'm not saying we have to go that extreme, but what I am saying is there's a growing demand for hydrogen, and we have in Manitoba excess electrical power, and we have especially an excess of electrical power in the evening and nights which could be used to produce more hydrogen.

I would recommend that the fee we charge for the emissions of carbon be used to try and develop this hydrogen economy which would then give us a double benefit.

And with that, I will stop at this point.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for our presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you, Dr. Prentice, for coming down here tonight, and you've raised some great ideas and some new technologies that will certainly help all of us reduce our carbon footprint and transition to a low-carbon future.

And I'm reminded of words that His Right Honourable Edward Schreyer had said to me when we were on a panel not too long ago discussing some of these very topics. And he said, I've been around long enough to see engineers have the great ability to come up with solutions to the problems that we're facing and that we have faced in the past and that we're facing today. And between all the engineers and the geoscientists and the scientists that we have, we certainly do have reason to be optimistic that there is, you know, solutions to the challenges that we're facing.

So thank you for coming here tonight and for reminding us of some of those opportunities ahead of us.

**Mr. Prentice:** Thank you very much. Again, there are many opportunities. One of my colleagues said going into this last recession that this is not like recessions of the Great Depression. This is more like the recession of the 1890s, which we all remember very well, I'm sure.

And I said, what are you talking about? And he said, well, going into the 1890s, it was horses and wagons and steam engines; coming out of that recession with electrical power and chemistry and internal combustion engines. And a lot of technology's changed because the economics changed at that time and a lot of technology came together.

I think, and he said, and I agree with him, that coming out of this past recession, we have many opportunities ahead of us that we didn't have: solar power and wind turbines and electric cars and hydrogen fuel cell technology, and many other things. Maybe I'd even say airships, if I could be permitted to be so bold. I think there are a lot of technologies and a lot of hope and opportunity for us, and we do have the engineering talent.

It's not a matter of the lack of talent or lack of ideas; typically, it's the lack of investment and risk-taking to do things that are new. And that's where something like the carbon fee and the collection of a fund like that is available to make a difference, because most businesses aren't going to take a lot of risk; they can't afford to. But the public, collectively, we can take a risk on ideas and try new things that are new and see if they work. And if they don't work, well, all right, we lost some of that fee but at least we found out and—but not doing anything, that's a bigger crime, if you wish, in my books.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thank you, Dr. Prentice, for giving your time and expertise. I'm sorry I had to step out to talk to a previous presenter, but I've scanned your very nice, compact summary here.

One of the difficult parts it seems for the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has been the concept of the nudge, as you put it, that increases each year. In my reading of, say, the BC example, there was a gradually increasing nudge in the price of carbon and there was a corresponding drop in emissions. And then when the nudge stopped and held steady, well, lo and behold, behaviours stopped changing.

Do you have any advice for me or further comments on that? Or am I reading that situation correctly that it would make sense that, as the price of a type of pollution increases, that people will continue to take action to avoid those costs as the economic theory goes?

\* (19:20)

**Mr. Prentice:** I think the notion is it's all about expectations. And so, if you expect that prices are going to keep rising in the future and you can factor that in—should I buy electric car? Should I buy a gas car? Well, you know, then you say, yes, if they're going to keep rising, I think I'm going to buy that electric car and save myself money in the long run. So, absolutely, you have to have the expectation there.

What is the appropriate level for this? I have no idea, and I don't think anybody does. I mean, if we wanted to really get serious about this, it'd be a very high price, but I'm not about to kill the economy and nobody else should be either. We have to be careful about what we do, and measured steps are the way to do it. And, again, if it's a small nudge, it's not going to hurt the economy very much, and we will adjust.

Don't forget, we're not just going sit still. We're going make the changes, so I know there's great concerns in the farm community, and I would sincerely accept that. I have a farm background and an education in that area. I know farmers can't pass their costs on, but will farmers ever adopt an electrically powered tractor or a hydrogen fuel cell tractor as long as diesel's cheap and it's always there?

And I would say, well, no. Why would they? Why would they make that change? There's no incentive for them to do so. But, if there's assistance or help or there's a nudge in that direction, then gradually, over time, when things wear out, they replace it with something that's going to be for the long term. So, yes.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for questions and answers has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Shirley Thompson, private citizen. Shirley Thompson will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Colleen Shipp, private citizen. Colleen Shipp will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Solana Pratt, private citizen.

Solana Pratt will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Peter Chadwick, Rainbow Forest Gardens. Peter Chadwick will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Marianne Cerilli, private citizen. Marianne Cerilli will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Angela Reeves, private citizen. Angela Reeves will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

We will now be calling names for a second time. I will call on Jill Verwey, private citizen. Jill Verwey will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Everett Rudolph, private citizen. Everett Rudolph will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Zach Fleisher, private citizen.

Mr. Fleisher, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Mr. Zach Fleisher (Private Citizen):** I do. It's a supplement to part of the presentation. I apologize to the page that the last staple came off here.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Fleisher:** So how's everyone doing tonight? So good evening, everyone. My name is Zach Fleisher, and I apologize if I come across a bit weary. Last night I was working in the civic election campaign and was unable to make the first round of presentations, so if I'm slurring my words at all, you know folks around this table know what it's like to be elected. The next day is a bit groggy and then the real work starts.

So I am thankful that members of the opposition pushed the government to consider a second evening of consultations and presentations to the committee. Manitoba is unique in allowing presentations of this nature, and I think it's a unique factor that makes our province so special. I remember when I worked in Saskatchewan for the official opposition there and they were kind of aghast. They said, you mean, like, everyone just gets to speak and say their minds and interact with, you know, politicians and Cabinet ministers? And I said, yes, it's a foundation of our democracy.

So, regardless of where you stand on the political spectrum, you know what? We may agree or disagree at the end of the day, but, you know what? We're going to have a respectful dialogue and I look forward to continuing that fine tradition tonight.

So, for my day job, I am employed as a communications and research officer with the Amalgamated Transit Union 1505. I'm here presenting on behalf of Aleem Chaudhary. He's our president for the union. For those who may not be familiar, we represent 1,400 transit workers in Winnipeg and Brandon, Manitoba. So that's Winnipeg and Brandon transit. In addition, we also represent the maintenance workers within the Winnipeg plant.

Winnipeg Transit is unique in that we actually save millions of dollars every year by having the work done in-house as opposed to contracting out. That means that work gets done faster, and it means that we actually have one of the leading maintenance departments in North America.

I'd also like to indicate that I'm also a board member for Bike Winnipeg as well as a Winnipeg resident. I'm not quite as dedicated as Ian; I took the bus to work today. I'll probably walk home from here, but most days I do bike and some days, you know, when it's really cold out, I might take my car. But none of this really is particularly important, as titles don't even register compared to the challenges and threats that we see from climate change.

It goes beyond saying climate change is the biggest issue facing the world today. Recent studies show a catastrophic outcome if we continue business as usual. Pretty much, if we continue with business as usual, we won't have any business to continue with.

But you'll hear this over and over again, and I'm confident that departmental officials and previous presenters have let you know this, so I'm going to, you know, try and make a more impassioned case as to why I think this bill needs some major changes.

So, on behalf of our members, we support a price on pollution. We need carbon pricing and climate action to change citizen behaviour. We support a price on pollution, because we know that other volunteer initiatives have thus proven ineffective in decreasing our emission levels.

Years of missed targets have made this clear. I watch question period most days and, you know what, as a former staffer for the previous

government, you know what, I see both parties blaming the previous party in government for all the pitfalls within the province. You know what, when the world reaches uninhabitable levels, I'm sure we'll take solace in this.

We know that the way forward is to support a low-carbon or no-carbon economy and to prioritize investments in public transit. Electric or diesel, it is clear, that a bus or light-rail vehicle, subway, rickshaw, whatever you want to put on there, it's a more efficient way to get around than a single-occupant vehicle. And the government at all levels—provincial, civic, federal—should be investing in public transit as a viable way to meet our targets.

Government's record here is a bit puzzling. In the budget last year, they wrote off the 50-50 funding arrangement between Manitoba and our cities that affected transit in Winnipeg and Brandon. Now, with the closure of Greyhound in Thompson, Manitoba, that means that they're looking for a new public transit service provider. That means that the province, under the existing legislation, would not be able to come forward and help them.

This legislation was some of the most progressive in the country. It allowed cities and the province to invest in public transit, an important and vital public service.

In the 2016 election, the PC government defied Conservative logic at the time and quietly announced their price on carbon. This was a refreshing thing to see. I think that there was, you know, a lot of pressure from across the spectrum to say, you know what, it's just another tax; we're not going to do it.

Later, in 2017, as part of this climate plan that they are now debating, they announced 100 electric buses for Winnipeg Transit. I was looking for the answer, and I wanted to see if that was to replace existing buses or to add more buses, because, right now, we do not have enough buses or operators to meet the needs of a city of 500,000. We are currently at 750,000, and, as the newly re-elected mayor of Winnipeg likes to say, we're approaching a million.

So far, we have not delivered on this promise. In fact, as confirmed by media reports last week and initially reported by some citizens and some of our members, there are now less electric buses on the road than there were last year when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) made his promise.

We wanted, as a union, to put aside and help the government move forward on this file, and you

might be thinking to yourself, you know what, it might be a bit odd that—or the PC government might have a closed mind to ideas from a public sector union. We believe that if the government wanted to make a difference, that they would prioritize public transit, reverse the 50-50 funding, provide dedicated funding.

Who better to help them navigate this reality than those with the knowledge and expertise from those who help move Winnipeg on a daily basis?

We are ready to take a chance to help the government and to work together for our future. We reached out to the minister on several occasions to offer insights and supports, and we didn't hear back. Then we found out in the budget that the carbon tax, as presented, provided no money to transition to the green economy—no additional funds for transit, no additional dedicated funding for electrifying the fleet, even a bit of fare relief. You know, a targeted program of that nature would be helpful. But we didn't hear back.

\* (19:30)

So what we did was we researched our own case. We presented a model called pay as you save. We borrowed it from other—or, other areas as well, and we released it publicly. MLAs who are reading the supplement right now will see this is as an op-ed piece that we published in the Winnipeg Free Press.

Under this model, the Province would have loaned the City of Winnipeg the cost difference on the electric bus, making money after the fact based on operational savings and providing Manitoba Hydro—which, I would note, is in financial trouble and needs more revenue—with a solid revenue source. So, instead of the money that Transit spends leaving the province to pay for diesel gas, we could actually—we could fund it using locally produced electricity, and electricity that is fairly renewable at that.

After we went public with our plan, the minister called the proposal interesting and promised to review it. We haven't heard back yet to this point. And, you know what, I would like to, you know, say for the record that I'm not interested in the partisan bickering that's going to come out of this. And I want to make an offer to the government and to the opposition and to the second opposition that we want to be on your side. We want to work for the betterment of Manitobans. We want to work for local jobs, for local clean solutions and to get more people on the bus.

So we hope that the government will see the light on climate change and invest money to prioritize transit. We need to get people out of their cars and onto a cleaner way of transportation. Even if it's not electrified, transit is still a greener choice than single-occupant vehicles or even carpooling. So I'd ask MLAs here—and I apologize; I didn't think of the rural MLAs when I was thinking this. But, you know, I understand you stay in Winnipeg during the session. Do you ever take the bus? Why or why not? It's probably not efficient for you. If you have to go to a committee meeting or if you have to get out of the Legislature, you know what, you don't want to be waiting 30 minutes outside at that bus stop out there. I've been there. It's cold. It's not fun.

So, the reason that that is, is because current levels of investment are not sufficient to provide reliable, affordable and safe service, so why not make the investment and make a difference?

If the government is serious about fighting climate change, then they'll turn this bill around and ensure that public transit gets the resources it needs. Our future depends on it.

The solution here is pretty simple: take the bill back to the drawing board; bring in some dedicated provincial funding for municipal transit systems; allow them to grow their networks, creating good, local jobs in the operations and maintenance and bus manufacturing sectors. These are jobs that are well paying. That means that people who are trained in these sectors will spend money in the economy. The money gets recycled back in. That grows our economy.

The government is correct in stating that there's not a lot of low-hanging fruit when it comes to Manitoba's emissions profile. Essentially, transportation makes up a third of our emissions, so why not focus on this? It just makes sense.

While we've been on a bit of a bumpy road so far, I want to offer my union's support, insight and advice to the government, should they want to hear it. I'm happy to clear a schedule at a moment's notice to make a meeting possible.

As transit operators and workers, we know where to invest so that the Province can work with transit to invest smarter. We want to be part of the solution to clear-cleaner air, to create local jobs and to ensure a sustainable future. We think this is a fair deal, and I want to ask, is the government on board?

Thank you very much.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you very much, Mr. Fleisher, for coming down here this evening and for offering to work with us as we transition to a low-carbon future and, specifically, to get more people on the bus. And that is certainly a goal that we have in our government, and thank you for extending the offer to help, and I will take you up on that. Thank you.

**Mr. Fleisher:** I appreciate the comment from the minister. I would like to add, for the record—and one of the reasons I'm so exhausted right now is I spent a large portion of the last few months door knocking across south Winnipeg for a city council candidate. He got back in; I'm very proud of him. And I got to spend a lot of time in the St. Vital area and—as well as the Riel constituency on both sides of the previous and potentially future boundaries.

And one of the things I heard from people, and I also heard it from people in Sage Creek, is that they want better public transit. So this isn't a hard sell to people. And I think, you know what, this is a government that has, you know, for example, on the cannabis file, identified high driving as a major, major issue, so why not invest in transit? This is—this can work across a spectrum, and we want to be there to help you.

And, you know what, like, we're open. We want to work with the government, and we want to get this done.

