

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

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

Vol. LXXI No. 80A - 10 a.m., Thursday, October 25, 2018

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, October 25, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Please be seated. Good morning, everybody.

In accordance with rule 24 and as previously announced, we will now consider Bill 216, The Human Rights Code—oh.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Madam Speaker: In accordance with rule 24 and as previously announced, we will now consider Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act, which is the second selected bill from the second opposition party.

As a reminder to the House, this bill will be debated until 10:30.

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 216—The Human Rights Code Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: So, moving then to second reading of Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the MLA for Kewatinook, that Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code des droits de la personne, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, members of the Chamber, this bill will put physical size and weight as protected characteristics under the Human Rights Code.

The bill asks Manitobans to be fair and respectful in their treatment of others regardless of whether the person is small or tall, slim or fat.

It is time for those who are obese or thin, small or tall, to be treated with fairness, with respect and understanding and without discrimination in our society.

The judgment, bias and discrimination toward people based on their weight, shape or size disproportionately affects people seeking health care, education and employment and all too often results in poorer mental health, poorer physical health and, as a result, leads to increased costs to the health-care system and other government services such as EIA and housing.

Lindsey Mazur has recently written and shared examples of Manitobans who would have benefited from the passage of this bill. I won't repeat them here. I will note that since bullying based on physical size or weight is common in schools, this bill will help the children of our province, as in the years ahead, by providing a helpful perspective of others, regardless of size or weight.

One of the concerns that has been raised is that there might be additional costs to the health-care system if this bill were passed. Dr. Mary Forhan, who was recently in Winnipeg, has looked at this issue in work she's doing in Medicine Hat. She has found that any costs are outweighed by short-term and long-term savings in enabling improved health care for those with large bodies and so that the health care can be done more quickly so they can be discharged earlier and healthier and in fact save dollars for the health-care system.

In speaking today, I specifically extend an apology to the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook). In my previous comments on this bill and in a subsequent Free Press editorial, an inaccurate reference was made to the remarks of the MLA for La Verendrye, which suggested he didn't support the bill. I apologize to the MLA for La Verendrye. I'm sorry about this.

I want to thank Lindsey Mazur, Samantha Rayburn Trubyk, Elaine Stevenson and many others for helping me understand the stigma and discrimination that has existed in Manitoba with

reference to physical size and weight and for their support for Bill 216. I want to thank Dr. Arya Sharma, Dr. Mary Forhan and Ian Patton who came to Winnipeg recently to talk about the need to pass Bill 216. I want to thank my staff and our caucus staff and Legislative Counsel for this assistance with bill 16. And I would most particularly like to thank Dr. Moe Lerner, who sadly passed away earlier this year.

I hope all MLAs will today support Bill 216 going to committee so it can have further input from Manitobans.

Thank you. Merci. Miigwech.

Questions

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

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): Thank you to my colleague, the member for River Heights, for bringing in this bill and, obviously, initiating a conversation that's overdue here in the province.

I'm wondering if the member for River Heights can share any conversations or consultations he's had with the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and, more importantly, any advice they gave to the member in terms of strengthening this proposal.

Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I thank the member.

Yes, indeed, I have met with board members of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission. We had a really good dialogue. We went over the fact that, under the present Human Rights Code, although some individuals with different body size and weight would be covered under the category disabilities, that there are clearly others who would not be covered under the category disabilities. So it is clearly a valid and important additional inclusion to put physical size and weight.

They offered—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I want to commend the member for River Heights for bringing this bill forward again.

I just want to follow up on that last point. The only real criticism I've heard is those who say, well, this could already be covered under the disability provisions in the Human Rights Code. I don't share that view; I don't believe the member for River Heights does. And I wonder if he could expand a little bit more on that point.

* (10:10)

Mr. Gerrard: There are, in fact, two Canadian cases where people with large bodies were considered to be healthy and not disabled. Quite frankly, there are many people who are fat or obese who are—who exercise a lot. They can even be physical trainers and are clearly very fit and not disabled.

And so it's not only that. There may be people who are of small size or large size, tall stature, who are not necessarily disabled, who would be covered under this. So it's clearly, as the discussions that I had with the members of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, that this is a, you know, a valid—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Martin: I always appreciate hearing from my colleague, the member for River Heights, as he articulates the validity of hearing from Manitobans on this bill.