**Madam Chairperson:** The honourable minister, on a follow-up.

**Ms. Squires:** Just a quick comment. I want to say congratulations to you and your candidate, and I look forward to working with my city council.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thank you, Zach, for what I think is actually quite a remarkable presentation. Your union, the people that you work for, the people that you represent deserve our thanks day in and day out. So please pass that along, on behalf of all of us here at the committee, and to Aleem, as well, a difficult job he has, you know, following your advice or changing it, as the case may be, but also still managing to put forward really positive suggestions and really kind offers to help when you're getting not a whole lot in return. And then, I mean, you're very diplomatic in your presentation. I commend you for that.

We have tried on various occasions to invite the government to also tone down the rhetoric, realize the severity of the climate crisis that we're in, and, you know, the 50-50 deal is gone, the electric buses are gone. There's no additional support on the horizon for any municipality, and yet you're here putting forward a really neat idea like PAYS.

You had to skim over it a little bit. Do you want to dive in, you know, for a government that is apparently very concerned about money? Talk about the return on investment, as Aleem identified in his article here. Like, share a little bit about the numbers of what we're actually talking about here and how that could benefit workers and transit users and the environment and the government as a whole. *[interjection]*

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Fleisher.

**Mr. Fleisher:** Oh, yes, sorry.

It's been a while since I've been at committee, so I apologize for my informalities here.

I think, you know what, in addition to the article that we passed to members of the committee here, Dr. Ryan Meili, in Saskatchewan, the Leader of the Opposition there, has put together a fairly comprehensive proposal, as well, to recycle the money that you save. So the basics of it are: you know, think about it as if you were heating your house. If the government came forward to you and you were, you know, spending \$500 a month—that's an arbitrary figure—and they came forward and said, you know we're going to install geothermal and it's going to cut your savings down, but we'll give you the loan up front and then you pay back through an increase on your electrical bill, or your heating bill, to cover the costs for government. They can even make a few extra bucks off of it, and you're still saving money.

You know what, we've seen this already. The model—I wish I could say, you know what, me, Zach Fleisher, I came up with this entire model; I didn't. But we applied it to the model here. It's already happening with Aki Energy. So, for example, people—residents of First Nations reserves, predominantly, poorly insulated housing with electric heating, when you transition them away from costly heating that escapes the housing that they have, it means that they have more money in their pockets to spend. Now, you know what, I'm not a fan of Reagan or Thatcher or any of the Conservative, kind of, thought leaders on this, but

this is actually a pretty good example of trickle-down economics, of putting more money in people's pockets and it actually having a positive effect.

So I think that this is something that we could look forward to. Within the article, you know what, we said, with the savings you have there, buy more buses, hire more operators, drop fares a few bucks. It's not too hard. The possibilities are endless. The only issue that you would run up into is where to spend the money, which is not a bad place to be when you're saying, well, you know, we have \$10 million that we've saved from operational review. Should we cut fares? Should we hire more drivers? Should we have more frequent service? You know what, if you're hearing about these things, it's not a bad thing.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for question and answer is expired.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Molly McCracken, private citizen.

Ms. McCracken, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Ms. Molly McCracken (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do. Also, Mark Hudson was scheduled to present from the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and was unable to attend, so I have his as well. I don't know if—I thought I'd ask to see if you could distribute it as well.

**Madam Chairperson:** Okay, we will have a staff member help you with that.

So you can go ahead with your presentation.

**Ms. McCracken:** I'm a fifth generation settler here in Manitoba. My family came here right after Treaty 1 was signed, and we got farmland near Neepawa and ran the lumber mill. My grandfather was one of the first insurance salesmen at Great-West Life—when they were called salesmen; they are now salespeople—and my mother, an historian and journalist. I'm a policy analyst.

\* (19:40)

And my husband and I have a one-and-a-half-year-old that I am not with right now so I could be here with you because I really care about our collective future here as Manitobans, and I really want the best for all of us into the future.

Climate change poses extreme risk for all of our families, communities and the province, and as our elected officials, you have a responsibility to act in the face of threats. The United Nations International Panel on Climate Change says we only have 12 years to change and avoid catastrophic impacts of climate change.

Here in Winnipeg, the Prairie Climate Centre, their climate atlas for Manitoba finds that we are in a trajectory for a high-carbon future. This will impact agriculture via more droughts. Hotter summers will result in more, larger and more intense forest fires. Manitoba will have floods in the spring and then droughts in the summer.

These will have huge economic costs to the Province, the business sector and inhuman suffering. This is a catastrophe in the making unless we make drastic changes now.

I have several points.

My first is we must work back from our goal. In 2016 in Paris, Canada committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 30 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030. Many scientists were critical of the Paris commitments not going far enough.

The United Nations itself audited the Paris Agreement and said that it would only limit rising Earth's temperatures to 3°C warmer by 2100, relative to pre-industrial levels. So even what was agreed to in Paris does not go far enough, but it's what we have to work back from.

This past August, Harvey Stevens, a well-respected former civil servant and quantitative researcher released An Analysis of Manitoba's Proposed Plan to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions as Contained in the Manitoba Climate and Green Plan, published by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Manitoba.

Stevens writes that the Paris commitment to Manitoba means that by 2030, the greenhouse gas emissions for that year have to be 14,158 kilotons. They were 20,936 in 2016. They must be reduced substantially, but the Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan falls short of these goals, and I will highlight three ways.

It does not address the fixed goal of greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 but instead uses cumulative reductions over time. It sets no cumulative reduction target. This is not the standard method of reporting.

All countries report to the United Nations using total annual emissions.

It sets out five cumulative pathways. The most aggressive falls short of the needed 2030 goal by 1,400 kilotons or 1.4 million tons. The social cost of carbon is estimated at between \$50 and \$200 per ton, depending on what assumptions are made, and these are the social costs if we look at the full cost accounting of carbon on agriculture, forests, water availability and pests. So this means that the shortfall could cost Manitoba and Canada \$70 million to \$280 million.

And the carbon accounting system in the act described in sections 5, 6 and 7 is not clear on how it will measure how Manitoba will be Canada's cleanest, greenest and most climate-resilient province.

Stevens used a FIPPA to receive the two reports the government used to create the climate plan. The EC-PRO report commissioned finds—it compares the current federal plan of \$10 a ton a year, increasing to 2022 with no further increases, to one that increases continuously up to \$130 a ton.

And this EC-PRO number finds that the price on carbon would have to continue an increase—\$6.78 a ton, to prevent an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, which is our goal here: to prevent greenhouse gas emissions.

And Stevens found that the reports commissioned by the Province said that a carbon tax is needed and it must be high enough to reduce emissions. But instead, this government is ignoring these reports and backed out of the provincial carbon tax.

Now that the federal backstop will apply to Manitoba, the provincial government should do nothing more to fight this.

Number 2: Climate action must be fair. The Ecofiscal Commission's report Provincial Carbon Pricing and Household Fairness identifies that a price on carbon affects household budgets differently as it increases the prices of emission-'intentional' goods and services, which represent a larger share of expenditures for lower income households: things like food, gas, home-heating.

So Ecofiscal estimates the cost of a \$30 carbon tax on a household with an income below \$50,000 a year is \$288 a year. The federal climate action plan incentive will pay a family of—\$685 a year when the



carbon tax rises to this \$30 a ton in 2021. It is sufficient to cover the costs for low-income households.

The price on carbon is like the stick, and it must be matched with a carrot, which is help for families to get off carbon. And these are items to reduce carbon costs by supporting better, more affordable public transit—as we just heard—affordable local food and home energy retrofits.

Number 3: the Climate and Green Plan cannot be done in isolation of other government policy. This act replaces the sustainable develop act, and important provisions will be lost and should be reinstated. For example, regulatory codes and standards for green buildings and green vehicles and principles and guidelines for sustainable development. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals to 2030 are widely used. For example, the United Way Winnipeg and Economic Development Winnipeg are using the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, and I suggest the Province should do the same.

Currently, the plan ignores government's actions that will increase greenhouse gas emissions. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Eichler), for example, wants to increase the number of cattle from 400,000 to 750,000. This will increase greenhouse gas emissions, according to Harvey Stevens' calculations, by 789 kilotons a year, for a social cost of carbon of between 39 and 157 million. The hog industry is calling for 1.2 million more hogs over the next five to 10 years. This will add an additional 251 kilotons a year, for a social cost of carbon of 12.5 to 50.2 million.

There's nothing in the plan to address new emitters. The cumulative emission reduction metric described in 7(2) only considers measures that lead to a reduction in emissions, not those that lead to an increase in emissions, such as the increase of cattle or hogs. Annual emissions by sector and subsector should be included in the reporting. And moreover, there are currently no details in the Climate and Green Plan on implementation. Recent government actions undermine the goals. For example, ending the 50-50 cost-sharing agreement with the City of Winnipeg on transit, which is a loss of \$5 million last year. And transit ridership is lower today than it was 20 years ago. Transportation is the largest greenhouse gas emitter in Manitoba, and we need to improve public transit to get people out of their cars across the province.

Earlier this month, William Nordhaus and Paul Romer won the Nobel Prize in economics for their work studying the consequences of climate policies, such as carbon taxes. Their key recommendation is that governments, corporations and households should have to pay a rising price on carbon emissions. This is what's called—if you ever studied economics—internalizing the externalities of the cost of carbon to all of us.

British Columbia has had a carbon tax since 2008. The tax covers most types of carbon—of fossil fuels. And according to Professor Stewart Elgie of the University of Ottawa and Richard Lipsey of Simon Fraser University, since it came in, BC's total use of fuels has dropped by 16.1 per cent. By contrast, in the rest of Canada, fuel use went up by 3 per cent. BC's dramatic drop since the tax marks a big change from the previous eight years when fuel use was actually rising. Also, notably, BC's GDP outperformed the rest of Canada since the carbon tax has begun, something that a slow-growth province like Manitoba should pay attention to.

And No. 4, action is an insurance policy on the future. As the granddaughter of an insurance salesperson, the insurance sector warned of the effects of climate change in—early as 1973 and continues evolving its business model, including increasing rates to adapt to changes. The Fort McMurray fire is 'attributed' to climate change, and the cost of—to the insurance industry was between 5 and 9 billion dollars, which is now passed on to property owners and businesses in their new insurance.

If the anti-tax business groups think that any government can prepare for climate change, including the disproportionate impact it will have on the poor, creating green infrastructure, all without somehow increasing revenues, it needs to get a reality check from those in the insurance sector who increase in their revenue as they understand the world we find ourselves in. And yet this provincial government is bent on placating certain business interests and cutting taxes and bringing down the deficit all at the same time.

This austerity at a time of climate crisis is irresponsible and will create an undue burden on our future generations. The Province could do a number of things to bring in new revenue. It could keep the PST at 8 per cent and direct money to make life affordable in a post-carbon Manitoba. It could

introduce mobility pricing so cars pay the full cost of using roads—

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. McCracken, the time for your presentation has now ended.

Before we move on to questions and answers, I just want to notify you that we did receive Mr. Hudson's submission yesterday, so it is included with the presentations.

Thank you for your presentation, and do members of our committee have questions for our presenter?

\* (19:50)

**Ms. Squires:** I just want to thank you for coming down here this evening and forgoing that precious time with your one-and-a-half-year-old to express your opinions. And I also thank you for your presentation here that we can read again and much appreciated.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thanks very much, Molly. Really good stuff, as always, and I'm sure educational for any member of the committee who isn't yet subscribed to receive the very important updates that CCPA sends around. I know I always learn lots from them. I would encourage others to do so; there's no cost.

And, you know, we learned some really important things in the last 10 minutes, things like the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) been using this report all along, claiming that, you know, the plan, which now doesn't really exist in Manitoba, would be better than the federal one, but it would require for the price of carbon. And that very same report, if I'm not mistaken, from what you said, the price of carbon has to go up by almost \$7 a ton just to stop emissions from increasing. He's left that part out. That's never reached the light of day.

You've also done an excellent job of pointing out that we have to keep on eye on increases in our emissions, and not just talking about any place where there might be a reduction, and agriculture also a very big emitter, et cetera, et cetera. I mean, you've laid out the argument very clearly. And I think of my three-year-old at home in particular, my 14-year-olds, and you've got the one-a-half-year-old.

What would you like to see this committee do tonight? Is this bill good enough? Is it, you know, an appropriate start on something or does it need just a radical overhaul before it's going to do anything even

close to what the science and what you are telling us needs to happen?

**Ms. McCracken:** Thank you.

Well, it's a rapidly changing area, as we've seen, and so I think it would be wise to take a small pause. It's unfortunate I know, the committee hearings are right before you consider voting on the bill, but I really think this is a non-partisan issue. This an issue of all of our collective futures here in Manitoba and we really need to have something that addresses all of our concerns, in terms of measuring impact and working back from our goal, and a whole of government approach. So I would hope that you could reconsider the act.

I also think the sustainable development goals that the UN uses, I mean, I think this is something that perhaps has been missed by the public here, that The Sustainable Development Act is being replaced here and that we really need to use those goals in our work and to really consider how all of government will—we need all rows in our boat rowing together. And so I—that's—you know, I know you're in a tough spot but that's what I would suggest.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Just a quick follow-up: I mentioned this earlier in the evening; I think you and others may have come in later on. I'll be introducing an amendment later on tonight, picking up on your theme of starting with your goal that would require current and all future governments in Manitoba to implement a climate action plan that is directly linked to what the scientists at the United Nations are calling for the world to do. So in this most recent instance, should this amendment pass, Manitoba would be committed to a 45 per cent reduction minimum of 2010 levels by 2030.

So I would ask you, if you were one of the MLAs sitting around the table here tonight or as a citizen of Manitoba now, would you be in favour of the initiative?