Now, I know the Supreme Court has ruled that the—that discrimination should be given a broad context and a broad interpretation in order to ensure that all Canadians are covered and protected, and how does the member view the Supreme Court ruling in the context of the legislation he's bringing forward in terms of, I guess, redundancy or whether or not this actually may, in fact, strengthen our Human Rights Code?

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for that question because, you know, clearly, the Supreme Court is, in a sense, reaching in this direction. But it's clear from the discussion with people at the Human Rights Commission here, and it's clear from people who have gone to our Human Rights Commission that unless the discrimination fits under one of the categories—gender, sex, race, ethnicity, or in this case we put physical size and weight—that there is not a case that they can really investigate and that they can get involved with.

And so it really is essential that we include physical size and weight to make it very clear that these are protected characteristics.

Mr. Martin: The member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) identified at the beginning some correspondence sent around by Lindsey. I received the same correspondence identifying a number of examples of individuals who were on the receiving end of discrimination based on body type and size and that.

I'm wondering if the member could share any detail as to whether any of those cases, to his knowledge, were brought to the human rights—Manitoba Human Rights Commission and whether they were investigated, or perhaps it's that lack of investigation that has led to the proposal of Bill 216 today.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes. One of the cases that Lindsey Mazur mentioned went to the Human Rights Commission. And, you know, it was, in fact, difficult, right, for the Human Rights Commission because of the question of disability. They, of course, looked at, you know, whether or not there was discrimination, and they did that in a responsible and fair way, which is really what we're asking for here.

Another of the cases was in the process of going to the Human Rights Commission, but it was never—the individual died before—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Martin: I'd like to give the member a little more time to articulate the first component of his answer when he said that one of the cases was indeed brought forward to the Human Rights Commission, but they found it difficult. But what was the, I guess, the final conclusion of the Human Rights Commission? Although they may have found it difficult, were they able to find a resolution to the complaint, or was it identified that the, I guess, lack of specificity in the Human Rights Commission made it too difficult for them to properly investigate that claim of discrimination?

Mr. Gerrard: I think the first thing I would say is that had there been physical size and weight under the Human Rights Code, there would be no question at all that it would have fallen under the Human Rights Code. So this would be helpful.

In that particular case, the Human Rights Commission investigated, and they did not find discrimination. It was still a matter of contention,

but, I mean, that is the role of the Human Rights Commission and that is what, you know, we're trying to ask in this bill, that the Human Rights Commission be given this mandate so that they can look carefully and fairly at situations, which they have a reputation for doing.

Mr. Martin: Madam Speaker, one of the, I guess, guiding, not necessarily principles, but guiding—I can't think of the proper word, but anyway—we often look to as legislators, what are—what have other jurisdictions do in terms of best practices. Now, that isn't to suggest that there aren't instances where Manitoba has been on the vanguard of protecting human rights. In fact, the recent women's day in recognizing Manitoba's role in identifying or providing women the right to vote would never have occurred if we just simply had that attitude that, you know, no one should be the first. But, that being said, I'm just wondering if the member can share with us if there's any other jurisdictions in—or in Canada that have this definition within them.

Mr. Gerrard: If we look, starting outside of Canada, I believe, in Michigan, they have this provision with regard to employment. I think that there are other countries, a couple, which have moved in this direction, and, clearly, this is the direction which is being taken in other provinces. There's movement in Ontario and Alberta to do this. It hasn't reached the stage of legislation passing at this point, but, for instance, people from Obesity Canada have been across the country in monitoring the situation. We had Dr. Arya Sharma here, and not long ago, presenting on this. You know, this is clearly something—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Martin: And I thank my colleague for sharing that perspective and that information, and, again, there are times that we will want to lead the country on this file or any number of files, and it is important that we as legislatures take a look at that, and I said, like, not use the fact that there may not be another jurisdiction as an excuse for inaction.

And I'm wondering—I know the member did articulate a number of jurisdictions south of the border or overseas and that some—at least two provinces are looking at it. I'm wondering if he has any perspective on, potentially, the federal government and whether or not they're looking at any changes on a national level that may supersede what he's proposing here today.