**Ms. McCracken:** Yes, definitely. I think we have to work back from our goal. If you're going to have a goal, you need to uphold that, and it's very, very important here in Manitoba because the risks that we face, and we also have to do our part as global citizens.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for questions has now ended.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon Jane McDonald, International Institute for Sustainable Development. Jane McDonald will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Ben Hanlon-Dearman, private citizen. Ben Hanlon-Dearman will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Karlo Aguilar, private citizen. Karlo Aguilar will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Jazmin Alfaro.

Ms. Alfaro, do you have anything—any written material for distribution?

**Ms. Jazmin Alfaro (Private Citizen):** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Alfaro:** I would like to sit, if that's okay. I'm not feeling very well. I prefer not to stand.

**Madam Chairperson:** Go ahead, Ms. Alfaro.

**Ms. Alfaro:** Thank you. My name is Jazmin Alfaro. I live in Fort Garry electoral division, in Osborne Village, just over the river. I want to thank the standing committee for your time today to listen to the voices of the public.

This is the first time I've had the opportunity to speak here, and I really appreciate the positive and welcoming attitude of everyone, from Julie at the Clerk's office to Dave at the back table and all of your support staff. Thank you. This is an enjoyable experience.

The role you play for Manitobans cannot be understated, and it's truly valuable to our communities to have a voice. I also want to acknowledge the other citizens who have had the courage to speak to you today, before me and after me. Miigwech, ekosani, thank you, merci.

And I'm here to share with you today who I am and where it is that I come from and my opinions on why removing carbon tax from Bill 16 is bad for us.

I'm an immigrant. I came to Canada, as a child, with my mother and older brother. My family was, and is, very fortunate to have had the opportunity to shelter ourselves from civil war, economic unrest, corruption, brutal violence, terrorization from the state.

Leaving El Salvador and becoming a citizen of Canada has been a very confusing experience for me. My brother and mother have taken the responsibility

to survive so that I can self-actualize, and I have had the immense opportunity to familiarize myself with our lands and our connections internationally.

I am fortunate to be educated, and I have been directly active in the environmental realm for 12 years as a community organizer, activist, advocate, researcher and messenger.

My name given to me by one of my elders is Pluma Voladora, and it means flying feather. My environmental science and biology degrees focus on policy and ecology, respectively, with a focus on water resources and social implications. This led me to work directly with indigenous peoples who want to share their voices.

I've had the honour to work in a very diverse environment, in non-for-profit and research at the federal level, provincial level. I've had the honour to work on Clean Environment Commission. I've had the honour to work on national actions with, and alongside, Indigenous leaders and allies at the United Nations, at the Organization of the American States.

I've had an extremely privileged bird's-eye view of what's happening in the world, and it's all focused on climate change and climate action.

Merging my environmental research experience, the relationships I have with my communities, it's undeniable how important it is for us to measure our impact. By removing the carbon tax, we are removing measures that focus on where our success is and where our success is not.

I worry that we will fall in line to rhetoric, that we are siding with current, you know, needs for the government for re-election. I really worry that we are not focusing on our moral and legal obligations to the world.

All of the work I do is directly connected to climate change. And all of the work I do—we need legal action.

\* (20:00)

I do apologize. I'm not feeling very well today, and I'm a little nervous. So I might be a little—places, here. But, basically, there are opportunities. There's a lot of opportunities for us to take action on climate change. You know, several people here have talked about the science. Several people have talked about individual activities that we do, right? We can cycle, we can eat vegan, we can do a lot of things. And I think people have presented—very valid places where we can go. I really don't think you need to hear more

from the public. I think we are forgetting our responsibilities. We are party to United Nations convention on climate change. We have also signed the rights of the child, which supports a healthy life for children and their futures.

Without a measure, where can we go? It is rhetoric. We are positioning people in scenarios that I think honestly, are beyond our capacities. I shouldn't be here presenting to you today. I'm doing my master's. I volunteer for a variety of networks and communities, including Honduras right now, where over 7,000 people are leaving in mass exodus. And we forget these are asylum seekers. They are affected by the policies that we have and that we do in the world. And a lot of this is climate change.

This is highly complicated because there is no legal framework release that—for environmental refugees. You know, these people are leaving as a result by our actions. If—we are not taking action on climate change.

If we look even further to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals of 2030, we are still not meeting our obligations to the world on this. You know, we've been also talking about how the IPCC report is a softer version of the actual science.

Where are the indigenous peoples? I'm one of the only people of colour here and this greatly upsets me.

You know, it's—we have so many articles of responsibility. Climate change is happening. We do need measures. I do apologize for being a little bit all over the place. I have been involved in this work for so long, so my mind takes several avenues. But, you know, we have ILO 169 recognizing the autonomy of indigenous and tribal people, and it identifies their governments and governance institutions. Where are they at the table? I do not see any indigenous involvement within the plan that we have right now.

I stated before, the rights of the child, article 6: The child's right to survival and development claims the right for children to realize their fullest potential.

We are going to see every year an increase of migrants around the world—asylum seekers. You know, the correct term is asylum seekers. The majority of people are not going to leave their lands because they want to; they're leaving their lands because they have to. You know, we can look back at the research and look at the push and pull of why people leave their lands, but, fundamentally climate is involved within all of this, right? I did speak to a—

Honduras. Honduras is seeing higher dry events, more intense rains, unpredictable weather. People cannot survive. Again, we have the right to them and responsibility to them.

If we're looking at the convention on climate change, you know, we also need to speak to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. We need to—like, these are universal minimum standards. And, if we are looking for—to meet these standards for survival, dignity, well-being and rights of indigenous peoples, we do need to be much more stringent with our impact in the environment.

You know, we are an Annex 1 country of the United Nations. This is directly related to our agreement that we are going to co-operate and support climate change initiatives and activities. We should not just be funding these programs in developing nations; we should be investing that within ourselves. And there are several models of community economic development in which we can do more progressive work.

As you know, someone earlier mentioned how the government is risk-adverse in many places. We need to invest more in our communities. It's clear that there is a lot going on, a lot that we can invest in. And carbon pricing should not be a deterrent. You know, many other people mentioned it's an opportunity for us, within agriculture and in business.

And also, you know—again, one of the only people of colour here. In Winnipeg, we have—I found a report from 2011 from canadaimmigrants.com that collected data from Statistics Canada. Unfortunately, it was a 2011 copy. One in five; 20 per cent of Winnipeg's population are immigrants. Where are they?

You know in that—the day that this meeting was originally scheduled, a filibuster was held. We all went home. We had no idea what was going on. You know, yesterday, I was here again. Things proceeded, unfortunately, too long. I had to leave.

And today, I'm finally speaking, and I'm happy for that, but again, disappointed that I am one of the only people of colour. I—you know, I may be one of the only people coming from an indigenous perspective, working with indigenous peoples—

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Alfaro, the time for your presentation has now come to an end, so we are going to move on to question and answer time.

And do any of the members of the committee have questions for our presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** First of all, I want to say I'm very sorry to hear that you're feeling unwell and I hope that you get better soon. And I also want to thank you for coming here to this room; not once, not twice but three times. And so I really commend your perseverance for coming here to make sure that your voice is heard.

And you had a very compelling presentation, very well-thought-out and very well articulated. So, thank you for coming down here to let us hear your views.

**Ms. Alfaro:** Thank you.

**Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade):** Ms. Alfaro, I listened with great interest on your education, your background. My department, Growth, Enterprise and Trade, came across a very interesting proposal today about setting up greenhouses in remote First Nations in the North.

I just—I'm out headhunting. If you're interested in this, I think with your background and your education, there's tremendous opportunity to help improve the lives of some of our remote northern communities. So I just encourage you to keep in touch, and thank you for coming out tonight.

**Ms. Alfaro:** Thank you very much. Actually, my experience is in community-based participatory action research focused on how food is used as a tool for cultural resilience. I do that work connected—it is partly a focus for my thesis as well; you know, indigenous innovations and what it is that we can do to support communities.

Again, I would go back to the fact that the government relies on contractors who have money to start these projects when the resources are already there within the communities. You know, to add to greenhouses, there's also the potential for biofuel.

Indigenous peoples are not necessarily part of the conversation right now in terms of what we can do, where communities can provide economic opportunities for themselves, fuel their own spaces and then sell that, right? So, suddenly, indigenous peoples are the owners and leaders of industry that is traditionally put to contractors, which, again, oil, right?

So there's a lot of innovative things that we can do, so thank you for sharing that.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thank you very much for managing to conquer multiple barriers to be here; none of which I acknowledge have—well, I'm not feeling a hundred per cent today either, but that's the smallest of the barriers that you've had to face, and yet you're here to bring a really powerful presentation.

Of all of the people who have presented, there's been very few who have felt that the government's move here has been a good one. And universally, younger folks are bringing the clearest message of all, and yours has been an absolute gem of an addition to that.

I really appreciate as well, the global perspective. You feel what other people are feeling and going through. That is what's going to get us through this, more than anything else. We need more of that, not less. So whatever barriers you run into, stick with that. It's our only choice.

\* (20:10)

It seemed to me like you had a few other points you were hoping to make. Maybe with the rest of question time with the committee's permission, if there were some other things you wanted to share with us, we could give you that chance to do it.

**Ms. Alfaro:** Thank you for sharing your words. You know, I think if there's anything else that I could really stress to this is I have not heard. You know, a few of us have been asked, you know, what are our recommendations to nudge the government in a better direction. Migration, you know, asylum seekers, refugees, I think that that is a realm that we don't fully understand. It's not really discussed, but it's a hundred per cent going to be a factor in terms of what this province is going to go through, what Canada is going to go through, and when you think about our legal implications that are going to come up, right, our responsibilities that we have signed to, we need to get more efficient with how it is that we are documenting our actions and measuring our successes with reiterative evaluation that has more community involved, so I would also add to that.

Thank you. I will—I'll allow the rest of the time for other questions if anybody has.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for questions has now ended. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Derek Koop, private citizen. Derek Koop will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Gloria Taylor, private citizen.

Ms. Taylor, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Ms. Gloria Taylor (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Taylor:** Thank you. My name is Gloria Taylor. I'm a long-time resident of Manitoba who also happens to be the CEO for Winnipeg South Centre, Jim Carr's riding, for Green Party Canada. However, I will be speaking on my own behalf this evening, and I thank the members of the committee for allowing me this opportunity to appear before you.

We all know that the federal government's announcement on Tuesday to force its own carbon pricing measures on our province has changed the initial plans of the Manitoba government to enact its own strategies under the made-in-Manitoba plan. Nevertheless, we do now have a carbon pricing strategy and there is a plan in place even if it is not the government's—the Manitoba government's plan.

And at this time I would ask that the Manitoba government not go forward with any legal steps to fight the federal government on its plans at this point, but to co-operate in order to let the federal carbon pricing strategies go through.

The IPCC report made it clear that time is very important for all of this, for all of us, and this could help to ensure that carbon measures are put in place relatively quickly, and I feel that Manitoba should not be spending citizens' money on any costly legal ventures.

Further, neither carbon pricing plan has the kind of numbers that could really make a difference to the emissions of greenhouse gases in Manitoba, which rose by more than 14 per cent from the years 1990 to 2013. I don't have the figures from 2014 to 2016 for Manitoba emissions, but I would bet that they continued—have continued to increase.

I would like Manitoba to enact Bill 16 and build on the document which is essentially a good blueprint of worthy intentions to do a sector-by-sector greening of our economy. It's written in general terms, but the Province could build on this document, which is a good fundamental framework, through a very intensive sector-by-sector approach to greening the economy. And there are so many initiatives that could fall under such actions, and there are too many to mention here. But I would like to elaborate on some of my favourites.

One which would be fairly controversial is for the Manitoba government not to automatically support projects like pipelines, and the one that would come to mind automatically would be the Enbridge line 3 project which would go through southern—the western part of our province. They are targeted, the pipeline, because it would be a replacement, but a larger pipeline would result in arguably larger emissions, because the replacement pipeline is larger. And, of course, this does fall—pipelines do fall under federal jurisdiction. But I understand there are panels or meetings between the Manitoba and the federal government on projects such as this, and Manitoba certainly can speak to what is best for Manitoba, even on these major projects.

Enbridge, some time ago, announced that there would be 80 new pumps—pumping stations built in connection with this project, and at this time, it doesn't appear to be clear whether one of those new pumping stations will be in Manitoba, but if so, pumping stations do take energy to operate, and we should be well aware whether it would be fossil fuel energy that is used in the pumping station or whether it would be Manitoba Hydro energy.

Either way, I would submit that neither is a good use of our energy, and our Manitoba should—government should discourage projects that increase Manitoba emissions while encouraging more tar sands activity in another province, and at the very least, make comparisons with green alternatives for our province.

Another point could be to support and just develop the renewable infrastructure and renewable energy sources and the jobs that renewables would generate, and there are many ways that can be done, many of them fiscal. Support the installation of the infrastructure that would support electric vehicles, and we are talking about charging stations, or charging points, as they're called. And we know, of course, there's been a lot of publicity that the electric vehicles are not readily available. I'm not sure why. But the Manitoba government could ensure that charging stations be built or incentivize the building of the charging stations throughout the province, along with other measures to ensure that the hydroelectric power is available to them.

Yesterday we heard by the Manitoba Automobile Association a variety of ideas that were clearly stated, and they are very, very good ideas that I would support. There are other ideas,

like developers are building a number of new condominiums all throughout the province at this time, and I understand that there's no requirement for them to build in the charging stations. Although I understand that there are requirements for commercial developers of new government buildings to build to LEED, or green, energy standards.

We could support measures to mitigate the effects of climate change on agriculture. And these are just a few of great many number of initiatives that can be taken to build what is fundamentally a very good plan and a very good framework. It's just a starting point. It doesn't speak to actions that can be done, but still, it could constitute a good foundation.

I think there is a great need for more communication about climate change, not necessarily to people here who are savvy enough to look up the sources that are available now on the Internet, but I would like to see a little more of Manitoba government get involved in education initiatives to speak to the population generally.