Mr. Gerrard: I'm not specifically aware of changes at the national level or what is happening. What I can say is that, you know, this is clearly the direction it is going, and we as legislatures, this legislative session and the MLAs here have a chance, right, to step forward. We have a chance to at least let this go to committee so we can hear from others and get an additional perspective from the citizens of Manitoba, and I think that is worthwhile doing, and I hope you'd be supportive.

Madam Speaker: The time for questions has expired.

Debate

Madam Speaker: Debate is open.

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): It's always a pleasure to rise in this House, and I think it's very apropos that we're discussing this bill the day after municipal elections here in Manitoba that saw a large number of people put their names forward on a ballot in order to ensure that the democratic choice remains here in Manitoba and in Canada at large. And if it wasn't for the courage of those individuals to put their lives on hold and to put themselves out there—and sometimes it can be a challenge in more ways than one, not just a financial challenge and time challenge, but in today's world of social media, can lead to unfortunate anonymous attacks and such. But, again, our democracy is strengthened by the involvement of all those individuals who put their names forward. And so I say congratulations to everyone who will be either re-elected—who was either re-elected or elected yesterday in their municipal councils. And I know we as a government, indeed, all members of this House, look forward to working with our municipal counterparts.

And so it is with that that I have an appreciation for what the member is doing today. And I think not only is it appropriate that we're debating this bill in light of the municipal elections yesterday, but maybe most members aren't aware of this, but actually today is dwarfism awareness day, on today, October 25th.

* (10:20)

So, again, I think it is very appropriate, and I don't know if it is by plan or by just sheer coincidence that the member for River Heights' (Mr. Gerrard) private member's bill here on The Human Rights Code Amendment Act is coming forward this Thursday on Dwarfism Awareness Day. But, again, I think it just will highlight to all of us as legislators the need to look at the—at this legislation

and this request that those protections for all Manitobans be enshrined within the Human Rights Code here in Manitoba.

Now, I listened carefully to the member for River Heights, and he always has, I think, a good perspective, and I know he has challenged this legislation and he's brought forward a number of supporters. And I know in one of his comments, he made a reference to individuals who may be larger, who despite their size are actually quite physically fit.

And it's interesting, Madam Speaker, because myself and actually the member for Minto (Mr. Swan) are avid runners and our paths will often cross on the half-marathon courses and that. And I've had the opportunity to teach a number of clinics through the Running Room. And it always struck me as to the variety of individuals who come forward to train for a particular goal, whether that be a half-a-10K or a half or a full marathon.

And it—I remember one individual in particular when I ran and was training for my first full marathon. His name was Brad and he worked at Maple Leaf. And I don't know if it was too much bacon and that, but he had decided that—to embark on a healthy lifestyle. But what was interesting in his perspective, again—and—that his goal was health, not weight, Madam Speaker. And there is a difference between the two of them.

We can be healthy and not fit a certain mould perpetuated, whether it's by, you know, the—you know, whether it's perpetuated by the media, magazines or the culture in which we live, that there is no, sort of, perfect mould. And I always was astounded by his amazing stamina as we would go out and run, you know, 10, 15, 20 miles as we prepared for the Manitoba Marathon. Because he didn't, you know, fit the—sort of—your stereotypical physique of a runner. But that being said, he more than made up to it in terms of just sheer stamina and endurance where he maybe, you know, not have met those criteria earlier. So he did meet his goal of becoming fitter and becoming healthier, but you didn't actually—you didn't see—and, again, he didn't identify weight loss as being a significant motivator. Again, it was the birth of a child and a desire to obviously see that through.

Now, the member mentioned Samantha Trubyk, who I consider a friend. I used to—I got to know Samantha first—and Samantha is the president of Little People here in Manitoba. And they've had

awareness days here in Manitoba, just last year, in the Golden Boy Room—again, advocating on behalf of Manitobans to ensure that awareness is there. I got to first know Samantha during my previous role as the executive director of reaching employment equality services, where we help people with physical or health—physical disabilities or health circumstances find or improve their employment circumstances. And Samantha had come to us in relation to her son, and—who also is a little person—and obviously the barriers that he faced in terms of identifying employment opportunities and a willingness on the part of some employers to look past stature and instead look to the skill set that this young man could bring forward. And I'm pleased in that instance that we were successful, and I do hope that that success for him in terms of employment opportunities has continued, Madam Speaker.