\* (20:20)

Communication could consist of what initiatives are really being taken by the Manitoba government to reduce emissions based on whatever actions the government is taking. It could—that kind of communication could be personalized so we could understand that if we take a plane from Winnipeg to Churchill, which is a wonderful destination, what is our footprint? And just have an easy source where people can look up some facts and figures without wading through the longer documents. And, of course, this information is available, but I would just like it in very accessible format in various ways.

In Manitoba, we do need clearly stated emission goals and reporting mechanisms, and that was one aspect that I liked very much about the made-in-Manitoba plan, because there is a requirement to report to the citizens of Manitoba.

And other things can be done just to educate people, such as a day of meetings. And every party can get involved with this—just to talk to people in our communities about climate change and government initiatives and party initiatives, because we've seen, by all the presenters here, that people are very interested in talking and being heard and taking part, and, of course, this is an urgent matter. People have never had a more urgent call to make far-reaching changes than we do now, and we have

to rise to the changes now, unless we live—leave an unlivable world to our children.

I would like to see the government not oppose the federal government's plan for the carbon pricing structures or initiatives and just go one step further to support Bill 16 and to—

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Taylor, the time for presentation has now ended.

So I'll move on to questions.

Are there any questions from our committee members for our presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you very much, Ms. Taylor, for coming down here and expressing your views and sharing your presentation with us, and I really appreciate hearing from all citizens. That's how democracy works. And so, again, I just can't thank you enough for your advocacy work on this file, and I know you've had—you have an influential opinion that you've shared on many other occasions, and I thank you for that.

**Ms. Taylor:** Yes, thank you for meeting with me. I appreciate it.

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** Thank you for coming and presenting for us tonight. You've certainly put some thought into what you've presented. You've made a couple of suggestions about education. Have you got some other suggested actions that a government could take?

You've said that the bill itself is a good start. It kind of is full of lofty ideals, type of thing, but what kinds of things can you suggest to the government that could be the actual action plan or the action steps that should be in there?

**Ms. Taylor:** Okay, that answer is so comprehensive, like, I could stand here all night and give suggestions. But it entails to—a sector-by-sector look and a plan. But I think those—that look should include people when the sectors are examined. I just offered a few suggestions here, but there are many. Sorry, can you state your question again? What ideas?

**Mr. Lindsey:** Just a quick snapshot of some suggestions that you could give the government to make their planning document real and something that will make a difference.

**Floor Comment:** Well, there could—the document could be tightened up—

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Taylor.

**Ms. Taylor:** There certainly could be amendments for ideas and action, because it's a nice document of intentions right now or a plan for a plan. I don't know whether that really is the way to go. If there's an opportunity just to build on this plan later, I'm not sure whether there is a need to enshrine one particular action after another, because I think it is important to move ahead. I think time is important, and we can't spend our time fiddling while BC burns. So we should move ahead if it is possible to build on the plan.

Certainly, some amendments can be helpful, and I think Mr. Altemeyer has one amendment in mind.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

Before I recognize the next presenter, we received a written submission from Robin Bryan, and staff is distributing copies. Does the committee agree to have this document appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

He appears as No. 25 on your presenters list, and you can remove his name from our list.

I will now call on David Taylor, Concerned Citizens of Manitoba. David Taylor will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Matthew Lawrence, private citizen. Mr. Lawrence, do you have any written material for—

**Mr. Matthew Lawrence (Private Citizen):** I don't.

**Madam Chairperson:** Okay, please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Lawrence:** Okay. Yes. I don't think I'm going to take up the whole 10 minutes. I just came to—and I think it's going to be more kind of, you know, 30,000 feet kind of statements, not really drilling down and telling you about, you know, throwing a bunch of numbers at you. I'm not a professor. I'm a concerned citizen. I have a background in environmental issues. I think I started the first recycling program in Winnipeg; I'm just going to say I did. I think I was one of the original signatures on the Green Party of Manitoba and creating that party in Manitoba. I've also been involved with, you know, just bike culture and creating outdoor learning spaces. And was very involved and very active, and

then had three kids and, you know, several moral compromises, a couple of decades later and here I am.

So, anyways, I'm here to just really urge everyone here—well, thank you for hearing me out; I'll be brief—but, again, I'm just here to urge everyone to try to work together as a group. It's not a time for us to be doing the partisan thing, I don't think. So I guess I'm just kind of urging, imploring everyone to work together, put their heads together.

It is a time, I think, for leadership, not for kind of pandering to the lowest common denominator. It is a time for educating people because I think a lot of people, at least that I know that are opposed to carbon tax, they hear it; they don't even know what it means, but there's a knee-jerk reaction to it. So education is important. Which is sort of hard because we have a bit of a moving target, so how do we educate people about stuff we don't know exactly what it looks like? So that's going to be important.

And also, I guess, business, and this is just a little bit of the lefty communist coming out in me, but I do feel like business has sort of been allowed to just, you know, kind of do their thing, not accounting for the environmental cost of when we do those things. You know, when we make a hamburger, when we, you know, make a product, whenever we're rolling that stuff out, I think we need to have—be able to put it in people's consciousness whether it's, they're getting a bag at the store or I'm a business leader and I'm cranking out a bunch of widgets. We need to just put that piece, that environmental piece, and factor it into everything that we're doing. And we can't really do that, I don't think, unless we create something like this carbon tax. We need to really just put a number on it. Otherwise, if we rely on people's good will, if we rely on just people doing it because it's the right thing to do, I've been doing it long enough to know that we're going to be waiting a long time.

So that's it. I just wanted to, yes, urge you all to work together and I will help you. I will work for free. The kids are almost old enough now I can, you know, I punted two of them out. I got one left. And I'm here to help you. Thank you.

\* (20:30)

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?



**Ms. Squires:** Well, I would like to ask you your secret on getting your adult children out of the house so early, but maybe I'll save that conversation for another time.

I just want to say thank you so much for coming down here tonight and for providing us with such a lively and passionate presentation. And just sharing your views on how important this issue is and how important it is that we all come together as leaders and have real, meaningful action for—on climate change for the here and now, but well into the future.

And so thank you for being here tonight.

**Mr. Lawrence:** Thanks for hearing me.

And just sharing a quick little memory, as you were talking, I was remembering Reg Alcock—speaking of action—was somebody that I was involved in, again, community-based recycling. Free, wasn't for profit. It was just because it needed to get done. And Reg was awesome, and he—we connected and we came here. He basically dragged me down to the Leg., and we were in his office crafting some kind of funding proposal and we got money so that I could set up bins at the community club. I think they were probably the first of their kind, where people could just drive by and chuck their stuff in there. And then I would get it out of the bins.

And so we need that kind of direct action, that passionate action. So, Reg, wherever you are, can you—can—I'm calling him into the room to urge you again to take action. Thanks.

**Mr. Lindsey:** Thanks for coming and presenting. And, certainly, you have some energy and some passion about that—what you're doing.

I just have a quick question that probably doesn't have a quick answer. Maybe it does.

You're in favour of the carbon tax. What should be done with the revenue that's collected from carbon tax? Should it all just go into general revenue of the government? Should it all go into innovative things to reduce the carbon footprint? Should there be a mix of things that help some low-income people while also generating cash for innovation? Should businesses get a pass on paying the carbon tax?

We've heard a lot of people—individuals that have done a lot of things to reduce their personal carbon footprint. Can the tax do something more?

**Mr. Lawrence:** You know, I—well, first of all, I'd love to do more homework to give you a more

fulsome answer, but I think my out-of-the-gate response is I love the idea of people seeing—directly connecting the dots right away and being able to see that we put money here, it got used for this. And it was used for something innovative, was used for something with high visibility. It was used for education.

So I guess my out-of-the-gate answer, without a lot of homework done, is I like the idea of a fund. I like the idea of directing that somewhere else. It gets that idea of helping create that paradigm shift, because we're all kind of locked into this paradigm that we—you know, God help us, we got to try and crawl out of. And it's a huge one, right? So I like the idea of that visibility and that direct connection.

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Lindsey, on a follow-up.

**Mr. Lindsey:** Just very quick.

I thank you for that. And, certainly, you know, just if you got the spare time and want to scratch out some ideas, I'm sure that any number of us sitting around this table would be more than happy to look at them, although they probably wouldn't form a part of the official record at this point in time. So, sure.

**Mr. Lawrence:** I would be happy to do that, yes. Thank you.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Yes, thanks very much, Matt, for coming down and for all of your great work in the past. You have made no small number of sacrifices for the greater good, and I applaud that—not just on the environment, but on a wide range of issues.

Let—I want to touch on the—for someone who was speaking at 30,000 feet, I think he hit on a number of really key points that just drill home for us. One of them is the idea of a more non-partisan approach to this issue. In my ideal world, a committee meeting like this would not be about whether or not we're doing anything about climate change; it should be about how do we make sure what we're doing now is going to achieve what has to be done.

Do you have any advice for me? Because we're not all on the same page here yet. We do not have a common starting point. We do not have a common understanding. Do you have any advice for me and the other members of the committee how we get there? Because in 12 years, if we don't, we're done.

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Lawrence, and there are—10 seconds remaining on our question time.

**Mr. Lawrence:** You know, I guess—I mean, if people at your level can't get together, I guess I figure it's got to happen from the ground up. So, maybe it's a way of somehow having, like, you know, town halls or people that—from different worlds that can connect and also have you come to it so that we can all have that conversation together.

Or—because I think we all need to bring each other over, and that's at the grassroots level and up here. And is there a way to do that together? Because that's a lot of what's informing the vision in this room, is those people that we're connected to underneath us, those grassroots people.

So if I can get the five wingnuts that are my Facebook friends to get on board—which I'm planning on doing, then if we can extrapolate that conversation into this room, maybe that's a way to make it happen. So a dialogue, communication—

**An Honourable Member:** I might be one of those wingnuts.

**Mr. Lawrence:** —yes, no, I don't think—no.

**Madam Chairperson:** The time for questions has now ended. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon Edward Burgener, private citizen.

Mr. Burgener, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Mr. Edward Burgener (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Burgener:** Can you hear me?

I'm too hot. Okay.

Chairperson, honourable Ms. Squires, my name is Ed Burgener, I'm a retired mechanical engineer. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment publicly on our proposed climate action plan.

My studies included thermodynamics, radiative physics, quantum mechanics, ideal gas laws, et cetera. I have, over the years, supported sustainable development, and in 1995 received a sustainable development award from Premier Gary Filmon.

By coincidence, this was the same time that I introduced Ms. Elizabeth May as a speaker to a

Winnipeg conference, so my family, historically, has saw me as a—somewhat of a climate activist, I guess.

I know the green plan and carbon tax issue has been difficult for the Manitoba government. When I listened to Cross Country Checkup on CBC Radio last weekend, the majority of callers were in despair, thinking that we were ruining the Earth with carbon pollution.

We heard here last night from a teacher that he was so concerned that he was not going to have children. I don't know about you, but that is a scary thought, that people have—are in such a state of panic over this issue.

So, is this level of concern justified? No, it is not. I agree with the presenter last night. Remember the fellow that wanted to talk about science? They say that every party needs a skunk. I think he felt like the skunk last night, because—I almost thought he was getting a bum rush out of here, because I don't think that people really want to talk about the science.

Okay. He said, correctly, that CO<sub>2</sub> is not pollution, it is plant food. And believe me, I react very badly to the Prime Minister and anyone else saying that carbon dioxide is pollution, okay? It is not. It is the basis for all life on this earth, including you and me.

He could have also said that the only evidence that we can ascribe to our CO<sub>2</sub> is the greening up of the Earth, and higher crop yields. If you go out there and say, can I find evidence of our CO<sub>2</sub>, it is in the form of a greener planet, okay?

There's lots of published literature on this. On page 3, I'd like you to look at that nice green picture there, please. I got it copied in colour so that you could see the green. It doesn't show up very well black and white. You see those four trees on the top? Okay. In the left, he's holding a little sign saying ambient, okay? Then he adds—to the next one, he adds 150 parts per million and he adds 300 and adds 400, okay? The totals are on the bottom.

\* (20:40)

Then you go three years, and you see what the difference is. It's amazing, absolutely amazing what our carbon dioxide is doing to promote plant growth in the world, okay.

Down below, you see grassland areas, and, if you look at—my favourite area is the south Sahara, okay. Very, very green. I'm old enough to remember

the starving people leaving Biafra, okay, because their grass was gone, and there was—driven out by the encroaching desert. So, with the extra carbon dioxide, plants need less water; that's a fact. So that means they grow better in dry areas. And, as the plants come back, they shade the soil or the sand, whatever, from the sun; it retains more water, promotes more growth and it's in a virtuous cycle.

Would you believe, back in the Roman days, that was all grassland? We may be going back to that, okay. So to call carbon dioxide pollution is absolutely, totally wrong, okay. Our carbon dioxide is a blessing to the biosphere.

So my main point today is that the science is not settled. I know you've all heard that it's settled; you've heard that for 20 years. It's great propaganda, but—okay. So I want you to turn to page 4, okay—that's the last page—and take a look at graph No. 1. Now, how many here feel graph compromised that they can't—I'm looking around the room. All right, let's go through the basics. On the bottom, is a year—2000, 2005, 2010, 2015—and up the side is temperature change in degrees Celsius, okay—one, two, three, four, five, six. Now, these are what's called climate sensitivities. That is, how much will—do we calculate or figure that the world will warm up due to a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>, okay. This is called climate sensitivity. It's the jargon of the trade, okay.

All right, so you see it's dropping, as time goes on. And that little circle on the right, you see that circle down there? Recent. There's a whole—there's about 100 papers—sorry—wrong number—about 70 papers that give the climate sensitivity. That is, for a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>, the amount of global increase will be in the order of 1°, okay. And some of the ones that I respect the most in that group down there was actually 2011, Richard Lindzen, 200 published papers. He's the total guru of the field. Many others in there.

So what does that mean? That—it means that a lot of what you heard, in terms of rhetoric on the news and, indeed, from our federal government, is simply not supported by the science. If the science was settled, we wouldn't see this continuing learning curve where, well, it's not going to be quite so bad; it's going to be less bad than that, and, by the way, it's not a problem at all, okay.

If you look at that and you're a skeptic, which I am, you would say that the IPCC, in its recent report, was in a panic to get us all to spend a lot of money, because in another five or 10 years, this becomes a

total non-problem, okay. Time is running out for the—getting the money out of the various countries of the world. All right, so the science is not settled.

Second point is we've had warm periods before. That's on the bottom. That's Greenland ice core. As they say, everybody can be entitled to their own opinion, but you can't be entitled to your own data. That's the data from ice cores, and you see some words up there, various warming peaks, and they're two, almost three degrees warmer. Well, I guess from where we are now, 31.5 up to 29. Well, it's about 7 or 8 degrees warmer.

Those were optimum times for humans. So, when you hear people in a panic about it's going to be 3 or 4 or so degrees warmer, you say, well, you know, really. In this epoch of ours, 8,000 years ago, we were that warm. The polar bears were fine; they lived through it. Every other species lived through it, except for the ones we wiped out, of course, but. So the ice core tells us that we've got a very stable Earth; it's not going to run away, okay? That's the data. You can interpret it every way you want, but that's the data. So we've had warm periods before.

Now, on to my third point is that we in Manitoba and Canada, need to pay attention to what is happening south of the border. To make a long story short, the advice the President is getting down there is very different than advice that our Prime Minister is getting. He listens to Dr. William Happer; I know he visited the Trump Tower during the period just before he got—went into the office.

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Burgener, your time for presentation has now come to an end. We are going to move on to questions from the committee members. Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you very much, Mr. Burgener, for coming down here tonight. And I notice that you were here until midnight with all of us last night, waiting patiently for your turn and here again for a few hours this evening, and that is a great commitment of time, and so I acknowledge that. I also want to congratulate you for your sustainability award that was presented to you in 1995, and you had many contributions to our province, and so congratulations for that and thank you for coming down here. The hallmark of this room is listening to a diversity and a range of opinions, and I appreciate your opinion tonight.

**Mr. Burgener:** I'm giving a presentation next month, Creative Retirement for an hour and a half, a lecture. Its room is not quite full yet, but it soon will be. So you're welcome to come. It's—this is too short to get into the hard numbers as a science, but I'll be doing it there. Any questions?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** No, not a question, just also want to thank you for your perseverance and for bringing your very different perspective. It is a position that all of us at various times may find ourselves in where we have a point of view that differs from either our colleagues or the general public, and in a healthy, democratic society, it's important that there's a safe space for us to do that. So I congratulate you on that.

I will be honest with you. I do not accept your interpretation of the science, but I absolutely appreciate your right to bring your view forward here tonight. So thank you.

**Mr. Burgener:** You may not know that I didn't really express a point of view here. We're discussing data, okay, and you're entitled to your views on the data, but the data is there. It's in the scientific community; that's where this comes from, okay? So to—please don't just dismiss it because this is just my point of view. No, this is data, and as legislators in Manitoba, I think you need to be sensitive to what the facts are, and sometimes the facts are different from what you think they are. So please have a look.

**Mr. Bindle:** I'm just curious as to the date, time that you're giving the presentation.

**Mr. Burgener:** November 23rd, 1 o'clock to 1:30.

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Bindle. *[interjection]*

I, pardon me, I need to acknowledge people before they speak into the mic or none of this information is recorded in Hansard.

So, Mr. Burgener, if you want to answer Mr. Bindle's question, go ahead.

**Mr. Burgener:** It's at Peguis building for the lecture.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Thank you for your presentation.

I notice that one of your recommendations is that we consider electric vehicles as a new market for hydro power, but we need to charge road fees to make up for lost gasoline tax revenues to maintain roads. I would like to give you an opportunity to expand a little bit on that.

\* (20:50)

**Mr. Burgener:** This doesn't sound right—there it is.

Initially, when you start off it's not a big deal, but as time goes on you lose more and more revenue because you're—have so much excise tax on your gasoline. And other jurisdictions had to face up to this. Then they start billing—charging more, and it gets a little complicated as to how exactly you collect it.

If the individual gets power at home, how do you know that's for his automobile or it's for something—some other use? So you get into licensing, you know, and tracking the—with GPS how far the car goes, because in the end somebody has to pay for the roads.

Just something to keep in mind when you're going down that road.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Zainab Mansaray.

Ms. Mansaray, do you have any written materials for distribution?

**Ms. Zainab Mansaray (Canada Sierra Leone Friendship Society Inc.):** Yes.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Mansaray:** Thank you.

Good evening, Madam Chairman. Good evening to you all. Thank you for having me. My presentation today is about the organization—I'm the founder of the organization called Canada Sierra Leone Friendship Society Inc.

Oh, thank you. Yes, Canada Sierra Leone Friendship Society Inc.

We created this—I created this organization based on the belief that I've—have for so many years. I came to Canada in—I mean, yes, 2004. I was a teacher back home for nine years. I have a degree in teaching, and that's not—the rebels came to our country, Sierra Leone, so I was so passionate. I helped out with the WHR—the CHR—with Red Cross.

So one thing they asked me when I was coming to Canada, they say, oh, you're coming to Canada? I said, yes. I was so excited because my parents came from Nova Scotia to Sierra Leone. Based on that, I created this organization. I found the roots of my genes.

So they asked me, oh, where? Which part of Canada? I said well, Manitoba. Winnipeg.

It's cold. I said—is people live there? They said, yes, people are there. I said, well, I will survive.

So when I came, I'm all over the map. I love to meet people. People love to talk with me, so they gave me the secrets of how you can survive the cold, and I never had a cold. I followed.

So this organization I created is based on the connection we have in the—in Canada, in Winnipeg. I never—I only travelled for one—three weeks off, then I run to come back. So this organization I make is for—I'm so proud for Canada. I'm so proud for Winnipeg as well. To create jobs, because I found out we are—a lot of diversity in Winnipeg.

And I'm always with people. Since I came here, I have been working with seniors, and when you want to know the secrets of life, be with seniors. So in that note, I work with nursing homes, I work with youths, I work with children. I be with them, I volunteer. So I decided to create this organization.

*Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair*

So if you can check how the first one came, it's for cultural exchange. The geography of Canada, you can read it—I mean, of Sierra Leone, how it came about, and how Sierra Leone climate change is affecting. Affecting, we have two seasons: December and January, and February—I mean, April. You go there, you are fine, but it's hot; we have a lot of winds blowing.

Then Sierra Leone adopts a lot of projects, but it's not in the rights people.

During the time I visited, since I came 2000 and—I left 2002 in my country, with my children and with my family. I joined Canada 2004; 2015, I went back. A lot of struggle going on, after the war, eboli—Ebola and a mudslide—so. But, based on the money that I've been sending my family, Zainab, and I spoke I'm so proud for Canada. Every day I look at the ticket and say, oh, I want to come back.

So we created this organization; we registered in Sierra Leone, we registered Canada here, just to create jobs. To billet people we call—there are a lot of people while I am in school here, as soon as they finish they run away, they gone. Oh we don't have a job.

I said, okay, we'll find a job. So I created this job, like, for three pillars: education, agriculture,

medical. I need help, but all this I done is by myself—only I work. But, in the name of Canada, because I'm here, I work. I send money. If you call my number at Western Union, you will see a bunch of people just to help, and with the name of Winnipeg.

So you can see the other slide where I was, how the climate change is affecting, and anything that let us don't be in reality I'm telling you because I'm always with people. I know how the weakened points of the government, the weakened points of other people, how things coming out. I interact with people. They are telling me, but I don't have the power to say, no, change. All is the power I'm telling them, say, know what, when the time comes, go vote. You're *[inaudible]* will tell you; you will get your voice, that I always persuade people, and I know what they will say. Are you against of this? Go vote. Then I did that, and I always succeed, because when people go there, we'll see the answer of it in the results.

So I see how things going on in the country. And, if the climate changes Canada don't step up, why I want Canada to step up in—for the both countries. Anything affected in Sierra Leone, it affects us all, because if I don't have the money, I come to a government. Government's always given, and when I work, I should have been buying two, three houses, but I'm still on rent because I take that money to send back home. That's why I need help, so we can create jobs here.

Sierra Leone has all lots of resources, yes, natural resources, but lack of education. And, if Canada steps in with this my projects, with here, because it's both for both exchange. They step in to help me; we achieve this project. We can open, or were planning to open, a thrift store where all African stuff we can bring while we are sending.

\* (21:00)

More of Sierra Leone, they need education. Climate change, carbon tax, for example, let us don't say, scientists are fully not there, not stable. We are here on the scientists' way, without light. How can we leave? I'm sorry, I'm not yelling. How can we live? Let us be in reality. In Canada, the opportunity to read books. I can *[inaudible]* cut and paste, taking someone's idea, but on my naked eyes have been there, just like when the nursing homes.

Anyone tells me there is no place in Winnipeg I don't walk, I don't volunteer. I be with people. I know how they are feeling, but sometimes I am not

the manager. I'll—I wish I can help. I end up crying. The person embraces me back.

So I need this bill—let Canada think back, they are motherly, they help. Yesterday I just went—because I was supposed to call me and do observation only. I get my turn. I went for—I'm in university right now doing international development studies and conflict resolution for peace. This year's study we went with Judy [*phonetic*], the lady who won award for [*inaudible*]

The reality is there. Let us don't be fooled—or let it don't fool us. Most of you here is—

**Mr. Vice-Chairperson:** I'm sorry, Ms. Mansaray, the time for your presentation is expired.

Thank you for your presentation. Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Ms. Squires:** Thank you so much for coming down and presenting on behalf of the Canada Sierra Leone Friendship Society and just sharing your very passionate presentation. I have to admit, I was just so intently listening and encouraged by what you were saying, I hadn't really thought of any questions. Just wanted to let you know how much I appreciate you being here, expressing your view, and doing a good service to the folks here in Manitoba as well as in your home country of Sierra Leone.

So thank you very much.

**Ms. Mansaray:** Yes, please.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thank you so much for sticking around so late to share your wonderful point of view.

I've had the privilege of being able to attend some of the United Nations meetings where, of course, delegates from Sierra Leone and every other country in the world gather to try and grapple with climate change. And I love what you said about asking Canada to stand up and to really make a difference.

Can you give us any information—how many people live in Sierra Leone? And I just looked up the greenhouse gas emissions—for the whole country is 11 million tons a year. That's about half of what our province, all by itself, does in a year.

How can we not be the ones who do more when, you know, Sierra Leone has so many other more pressing issues like education to grapple with? Would be honoured to hear any thoughts you had on those lines.

**Ms. Mansaray:** Thank you, yes. You know, why I'm so passionate for Winnipeg as well, and I'm proud all the time because everywhere I go, people embrace me. And I meet with people. I'm not shy or scared of people. No, I meet with them.

*Madam Chairperson in the Chair*

Yes, and for step into the country presently, to be honest, I can't say because of different governments coming on, and my brother was the deputy head of police, that I can say—or I can grab you to say, let's go, because me, is the reality.

I don't believe in so much media something, but I want that.

But, unfortunately, he's not in this country right now. He's in America—but because of why we are getting too much, not that people are not trying to do something for Sierra Leone, but it's too much corruption. It's not going in. Well, because, for me, this organization is like, I'm strict. I am not—yes, I am so strict, and I know the value of we citizens, how we are always asking where our money goes, where our money goes.

So that one, I don't want this organization. That's why I create it for myself, because I value my citizenship in Canada. I value the revenue staying every—I have to give report say this is what I've done. All this that I done, I'm doing that, it's by myself, but I still give tax. I ask for tax and I give reports to Canada Revenue.

So that's the major thing I can tell people, and I do this for a non-profit organization. Not to send it to government that I don't know. And I've been here I only communicate. I go once and for all.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Just one of the things that I'm interested in in terms of the energy in Sierra Leone and whether the development of solar power, for example, has an advantage for Sierra Leone in providing localized electricity, and whether there's an opportunity for Canada to help Sierra Leone build up their solar power, for example? [*interjection*]

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Mansaray.

**Ms. Mansaray:** Oh, sorry. A hundred per cent. We are hard workers. In Winnipeg, Sierra Leoneans are more than 1,000. Not talking about the other areas of the other provinces that we have be moving. So that one it's really—they want Canada to step in although Canada has been, according to the history, because

sometimes I communicate, they are telling me how Canada have been stepping in, but they go it through World Bank because I doing international development studies. So—and it doesn't go direct, and the Canada doesn't have a project on its own in Sierra Leone. They have Ghana, Senegal for Sierra Leone. It save dozens. So if you stepping in that side, and I have even in my website where they are welcome in Canada, I was there.

So hundred per cent it's really good. They got a lot of things that's happening like this mudslide, people digging diamond, gold—

**Madam Chairperson:** Ms. Mansaray, the time for questions now has expired. But thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now be calling upon Shirley Thompson, private citizen. Shirley Thompson will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Colleen Shipp, private citizen. Colleen Shipp will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Solana Pratt, private citizen. Solana Pratt will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Peter Chadwick, Rainbow Forest Gardens. Peter Chadwick will now be removed from the list.

I will now call on Marianne Cerilli, private citizen. Marianne Cerilli will now be removed from the list.

I'll now call on Angela Reeves.

Ms. Reeves, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Ms. Angela Reeves (Private Citizen):** No, I don't.

**Madam Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Reeves:** Thank you for having me here tonight.

I just wanted to start off by saying in my day-to-day job I spend my time trying to educate kids in getting them outside in nature, and explain some of the impacts of climate change and impacts on—human impacts on freshwater ecosystems, as well. And while I'm encouraging them to do their part, I feel it's important that you all, as leaders, do your part, as well.