The—and, obviously, this isn't just simply about height or lack thereof. I mean, the member has identified that this is a broad range of identified characteristics. So, you know, some people are—can be discriminated against potentially for being too thin, that, you know, they may be considered unhealthy and an employer, you know, unfortunately—or an individual may think, you know, I don't want to take a chance on this person because they, you know, they look, you know, quote, unquote, you know, near death or something, Madam Speaker.

And, of course, we often hear—or too often we hear stories in the news of individuals who may be on the larger size, who are put in a position of being publicly embarrassed because they're—because a particular business or maybe an airline aren't able or willing to make those necessary or requested accommodations in a respectful manner, Madam Speaker.

Now, I know there have been some comments made, Madam Speaker, as to whether or not the current Manitoba Human Rights Code and commission has the ability, based on the current legislation and current wording, to protect individuals as identified by the member of River Heights under the basis of size and weight as a characteristic of disability, and maybe that, you know what, I don't disagree with the member.

And I think the member of Minto also made reference to it as well. And that might be the crux of some of the conversation and it's that attribution of the word disability to these individuals. Being a little

person is not a disability, being a tall person is not a disability and being large is not a disability.

And so I see that point, and I see it as a valid point, that that imposition of that phrase, in terms of identifying themselves as a person who has received—on the receiving end of some sort of discrimination within society is only valid because society sees them as disabled, Madam Speaker.

And, obviously, it's incumbent upon us as legislators to ensure that we are all educated, that we all are valid. As individuals, we all have something to contribute, Madam Speaker. Obviously, we are not there yet. We have come a long way, but there is no doubt from all our lives and all our perspectives that there is more to do.

So, again, I thank the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), for bringing this bill forward, bringing—for starting a conversation here in Manitoba. I know on this side of the House that we are supportive of moving this bill forward to committee so that we can hear from Manitobans and that Manitobans can share their perspectives on this bill, on the member River Heights' perspective and they can identify ways to improve the Human Rights Code here in Manitoba, whether or not the Human Rights Code currently meets those objectives and that.

But, yes, I think on this side of the House that we agree that Manitobans' voice should be heard on this bill through the committee. So I look forward to continuing debate discussion on this bill brought forward by the member for River Heights.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): The only thing harder than speaking for 30 minutes in this House is speaking for about a minute and a half. Let me be very clear that our NDP caucus supports this bill moving ahead to committee.

The road to full inclusion and the road to human rights is not a sprint; it is a marathon and sometimes a long and difficult path. There was a time in this province when people were not protected from discrimination against having a physical or mental disability.

There was a time when people weren't protected from discrimination based on their political beliefs. There was a time, only 30 years ago, when people were not protected from discrimination based on their sexual orientation, and Manitoba became only the second province in Canada to make that protection.

And there was a time, only six years ago, when people were not protected from discrimination based on their gender identity. And we were actually the first province in Canada to move ahead with that protection, although only one day ahead of Ontario, thanks to my friend Cheri DiNovo, an MPP in that province.

And I think the member for Morris (Mr. Martin) has touched on one of the most important issues, and that is that many of the people who are supporting this bill not only say that they do not have a disability, that is the very crux of their argument.

Somebody's ability to seek redress because they've been refused employment or a promotion or housing or health care, it's not because that they have disability. Frankly, it's that they would like the world to know they are not disabled. They are full members of our society and the Human Rights Code should reflect that.

Thank you, Madam—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

As per the written notice, debate on Bill 216 is now concluded, and we will move on to the next item of business.

* (10:30)

**Bill 231—The Municipal Harassment Policy Act
(Various Acts Amended)**

Madam Speaker: In accordance with rule 24 and as previously announced, we will now consider Bill 231, The Municipal Harassment Policy Act (Various Acts Amended), which is the third and final selected bill from the second opposition party.

As a reminder to the House, this bill will be debated until 11 a.m. So we will now move, then, to Bill 233–231. Pardon me.