We've already begun to see the impacts of climate change in our own backyards. Research findings in northwestern Ontario have revealed that

climate change is not just a future concern, but it's already having an impact on local air temperature and lengths of seasons.

Not only could this affect climatic patterns, but species habitat forcing some to become locally extirpated. These debates jurisdictions continue to have—must shift to urgent action if we are going to slow the effects from occurring. But urgent action—sorry—does not equate to a plan that provides no measurable indicators for how or where emissions will be reduced and what emission reduction targets are.

\* (21:10)

The Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan lists a wide array of potential actions that could build on Manitoba's clean electricity advantage and reduce emissions in the highest-emitting sectors of transportation, agriculture, and buildings, and many others for individual households as well. But a comprehensive analysis of benefits, risks, costs and when these things will be implemented are—and costs of different approaches to reduce the emissions in this province is not presented in the current Climate and Green Plan.

Essentially, this plan lacks detail.

And how can a bill be passed when there is no plan in place to support that bill? Where are the incentives for industry to comply with reducing emissions, and where is the plan to assist Manitobans in adapting more sustainable lifestyles if we have no carbon tax?

Bill 16 also does no—not hold the government accountable for achieving said emissions reduction targets. Section 5.2 states that if the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal in a five-year period has not been achieved, the amount of the emissions reduction shortfall is to be added to the emissions reduction goal in the next five-year period. So, essentially, there's no incentive to achieve targets when they can keep getting added to the next five-year period for potentially a new administration to have to deal with.

Section 7 also allows the government to hide any lack of progress in reducing emissions. Legislating a report to be due only every five years and then having another 18 months until it released—it's released does not hold them publicly accountable, as well. It also only requires them to outline any decrease in emissions while ignoring any increases

that might occur during this time period, as well. And I find this deeply concerning.

The legislation is vague and it lacks detail, and it's also concerning when we're talking about the future of our climate. Though the impacts to you and I may seem manageable or potentially even negligible since we live in an interior environment with easy access to the rest of the continent, for many, like northern communities, isolated communities, 'vulnerable' communities and small communities that are dependent on agriculture, climate change will impact people's ways of life forever here in Manitoba.

Winter roads that all isolated communities access to the rest of the province will either have reduced or no access at all. Food and necessities for isolated communities become more expensive and difficult to access, as well. Species in which support Manitoba economies will no longer be 'abundant' or will be extinct or 'exterminated' from the regions. Agriculture which supports our province will suffer a great deal through longer periods of droughts, and forest fires will become more regular and—displacing many communities, hurting our lumber supply, jobs, and our economy.

Since 2015 Paris climate agreement, more jurisdictions 'across' the globe have used carbon pricing at a national, provincial, and municipal level because they realize climate change is real. Carbon pricing helped to inform consumers about which goods and services are more carbon-intensive, send signals to producers about which activities are more carbon-intensive—example: burning coal—and which are less, solar power and wind power. It encourages innovation to find new, affordable, sustainable alternatives and convey all of this messaging in a well-functioning market and economy. It also helps to achieve revenue for making some of the proposed emissions reduction activities that are listed in the Manitoba and green plan possible.

Manitoba needs to be a leader. We need to begin collaborating with one another to achieve these things to ensure a sustainable future. Putting a price on carbon pollution is necessary, but it's only a small part of the solution—one that's part of a broader set of initiatives and tools. And those are things that we currently still lack.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Pedersen:** Thank you, Ms. Reeves, for taking the time to come and give your presentation. Lots of information in there and I'm sure the minister will review your presentation.

**Ms. Reeves:** Thanks.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Thank you very much, Angela. That was a great overview. You demonstrated, I think, a number of things and highlighted them that I hope the committee noted, first of all, the absolute truth. This is not just about the future. These things are happening now. They're having an impact on us now. And I really appreciate the way you talked about not just, you know, where we live here in Winnipeg, but what are the impacts in rural Manitoba, what's happening in the North. We're all in this together.

Let me just throw a generational question at you, if I may, again. Another young person, incredibly articulate, incredibly intelligent bringing forward just such obvious facts that we need to be acting on. What message does it send to you and your peers when we have a government which is just not there yet in being willing to measure emissions? As you said, there's no targets for reductions. There's no plan in place to achieve those targets. What message is that sending to your generation, and how do we try and move them along into the 21st century?

**Ms. Reeves:** If I'll—I'm going to be honest, it's not hopeful. It makes me sometimes question what I'm doing every day if no one else seems to really care about it. It's discouraging to see what we're seeing in Canada right now as a whole. I feel like, both municipally and provincially, we could be leaders not just in Manitoba but everywhere. It shouldn't take a national strategy to realize that these things are happening in our own backyard. We're already seeing the effects, especially on the west coast and coastline, with raising waters and forest fires as well. So I don't know what else we need to start to seeing to make things happen.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Thank you for coming here and presenting and talking about the importance of addressing climate change. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which we want to do, is part of the solution, but when we're talking about increased forest fires and in the boreal forest, in the short term, what sort of approach do you think we need to have to address the problem of forest fires, because when



you have forest fires, you're actually putting a lot of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, aren't you?

**Ms. Reeves:** Forest fires are part of a natural cycle; we're just seeing an increase of them because of warming drought conditions. So I'm not sure if there is—it's not necessarily a good thing to manage them because they are part of a natural cycle. I think what's concerning is that they're happening at a more increased rate. That's all I—the rest of the detailed science, I'm not sure, yes.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

That concludes the list of presenters that I have before me. Are there any other persons in attendance who wish to make a presentation?

Seeing none, that concludes public presentations.

\* \* \*

**Madam Chairperson:** We will now proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of these bills.

During the consideration of a bill, the preamble, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Due to the size and structure of this particular bill, the Chair would like to propose the following order of consideration for the committee's consideration. For your reference, we will provide copies of this outline for committee members with the understanding that we may stop at any point where members have questions or wish to propose amendments.

I propose that we call the bill in the following order: schedule A, pages 4 through 13, called in blocks conforming to pages; schedule B, pages 15 through 36, called in blocks conforming to pages; schedule C, pages 37 through 39, called in blocks conforming to pages; schedule D, page 40, called in blocks conforming to the page; schedule E, pages 41 through 50, called in blocks conforming to pages; schedule 51 through 54, called in blocks conforming to pages; the enacting clauses, pages 1 and 2; the main enacting clause, page 1, the bill title.

\* (21:20)

Is that agreed as an appropriate order of consideration for Bill 16? *[Agreed]*

Does the minister responsible for Bill 16 have an opening statement?

**Ms. Squires:** Yes.

Thank you very much to all the committee members that are left here—or, the members of the public that are left here and to all the committee members who are here this evening to work on Bill 16. And I just really appreciate everyone's opinion and perspective that has been shared tonight. And this is certainly, undoubtedly, the defining issue of our time. And we, as a government, acknowledge that climate change is real, and the time for action is now. And that is why we have moved forward with some aggressive mitigation aspects and preventative aspects, and we believe that it is everyone's duty to help us work towards a low-carbon future and transition to a low-carbon future for us in the here and now and for our future generations.

So again I thank the members of the committee for being here tonight to work on this important bill.

**Madam Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mr. Altemeyer:** If the government was actually believing that this is the defining issue of our time, this is not the piece of legislation that we would be considering tonight. This legislation is wretchedly weak. It was when it was first introduced. And now, following the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) incredible reversal—which I appreciate most, or perhaps all of the members of the government caucus who are here tonight did not know about until after he did it—there's almost nothing in here that is going to address any of the urgency that presenter, after presenter, after presenter, after presenter has given us tonight.

There's no way this government's actions amount to anything even remotely close to the defining issue of our time. The defining issue of our time, based on what your Premier is saying, is he wants to fight with Ottawa. He doesn't like the carbon tax now, even though he was in favour of it. He doesn't believe it'll work; it's unfair, disrespectful.

Well, it's—the fate of the planet is hanging in the balance. There's no way anyone should walk away, out of this room, believing that what the government has proposed either in their legislation or in their plan comes even remotely close to meeting the standard of what we have to do.

And yet I am still incredibly hopeful that members of the government who have sat here patiently and listened to Manitobans, listened to the

arguments they have raised, listened to the evidence they have presented, listened to the documentation they have provided, will come to realize that what they have been saying is true and that what they have been saying articulates what we as legislators must do.

And it is completely incomprehensible to me that a political party which prides itself on an image of understanding business opportunities, on understanding what is good for the economy, does not get it when it comes to the transition to the green economy.

Every decision that this government has made related to climate change so far has taken us backwards, not forwards in what we need to do. Transit means lower emissions. What did the government do? They cut funding to transit. Shifting transit to electric buses—our previous government partnered in a business relationship with a multinational corporation called Mitsubishi—you may have heard of it—and with Hydro, and with Red River College, and with Manitoba Hydro and built the first made-in-Manitoba electric buses of their kind.

Where are those buses now? They're rotting on the lot at New Flyer Industries. They're not even on our roads anymore. That's backwards.

Transit fares have been cut—or, transit funding's been cut, and fares have gone up. That's going backwards. The Power Smart program helps people save money and do the right thing for the environment. What did this government do? They froze it. They forbid Manitoba Hydro's Power Smart staff to even do any more public education work on Power Smart. So they can't even go out and tell Manitobans about the opportunities that exist.

They even went so far as to paint over the Power Smart sign on the Hydro mural at Portage Avenue and, what, St. James, there. I actually saw that. I caught a little snippet of it with my camera, a little video of them doing the work. I threw it up on my Facebook page and I asked folks to, you know, suggest what the new logo should be that the government was going to order Hydro to put up on the wall. There were two winning bids by the end of it. One of them was, Board members wanted. I thought that was pretty clever. The other one was, Feed your family or pay your hydro bill: Conservatives support choices. And that's really what it's coming down to.

You look at the solar subsidy that was in place before this government even took office. This is the first time in the world that the local solar industry, as far as they can understand, no one else in the world has ever carte blanche killed a solar subsidy. Usually, you phase it out gradually. You let the markets know. You let the businesses know. Hundreds of jobs in the solar industry that were created here by that program are now leaving the province. And you want to claim to understand that this is the pivotal moment of our time and that you understand basic economics and that you are acting in the interests—the best interest that you can of Manitobans, particularly of young Manitobans? Give your head a shake. You're not, not even close.

So there are loads of things in this bill that need to be improved. I'm only going to bring forward a few amendments tonight. And the biggest one is the one that I hope members of the government will consider passing. It would be historic. You would become the first government in the history of Canada to actually put a commitment to climate science in legislation. And what this would do going forward is it would mean that as the scientific understanding of the climate crisis improves in the years ahead, we would be automatically linked to that advice, and that advice is what we would be compelled to use here in Manitoba as we do our work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Nobody else in the country has ever even proposed this in legislation. And you could be the first ones to pass it. And I hope you do. And, if you don't pass it tonight, I hope you go back into your caucus and you tell people, this is where we need to go, and you bring it in as your own amendment or your own change later on.

This is what people have been telling us throughout these whole hearings. Climate change has to be depoliticized and the science has to come to the surface. And the science tells us we have to act at a level and a scale and with a commitment and with a level of collaboration that we have not seen before and which we as legislators have to create that space for that to happen. Because your grandkids, who I know you love dearly, my own kids, their grandkids if they get that far, they are depending on us to make humongous changes. And right now we are going in the exact opposite direction. All the political momentum that your Premier's (Mr. Pallister) actions recently have done are just feeding the fan of—feeding the fire of extreme views that reject climate science, reject action on climate. You've thrown your

lot in with Doug Ford, and that's a path to ruin for us all.

So, an amendment tonight, I will make a few of them. There will be sections of this bill that we will not be thrilled with, but we won't be opposing them for the sake of time and effort and sanity. But I don't want anyone to leave this room tonight thinking that there isn't a better way to do things. And I don't want anyone leaving this room tonight thinking that this is a good approach. And I certainly don't want anyone leaving this room tonight thinking that this is going to do justice for our kids, because it's not—not even close.

Thank you.

**Madam Chairperson:** We thank the member.

Does the critic from the second opposition party have an opening statement?

\* (21:30)

**Mr. Gerrard:** A major concern with this is that it's not a plan but sort of a framework to our plan. We can see this in 2(1): The minister must develop a plan. This is not the plan; it is something that is to be developed in the future. 2(2): When 'developing' and implementing the Climate and Green Plan, the minister must take into account the advice and recommendations of the council.

So the first step is to appoint the council, and then we have a development and implementation of a plan and we don't know how long that's going to take, and it's taken us two and a half years since the government was elected to get this far.

And then, if we look at the report, we've got a report or reporting which is every five years, and in terms of how we're doing on this greenhouse gas reductions, but the report for the first one can be, as I read it, something like 18 months after the end of the period. So we're looking at a report which could come in five years plus 18 months—six and a half years from now.

When we want to get to a major reduction in greenhouse gases by 2030, as the IPCC is calling for, we need much more frequent reporting. We need annual reporting; we need tracking, and we need to be able to monitor. I mean, I think we will actually be better doing what we do with our budgets and that is have quarterly reports, because when a situation is urgent, we want to be tracking things pretty frequently and pretty quickly, and so we know where we're going.

So, you know, I want to compliment the minister on her ability to say we want to tackle the problem, but I'm skeptical in terms of whether this is actually going to get us where we are, and that skepticism builds on a level of skepticism from previous attempts in the province of Manitoba to have set objectives and targets but then not meet them.

So I will be—we will be, as in the Liberal Party, watching very closely, and we are always hopeful but we are certainly skeptical in this instance, and we will see where things go in terms of the amendments tonight and we may present some at report stage.

**Madam Chairperson:** We thank the member.

We will begin, then, with schedule A, pages 4 through 13.