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): I move, seconded by the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), that Bill 231, The Municipal Harassment Policy Act (Various Acts Amended), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Ms. Klassen: First of all, I'd like to thank the persons who came forward to share their, at times, very traumatic stories with me. It was quite surprising that at this time and day such policies against harassment aren't already in play, but then all I have to do is remember whose parties have been in

government, and then I know why the reason they're not.

You know, one person's hair was pulled. How do you go back to work? How do you go back to facing that very same person when this has happened, when—and how do you go home? There's just simply no recourse for such actions.

I'd like to give a special shout-out to the new mayor of West St. Paul, Cheryl Christianson [*phonetic*]. She has been very vocal in this respect and has also been very instrumental in this bill.

It's time to put policies in action that would protect any persons from harmful behaviours in our workspaces across our province. We spend so much on workplace safety. My husband is in construction, and the progress that's been made to keep our workers safe from physical harm from when he first started decades ago to what it is today is quite contrasting. But that's only a physical aspect. We need to, yet again, borrow teachings from my people. For a human to have complete well-being, we need to also address the body, the mind, emotions and spirit. We need to have a holistic approach when it comes to people when they are at the primary function in life, when they are at work.

I've been there, where bully—where the bully tries every which way to diminish you. This has to stop. Our schools across the province teach our kids respectful behaviours, to be tolerant, and although there is still much work to be done in that area, the fact is, they are progressing.

Our own First Nation buried a 15-year-old yesterday, and that young girl, she was a star student. We don't know why it happened. But there was a lot of rumours circulating that she was bullied. And, in the end, she chose to stop the bullying, but not by entrusting us adults, but by taking her own life.

There has to be rules put into play and consequences if those rules aren't followed. If we're teaching this to kids, then surely we can teach these good types of behaviours to adults. We need to create those good workspaces for all. Life is hard enough today with all that we're going through in this province—a have-not province, mind you.

This bill is our team's attempt to start the conversation on dealing with municipal harassment issues amongst elected officials right across our province. We would also really like for our own conflict-of-interest legislation to be updated, but

we're more than happy to start this conversation today.

Megwetch, Madam Speaker.

Questions

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

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): I thank the member for her brief introduction. And also for mentioning specifically, at least one municipal politician that she consulted with in terms of the mayor of West St. Paul, but I was hoping the member could also spend a few minutes—we'll see what you can fit into the 45-second response—about the consultations that she did, hopefully, with others, prior to introducing this bill.

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): This was a team effort. Several women who sit on municipal councils across Manitoba brought forward a resolution to protect politicians from workplace bullying, which passed at the 2017 AMM convention, with an approval of 91 per cent of the voting members.

So we worked with those women closely in developing this bill, as well as the AMM leadership.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): So I do just want to take a moment to just congratulate the member for Kewatinook for putting this bill forward. I just lift you up today and say miigwech for that. And so I would ask the member for Kewatinook, of those folks that were consulted, what kinds of suggestions were made in respect of implementing this bill.

Ms. Klassen: That's exactly—you know, there's just no Greek horse. There's no processes in place that were defined processes, it was just, you know, every time something happened, they would start from the very beginning and not have any idea as to how to go about. So some of the things we'd like—as, you know, how to make a complaint, you know, how to investigate and report on such a complaint, and of course, the rules or the censures that would come forth, or, you know, suspensions if it had to be taken to that level.

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): Can the member indicate that, in view of the fact that there is a municipal election yesterday and there's certainly new members of the MMA that will be participating in further discussions in regards to municipal affairs, whether or not she'd taken that into consideration—to hear further input from the MMA.

Ms. Klassen: I'm sorry. I couldn't really make out his question. Can he repeat it?

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. James to repeat his question.

Mr. Johnston: Just to summarize the question: basically, there are new members that are involved in the Manitoba municipal association based on the elections that took place yesterday, and I was asking whether or not you'd taken—the member had taken that into consideration when she was indicating consultation on her bill.

Ms. Klassen: I believe that this is a great step forward across—this will be a great step forward across our province. And I'd like to congratulate all the newly elected officials throughout the province. But I believe that, you know, I would definitely be working with all our new partners in those municipalities, and once they review the bill themselves, you know, I'm sure they'll be more than happy to get on board. It's a great start. And I believe that this is the way we need to progress.