Clause 1—pass.

Shall clause 2 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I have an amendment to propose.

I move

*THAT Clause 2(1) of Schedule A to the Bill (The Climate and Green Plan Act) be amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (c), by adding "and" at the end of clause (d), and adding the following after clause (d):*

(e) put science first and accept the science on climate change.

**Madam Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr. Altemeyer

*THAT Clause 2(1) of Schedule A to the Bill (The Climate and Green Plan Act) be amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (c), by adding—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Chairperson:** Dispense.

The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Madam Chairperson:** Okay. If the committee is ready for the question, the question before the committee is as follows: Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Voice Vote**

**Madam Chairperson:** All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Madam Chairperson:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**Madam Chairperson:** Clause 2—pass.

Shall clauses 3 and 4 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I have an amendment to clause 4(1).

**Madam Chairperson:** We will deal with just clause 3 and go back to clause 4 for you then.

Clause 3—pass.

Shall clause 4 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I have an amendment to propose. I move

*THAT Clause 4(1) of Schedule A to the Bill (The Climate and Green Plan Act) be amended by adding ", and which are consistent with the goals set by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change".*

**Madam Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr. Altemeyer

*THAT Clause 4—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Chairperson:** Dispense.

The amendment is in order. The floor's open for questions.

The question before the committee—is the committee ready for question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Madam Chairperson:** The question before the committee is as follows: Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Voice Vote**

**Madam Chairperson:** All those in favour, say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Madam Chairperson:** All those opposed, say Nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**Madam Chairperson:** Clause 4—pass.

Shall clauses 5 and 6 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No—oh, sorry.

**Madam Chairperson:** Clauses 5 and 6—pass.

Shall clause 7 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I was close. I have an amendment. I move

*THAT Schedule A to the Bill (The Climate and Green Plan Act) be amended in Clause 7*

*(a) in subsection (1) by adding "annual" after "report on"; and*

*(b) in subsection (3) by striking out "18 months" and substituting "six months".*

**Madam Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr. Altemeyer

*THAT Schedule A—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Chairperson:** Dispense.

The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

**Mr. Lindsey:** I would like Mr. Altemeyer to explain exactly what it is he's proposing here.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I would be happy to do so.

Picking up on the comments from the honourable member from River Heights and many, many presenters who have noted the government's proposal in this legislation for reporting on greenhouse gas emissions is absolutely substandard. To believe that a five-year reporting period, which at the end of it then gives the government an additional 18 months before it is required to report to the public on what the emissions were like six and a half years previously is unconscionable.

This amendment, as adopted, for a government that is supposedly interested in accountability should be a no-brainer. Emissions are tracked annually anyways, and there's no reason why any government should need 18 months after tracking all the results each and every year of a five-year plan to report to the public.

\* (21:40)

So I would encourage the government members to think long and hard before voting against something that will not cost anything additional and which will improve accountability on their part and on the part of all future governments on what is, apparently—according to the minister—the defining issue of our time.

**Madam Chairperson:** Is the committee ready for the question?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Madam Chairperson:** The question before the committee is as follows: Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

#### Voice Vote

**Madam Chairperson:** All those in favour, say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Madam Chairperson:** All those opposed, say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\*\*\*

**Madam Chairperson:** Clause 7—pass; clause 8—pass.

Shall clause 9 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I have an amendment to propose, Madam Chair.

Just before I read the amendment, I would just like to quickly thank the hard-working staff in Leg. Counsel for their objective work in helping me bring these amendments for you tonight, and also to thank all the staff and clerks here this evening. This will be the last amendment that I have proposed tonight. There will be more coming at report stage.

So I move

*THAT Schedule A to the Bill (The Climate and Green Plan Act) be amended in Clause 9(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (d) and adding the following after clause (d):*

(d.1) the recommendations of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change; and

**Madam Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr. Altemeyer

*THAT Schedule A to the Bill—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Chairperson:** Dispense.

The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

**Mr. Lindsey:** I would, once again, like Mr. Altemeyer to explain his amendment to us.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Well, Mr. Altemeyer would once again be pleased to do so. Thank you to my honourable colleague.

This is more for the benefit of the citizens in the viewing seats who don't have a copy of the act in front of them. What I am proposing here—and for the interest of government members as well—is that one

of the provisions in this act is to strike an advisory committee to advise the government on what it should do around climate change.

It is my belief that the recommendations and advice that that committee provides to the government should also be based on the scientific evidence and recommendations of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. So this would just simply give further direction to the people that the government will be—or has appointed to that advisory board to give them that advice.

I would also note, Madam Chairperson, that prior to this government's election—and prior to our previous government's election—the government of Gary Filmon established the Manitoba round table on sustainable development and had a legislative requirement in there that the government and the ministers—and, at that time, the Premier—was required to meet with the round table no less than four times a year. And there is no such provision in this act for the minister to meet with her advisory committee nor to follow their advice. And I would think that that would also be a perfectly reasonable thing for the government to propose as its own amendment later on in the legislative process. Yet another step backwards in accountability, another step backwards in listening to the advice of Manitobans.

And this is just a small effort to make sure that the advice the government gets might actually be rooted in climate science. If/when they vote against it, it will be yet another indication that the ostrich likes their head in the sand.

**Madam Chairperson:** Is the committee ready for the question?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Madam Chairperson:** The question before the committee is as follows: Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Madam Chairperson:** I heard a no.

#### Voice Vote

**Madam Chairperson:** All those in favour, say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Madam Chairperson:** All those opposed, say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\*\*\*

**Madam Chairperson:** Clause 9—pass; clauses 10 and 11—pass; clause 12—pass; clauses 13 through 16—pass; preamble of schedule A—pass; enacting clause of schedule A—pass; title of schedule A—pass.

We will now consider schedule B, pages 15 through 36. Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clauses 4 through 6—pass; clause 7—pass; clauses 8 through 10—pass; clauses 11 and 12—pass; clauses 13 and 14—pass; clause 15—pass; clauses 16 through 19—pass; clauses 20 and 21—pass; clause 22—pass; clause 23—pass; clauses 24 and 25—pass; clauses 26 through 28—pass; clause 29—pass; clauses 30 and 31—pass; clause 32—pass; clauses 33 through 35—pass; title of schedule B—pass.

We will now consider schedule C, pages 37 through 39. Clauses 1 through 4—pass; clauses 5 through 11—pass; clause 12—pass.

We will now consider schedule D, page 40. Clauses 1 through 3—pass.

We will now consider schedule E, pages 41 through 50. Clauses 1 through 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clauses 5 through 7—pass; clauses 8 through 11—pass; clauses 12 and 13—pass; clauses 14 through 16—pass; clauses 17 through 19—pass; clauses 20 and 21—pass; clause 22—pass.

We will now consider schedule—[interjection]—oh, the schedule—pages 51 through 54. Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clauses 3 and 4—pass; clauses 1 through 5—pass; clause 6—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 9:49 p.m., what is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Adjourn.

**An Honourable Member:** Committee rise.

**Madam Chairperson:** Committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT:** 9:49 p.m.

#### WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Re: Bill 16

Climate change is a global challenge that must be faced by every human being and government on the planet. No exceptions. The Manitoba government

has an obligation to actually do something that stops climate change in the province; a plan that can be looked to as an inspirational example by our own residents, other provinces and countries around the world. Manitoba is in the centre of the North American Arctic vortex. The polar regions regulate the climate of the planet. Because I once lived in the central high arctic, now known as Nunavut, my experience living in Resolute Bay may shed a bit of light.

The timeline there was from 1983-1984. Living adjacent to the Ionospheric Monitoring Station that maintained a constant link to the Canadian military as part of the DEW Line, I was immersed both in the scientific and cultural intensity of the place. And everything there was determined by the climate and its weather. Those who had lived there for 30 or more years could predict when and how the climate would change. It wasn't just the scientists and military who lived there, it was also the Inuit. The Inuit have lived in the Arctic for thousands of years. The Arctic was in their blood and bones. Like all indigenous groups around the planet, the scourge of "white" European based colonialism and militaristic "civilization" had disrupted their culture. The people I met understood the ice and snow better than any human beings. Their knowledge and traditional way of life allowed them to survive in the most inhospitable of environments. Almost from birth, each member of the community had to know how to survive on their own in the middle of a vast frozen desert. They had to have this essential skill because ignorance would irrevocably lead to certain death. The elders that I met also understood the incredibly delicate balance that life in the Arctic was based on. Without a reciprocal respect for everything in the environment, life would be extinguished. To the still living, aging Angakkuq of the village, everything was in its own way sentient and conscious according to its specific form, even supposedly inanimate things like wind, water, ice, snow and rocks... He was carrying on a tradition that had its roots in antiquity, one that was being besieged by missionaries, alcohol, tobacco, sugar and venereal disease, among other things.

But during my time there, something very unusual happened, in that the temperatures at Resolute were warmer (over 25 degrees celsius) than places 2000 kilometers south, with extreme hot winds throwing the pack ice into jumbled mini mountain ranges all along the coastlines of the islands of the northwest passage. Those who had

lived there as residents recognized that the huge jump in temperatures were not normal. But the heatwave anomaly of 1983 was swallowed up by the return of the normal winter climate that had been experienced for generations and perhaps centuries. A six week window was all that was ever allowed for to get goods shipped into the port before the freeze came. There was no reprieve from the ice and cold. Winter came relentlessly and without stop. Once the sun went down, the temperature dropped to -40 to -45 celsius, and it stayed there for 3 months from December until the end of February, until temperatures in March slowly crept upwards. The ice on the Arctic Ocean was still ancient and colder than anything one can imagine. It was dense and hard as rock, literally. One could easily blunt a sharp axe blade trying to chop through it. Fast forward...

Over the past 35 years, all of that has literally disappeared. The average temperature during the coldest part of winter has warmed over 9 degrees celsius. This is not conjecture; it can be verified. This past February, the temperature at the north pole was above freezing! The old ice has mostly melted away. Ocean going ships can now sail from the Atlantic to the Pacific and vice-versa, through an ice-unencumbered Northwest Passage. Meanwhile, everything that helped to maintain the age-old life of the Inuit has effectively dissolved. The ancient ice that was traveled on for hunting has now become extremely dangerous. The animals of the arctic are in a state of crisis from the sudden shift in climate. The web of life has been disrupted. By human presence.

Some of the politicians are still quibbling over details of scientific research, and attempting to minimize the results of our unconscious actions as a global species. But the latest report from the IPCC has made it undeniably clear that if we don't act immediately and directly, all opportunity to mitigate the uncontrolled results of climate change will be beyond our control. The climate change of global warming is upon us, whether those sitting in air conditioned comfort wish to acknowledge it. The people of the transpolar regions have known about global warming for decades now, because they are on the front lines of it. As a matter of fact, every indigenous group has noticed the effects of climate change— except the ones who are mechanically perpetrating it. Human beings, unfortunately have an uncanny ability to deny and avoid taking responsibility for their unconscious actions. The compounded results of five millennia are finally coming around to confront each and every one of us.

What we have done to our home world—the biosphere, the ecosphere, the atmosphere, the hydrosphere, the terrasphere—and to one another, is now inescapably before us. (We have even literally filled the planet's surrounding outer space beyond the Kármán line with space debris.) The intentional ignorance of our self-generated consequences has been conditioned into the species with the pernicious false belief that humans are somehow separate from nature, a special case, instead of the truth that we are an interdependent and integral part of it.

The elders of every indigenous group I have encountered, look upon the "white man" and his mechanistic, greed and control driven industrial technologies, as the destroyer of life. I hope that is not yet irreversibly true. I hope we all awaken before that insight into our chronic nature plays out as an inevitability. The Manitoba government must act effectively and immediately to face the challenge of climate change. If it doesn't, those responsible will be rightfully viewed as the squanderers of the lives of future generations. The time for denial is over.

Ervin Bartha

Re: Bill 16

I am in full support of implementing Bill 16. The time for dithering about details and denial and finger pointing is past. Everyone has seen how the climate has been changing in the last few decades and the changes are accelerating.

I have friends in India who say the hot season temperatures have risen by 10 degrees celcius in the last decade often peaking at 50C in May compared to 40C only a decade or so ago. When I was visiting family members in Oregon this summer the average daily high was in the mid 30s and the rain stops for months, only returning in October. Out of curiosity I checked the high temperatures in Eugene Oregon in the early 80s and they were also about 10C lower on average....low to mid 20s were the usual highs in July of 1980. Even winnipeg winters which everyone complains about are much warmer than when I was a child. Back in the 1960s and 1970s there was always a solid week of minus 40C temperatures and this was without windchill.

We have just had a record breaking hot and dry summer. Driving out to Treherne I saw many fields of golden corn which may have made King Midas happy but gold means dead when you are dealing

with plants. And what happened to autumn? The temperatures plunged and for several weeks we had rain, rain, more rain and a fair amount of snow.

Anyhow, storms are intensifying and those who are concerned about the costs of mitigating climate change should check the costs of clean up for the intense climate events unfolding every week around the globe and closer to home. Ottawa just had a freak tornado event that cut power to 10s if not 100s of thousands of people for a few days along with destroying many homes and forcing even more evacuations.

Experts agree that a carbon tax is an economically sound and the least costly way to actually make a difference in carbon pollution. I call on the Conservative government to share all of the information about the carbon tax including the fact that individuals will receive huge rebates for the tax they pay. To spin this tax as just another tax is irresponsible. Do your due diligence of research and start responding to the threat of climate change, which, at this point is the second greatest threat to human existence after nuclear war.

We no longer have time to dicker and debate. Climate change is real and humans are responsible for accelerating it beyond comprehension. We have been told for many many decades that we cannot continue to pollute with no regard for consequences. It is insane for a species to actively destroy the eco system it relies on for its existence. Many people seem blinded by the pursuit of money but money is useless with no healthy environment. You can neither eat money, nor drink money, nor heat your home with it.