Mr. Teitsma: I noticed in the list of individuals that were consulted with, that the City of Winnipeg wasn't specifically addressed and certainly, for someone like myself, where I have my own prior city councillor now facing criminal charges for his conduct, I think it's important also in the context of the City of Winnipeg to consider what bullying and harassment might look like at that level. So I was wondering if the member consulted within the City of Winnipeg on this bill.

* (10:40)

Ms. Klassen: Yes, I would be happy to report that the City of Winnipeg moved on to implement an office to oversee their own issues. But I believe that we should go province-wide, you know. Smaller municipalities should also be protected.

Mr. Johnston: Thank you, Madam Chairman—or, Madam Speaker.

I was wondering whether or not the member can indicate whether or not she's had any discussions with our minister of municipal affairs in regards to

how the department may be proceeding in this particular issue.

Ms. Klassen: Yes, I would gladly take any meeting with the minister. I've been waiting for an invite. You know, lots of my First Nations have been waiting for an invite or an acceptance to their meetings, so I'd be more than happy to sit down with any minister.

Mr. Teitsma: Now, I think—I hope the member would agree with me that the best way to work with municipalities is not to dictate to them the way that they should operate, but rather to consult broadly with them. Now, I know that the member has mentioned a few individuals within the organization. She also referenced a consultation with the leadership of AMM.

I was wondering if the member agrees that it is worth it to take the time to consult with a broader selection of individuals across the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, the entirety of the leadership team, not only one or two members, and give many people the opportunity to—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Ms. Klassen: Yes, and I would welcome any of the members from that team to come and see what true consultation looks like. It involves going to tables, going door to door to every household in your riding and making sure those voices are heard.

You know, they have a big—there is a big problem with consultation of the indigenous people, and so, you know—I'm the expert on that. You know, you're more than welcome to come to every single table in your riding and that's how we—that's how it needs to be done. All people need to be at that table and you need to speak on behalf of all people in this province, and so I would welcome any one of those members to come to my riding and we'll go and sit down at any kitchen table in my riding.

Mr. Teitsma: Certainly, we, on this side of the House are very much aware of what a good consultation looks like and we're currently engaged in our prebudget consultations, and there's been thousands of Manitobans who will be given the opportunity this time again as there was last year time to give feedback.

But it sounds like the member thinks that she should introduce her legislation first and do the consultations latter—after. Is that what I heard from her?

Ms. Klassen: Yes, well, if it does pass the committee stage we'll have more than enough people coming and providing input and giving us feedback, and if it doesn't, then, you know, we'll definitely go back to those kitchen tables to see what exactly—how it can be redrafted to accommodate—to make sure that we are appealing to all Manitobans.

Mr. Johnston: A normal process when you're consulting on an issue like this with an organization such as the Manitoba municipal association you deal with the executive, and the president of the MMA has indicated that he working with the minister of municipal affairs currently to develop policies. So I'm just wondering whether or not the member feels it appropriate to actually talk to the executive of the AMM.

Ms. Klassen: Okay. Thanks for that clarification. I was wondering what the MMA was because I went to the AMM. And so, yes, you know, the president did say that he was also working with the new government and so, you know, the more voices that are at the table the better, you know, and if this one doesn't pass, then at least the conversation has started and, you know, because the end goal is to have something that protects workers mentally, physically, soundly and spiritually, you know. You're going to get a very productive worker if they're not coming into work every day with all that extra luggage—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired, and the time for questions has expired also.

Debate

Madam Speaker: Debate is open.

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): I do thank the member for opening the conversation. I think that that is praiseworthy to do so and to have an opportunity to speak today about this issue of harassment, of bullying, of sexual harassment and what we think about that in not just our political work environments but also the legislative ones, the municipal ones across this province. And, in fact, all workplaces, I think, should be places that are free from bullying and harassment. And that, I'm sure, the member who introduced this bill and I would agree on.

I think the member should be happy to hear—I think she referenced that there is contact between the executive of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, or AMM, between them and our Minister of Municipal Relations (Mr. Wharton). And I'll give—I'll shed a bit of light on, maybe, what the

member may not be aware as to what's been happening there.