Denial is a waste of time. Denial is the flip side of apathy. It is time to take action and Bill 16 is a Bill of action. I am in full support of this Bill. The consequences of allowing climate change to continue at its current pace is terrifying to me and I cannot, in good conscience, condemn my descendants to a filthy toxic world with an uninhabitable climate. How dare we do this to our children's children's children. We owe it to future generations to do the right thing and be remembered in history as a significant turning point for human civilization.

Thank you

Deborah Judith  
Register Music Teacher



Re: Bill 16

Government Of Manitoba Committees,

Hello, my name is Alex Green and I am a second year science student at the University of Manitoba. I first want to start off with an apology for not being able to attend the meetings and give an oral presentation as I am very busy with midterms at this time of the year. I chose to present a submission to you as I feel it is very important for the people of my generation to take a stand, and make noise and make sure we are heard on important issues such as the state of our environment and what we should be doing about it.

When my environmental sciences professor told my class about this standing, she told us to review Bill 16 before giving a submission, but a guest speaker (Mr. Rob Altemeyer) we had told us basically to just tell the committees what we want to see changed. I tried reviewing Bill 16, but it was very political language, which I have a very hard time processing and understanding. While reviewing Bill 16—The Climate and Green Plan Implementations Act it came to my understanding that it is a framework (Keep in mind I'm a science student, not a political studies student). So here are some ideas (some very broad) to insert into the framework you've developed:

1. My first concern is, where is the presentation of information? The only place I have heard about any sort of environmental issues, is Twitter. Which, mostly only applies to people of my generation. But I don't believe my generation (mostly) is the problem, we are the ones who are aware of the situation, the ones who know changes need to be made, the ones making the changes by using reusable bags, becoming vegan/vegetarian reducing our carbon footprint, and even starting composting systems at U of M. The issue of environmental awareness is your generation (not all of you of course, that would be quite the generalization again). I'm not sure if it's a lack of knowledge or simple ignorance, either way the situation is not ideal. In the case that it's just a lack of knowledge, we need education. I asked my mom what she thought would be the most effective way to truly reach people and she said free informational sessions in local communities putting special emphasis on the implications of our actions on future generations to come, but the information must be a bit more understandable and pamphlets should be handed out giving recycling guidelines, cheap and easy ways to reduce your carbon

footprint, as well as organic alternatives. Being what my mom would call an "envirogeek", I'm sure I could persuade family members and friends to attend these sessions. The sessions shouldn't run more than an hour and half as everyone is busy, meaning it would also have to be local (e.g. schools, community centres, etc.), not downtown. This is something I would expect the city to organize with volunteers. I'm fully aware how difficult volunteers are to come by, which is why I believe this volunteer position could be something done through the universities and colleges of Winnipeg and gives students opportunities to add extra credit to their CCR (a special student record that you want to look really good if you're applying to graduate studies).

2. A second concern of mine would be maintaining the few green spaces we have within our city. A friend of mine lives in the Charleswood area right off of Wilkes on Charleswood road. In this area as you may already know, there are plenty of green spaces and within these intervals of green there's bike trails- something that positively involves the community with nature! With the new development forming literally right off of Wilkes right behind Charleswood road, the city is looking to diminish these green spaces (or at least you were, I'm not sure if that's still the case). I read an article in the eco-journal elaborating on some concerns with a "Natural Area Assessment" that was released by the city of Winnipeg regarding the Ridgewood South development area. This survey is supposed to help identify natural areas that may be considered for protection, but some concerns that were brought up with this assessment were the timing of the survey did not allow assessment of early blooming species and the NAA did not acknowledge the presence of many species listed on the Red list (CCHP, Cosens, & Macdonald. 2012).

3. Third, the businesses of this city have major issues with recycling for some reason. I spent my summer working at the Manitoba museum as a science communicator. This was the first workplace I had worked in that put in such an effort to be sustainable and eco-friendly. We would sort our recycling, signage everywhere how to sort it, reusing all sorts of recyclable or garbage scraps, it was truly an inspiring experience. I believe the Manitoba government should be encouraging and maybe even enforcing sustainable work environments. Many older generations don't like change, so this is why it may need to be enforced somehow. When I say

enforced, I don't mean businesses will start getting fined for putting an egg carton in the garbage. By enforcement, I mean it should be a legal requirement for all businesses to recycle (for example). While working at the museum over the summer, I also held my regular job I have been working for 3 years now, as a bakery clerk. Speaking for only my store, we do not recycle. Although, we do provide our goods packaged in recyclable materials for the most part. Recycling really is not that difficult and it should be emphasized so much more, especially for big corporate companies with 100+ employees eating their lunches everyday out of paper boxes. Again, the issue of proper recycling comes into play when people are throwing dirty food boxes in the recycling, which brings me to the point of possibly bringing in a workplace recycling "tutorial" included in the yearly training.

4. The final issue I want to bring up is the big one. Our carbon footprint and greenhouse gas emissions. I am a full supporter of the Carbon tax. The Carbon tax will promote clean energy to consumers while still making a profit. A big question to ask is what should we do with the revenue? As a consumer, I think about 50% of the revenue should be given back to the municipalities so we can locally develop our communities and programs to be more green on the micro scale. As stated earlier on this month, Mr. Pallister is dropping the proposed 25\$/tonne carbon tax in exchange for the made-in-Manitoba cap-and-trade solution (Froese, 2018). Which in my opinion, for lack of a better word, is stupid. I don't see how that will help reduce emissions at all. From what I have pieced together with a basic sense of logic, it will only maintain our current emissions. Mr. Brian Pallister's argument relies on the fact that we are already a somewhat green/clean-energy province, which again for lack of better word, seems a bit petty to me. I believe the cap-and-trade solution will only keep us at the same levels we are at right now for emissions, but we need to do better, and we can do better, with a carbon tax (possibly not as high as 25\$/tonne, but still some sort of implemented carbon tax).

With that, I conclude my submission for Bill 16–The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act. I'm sorry if this was a little lengthy or too short (I'm not too clear on how long "brief" is considered). Again, I am also so sorry for not being able to attend the meeting and present orally as I feel a lively oral presentation would've been much more effective

and stimulating. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Alex Green

---

Re: Bill 16

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a presentation as a private citizen on Bill 16, the Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act.

As is noted in the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan, and acknowledged in the Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act, Manitoba has the potential to be a national and international leader in clean energy.

The purpose of this submission is to: i) propose mechanisms for implementation through science-policy fellowships, training, and research and development opportunities, ii) highlight the pivotal role to be played by natural and built heritage preservation in emissions reductions, and iii) advocate for the development of an electric mobility economy in Manitoba that builds on local expertise in hydroelectric power and electric bus manufacturing.

Mechanisms for implementation of Bill 16 include research and development and training opportunities that build on Manitoba's strengths, namely its universities and colleges. In particular, Section 11(1) pertaining to the Low Carbon Government office could include a clause or statement on government partnerships with Manitoba universities and colleges through initiatives such as a climate change science-policy fellowship program that would promote strong collaborations between government, academia and other stakeholders, economic growth and job creation, and continuity in training in emissions reduction strategies relevant to Manitoba, possibly supported in part through the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Fund. The fellowship program could offer a mechanism by which the Low Carbon Government office mandate is met.

I would like to bring to your attention a recent Winnipeg Free Press editorial (Addressing climate change in cities–Winnipeg Free Press.pdf, October 24, 2018) highlighting the significant role of built and natural heritage preservation in emissions reductions. In Section 11(2) a clause could be incorporated encouraging built and natural heritage preservation in Manitoba in light of reduced

emissions associated with redevelopment over demolition, and the role of urban and rural canopies as a carbon sink.

Initiatives noted in the article including the development of a standardized emissions monitoring and reporting strategy that would ensure targets and timelines are met in emissions-intensive sectors such as transportation, building, and agriculture could also be applied in a provincial context.

Finally, please find enclosed an open letter from a forum on electric mobility, "Moving towards a green energy future", held in January, 2018 at the Bay downtown. In the context of the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan, recommendations including the development of an electric and hydrogen mobility strategy for Manitoba that promotes economic growth and equality of opportunity could be incorporated as an additional area of focus in Section 11(2) for the Low Carbon Government office.

In summary, the Manitoba Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act provides an opportunity for Manitoba to realize its potential as a national and international leader in a decarbonized economy. Research, development and training opportunities, recognition and preservation of built and natural heritage, the development of an electric mobility and low-carbon economy through local partnerships amongst corporations and institutions that define Manitoba's role as a leader in clean energy, will ensure continuity in a vision and transition to a low-carbon future.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jennifer V. Lukovich

---

Re: Bill 16

Climate change is the biggest threat we face today. The science is clear: carbon dioxide is a trapping solar energy causing the atmosphere to warm up. Scientists regularly report that the longer we continue to emit massive quantities of CO<sub>2</sub>, the more damage we will do to ourselves and the planet.

Climate change is the biggest challenge facing the planet today and people like you in positions of power should know that. You have access to the scientists. You have access to facts. You must know that bold action is required.

Last year, this government chose to eliminate the 50-50 transit funding arrangement. This has left cities around the province in a position of perpetual uncertainty about future funding. This policy decision makes no sense when it is well known that carbon reductions are necessary. This government has tossed around the idea of purchasing electric buses. But amid service cuts, less people will be riding, negating the entire premise of going electric.

Public transit is a service and it is the service element of transit that must be funded. Transit must be frequent and affordable to entice ridership. And the more people ride, the less carbon intensive our society will be.

This Government also recently announced that it was backing away from a carbon tax. It seems a little strange to me that a government that ostensibly believes in market economics and climate change would think that there is an option more economically efficient than a carbon tax.

A carbon tax doesn't tell anyone what to do; It doesn't mandate that individuals live carbon free lives. It is about pricing pollution. It is about saying we are willing to pay for the costs of our polluting lifestyles instead of offloading the burden onto the next generation.

Is it moral to force others to clean up the mess you made? Of course it isn't. But by cancelling the carbon tax without creating meaningful alternatives that's exactly what you're doing. But it's even worse. Prevention now will be less expensive than cleaning up later. So even though we have the affordable option for cleaning up our mess, you are choosing to force those who aren't making the mess pay even more than we would to clean it up.

A carbon tax is about disincentivizing the use of carbon fuel. And to be effective, it must be applied collectively. Without collective action, the ongoing use of carbon fuels and heavy carbon lifestyles will continue to prevail over lower carbon lifestyles. We have seen this dynamic play out in the transformation of our cities to be oriented around the automobile. As private vehicles have become the main mode of transportation, neighbourhoods have come to be built to prioritize that mode of transportation to the detriment of all others. When we used to build corner grocery stores, we now locate super centres a couple kilometers away from shoppers' houses. Not only has this situation made it difficult for folks who want to lead less carbon intensive lives to do so, it has, perversely, made running even the most basic

errands more time consuming, more expensive and more carbon-reliant. By properly pricing carbon, we create the collective incentive required to make our societies less expensive for individuals and families.

By deciding to cancel the carbon tax, this government has put itself in a position where they must come up with an alternative in order to demonstrate to Manitobans that they take the threat of climate change seriously. If you will not create disincentives to fossil fuel use, you must provide incentives to reduce carbon emissions instead. One key way to reduce reliance on fossil fuels is to reverse the decision on the 50-50 public transit funding arrangement for Manitoba municipalities. Last year's funding cut to municipal transit agencies led to service cuts in Brandon and a very large fare increase in Winnipeg. That kind of legislative action makes it more difficult for Manitobans to lead environmentally-friendly lives. Research consistently shows that frequent and affordable service increases ridership.

Steps like these are a must for any environmentally conscious government.

This government must take climate change seriously and with the cancelling of the 50-50 funding arrangement for transit and the canceling of the carbon tax, it has shown itself to be ignoring one of the greatest threats of our time.

Joseph Kornelsen

Re: Bill 16

Good Evening,

My name is Robin Bryan. I'm here today share some thoughts with you about this climate bill as a fellow citizen of Manitoba. I'm not here to regale you with the dire predictions that science has told us, about the chaotic future we face with a warming climate, we've all heard enough to know it doesn't look good. We are in trouble.

I'm here to talk to you as a recent father, my first child a son, Taiga Wolfe Bryan was born 6 months ago and has proven to be a source of constant laughs, giggles and joy in our lives. Many of you have

shared the experience of new parenthood, the change of perspective, the effort it takes to provide for them, a deeper sense of responsibility. And just like you, the day will come when I can no longer can or should protect Taiga from learning about the troubling realities of the world we live in, and he'll learn that our world is headed toward a time of immense loss and suffering. The stable climate we've built our society upon is spiraling toward increase chaos.

He'll also learn that there are solutions, that there have been solutions for a long time and he'll ask me, What did you do? Dad, you lived in a time where we could have prevented so much of this, what did you do to stop this?

Like all of us, I will struggle to explain how I used and benefitted from the carbon economy and I think I'll always feel like I could have done more. Do you feel like this Climate Implementation Bill is enough? Can you tell your kids it was enough?

I don't claim any moral high ground on climate any more or less than any of you sitting here. I just what you to think about what you're going to tell your kids, or grandkids, or if you're lucky, your great grand kids when they ask you what you could have done to prevent this.

Because one day, when you've moved on from the political games you're expected to play as the member of a major political party, you'll need to think about this. Was is worth the political points scored to fight a carbon tax? Was is worth betting the future that you will pass on to your kids, to help the Conservative Party build an election platform? What is it going to take? How dramatic the changes, how deep the losses before the Conservative party realizes that bold action on climate change is a conservative issue just as much as a progressive, liberal issue, a human issue. We are all answerable. We need to stop thinking about this as a partisan issue, we need all parties to accept our responsibilities to address climate change and place the needs of our kids first.

Sincerely,

Robin Bryan  
Father, Manitoba Citizen

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>**