But first I just want to say that we take—on this side of the House, certainly, we take seriously our responsibility to ensure that all Manitobans have a respectful and safe workplace. And that responsibility starts with ourselves in terms of the way that we conduct ourselves. It starts with our own staff. That's why we've instituted a no-wrong-door policy. Certainly, that no-wrong-door policy is bearing fruit, and I think we've seen reports already that, you know, although they may be difficult to deal with, these issues are being dealt with, and that's really what we should all be—we should be pleased to see.

Now, what we—what I can also share with the member is that we have engaged an external consultant to ensure that Manitoba's policies reflect best practices from across the world. And we're working collaboratively with municipalities to ensure that there's a respectful work environment for their elected officials as well. That involves reviewing The Municipal Act to identify opportunities to strengthen protections for municipal officials. And we are considering amendments to that act, but those need to be done carefully, and I hope the member would agree that those should be developed not simply in this place but rather in consultation with municipalities and other stakeholders.

This approach, I think, is a contrast to, certainly, the approach of the NDP, of the members opposite, who've had to deal with issues within their own caucus of conduct, of ministers, even, ministers of the Crown, behaving in a very dishonourable way and even their chief of staff telling staff members to shut up and suck it up rather than to actually listen to victims. So we certainly—we don't approve of that approach, and we're going to move forward and I think in a direction that the member who introduced this bill should be very pleased to hear about.

So I did mention that we'll be having a robust conversation with municipalities across this province about how we can best ensure a respectful workplace for their officials, for their staff, for all elected officials.

And now—under The Municipal Act right now, all municipalities are required to adopt a code of conduct that establishes guidelines on acceptable behaviour for council members and dealing with each other and with employees and citizens. But I think we've seen examples—you've certainly shared

some examples. We've heard—those who were at the AMM meetings would have heard examples of conduct that fell outside of the guidelines that were established and yet the consequences for those conduct—that conduct was not—well, it just didn't—it didn't have the intended effect, because I think what every victim of bullying or harassment wants—the ones that I've had to deal with within this—my time here as a legislator but also as a senior manager in my previous role—I also had a no-wrong-door policy. I had an open door for people who were experiencing workplace bullying and harassment to come to me. And I'm pleased to say that, you know, people did come and that there was a level of comfort there that they were willing to do so and that they felt that I could advocate for them.

*(10:50)

Now, when that—when those opportunities occurred in my workplace, certainly the result of their complaints and I think, as I was saying, what every victim of bullying wants is their No. 1 objective is that this doesn't happen to anyone else. They understand that it's happened to them; that's regrettable. There may be direct consequences associated with that. But what they want very much is that others do not have to go through the same pain and suffering that they have experienced.

And I think that's something that we're not seeing currently in our municipal context, and I—and again, I can refer to my own councillor, former councillor now. I want to also take a moment to congratulate the new city councillor for Transcona, Shawn Nason, who used to work here in this building and is known to many of us. I want to congratulate him in his election and wish him all the best as he carries out his duties as councillor of Transcona, and that he does so in a collaborative way with the other members of council and the mayor.

But in any case, in that context I think we want to see that code of conduct violations are dealt with in an appropriate way. So we're committed to ensuring that municipalities are given the appropriate authority and the tools that they need to deal with these difficult situations. And we are responding to the concerns that municipalities have raised around The Municipal Act, and we're working with them in the spirit of fair say, and I think that's something that certainly the Association of Manitoba Municipalities will often use that phrase, fair say, and in this particular instance we are certainly committed to hearing from them.

I do want to spend a little bit more time talking about how that no-wrong-door policy is working here because I think it does provide some, you know, it's certainly relevant to the content of the bill and it does provide some guidance as to how we can expect Manitoba municipalities also to institute similar policies.

Now, our government is committed to ensuring that every government of Manitoba employee, and elected officials as well, work in an environment that is respectful and free of all forms of harassment, including sexual harassment. And we have to ensure that the Manitoba government is an environment where these incidents are taken seriously and are not tolerated and certainly are not allowed to perpetuate. That's why we've got concrete measures like the no-wrong-door policy that I mentioned earlier.

Now, we know that staff members still, and even some elected officials, may feel reluctant to bring matters forward. They may be embarrassed, or they may think that they just need to get over it, or to get through it. And to them, I think, what we want to say is that the whole idea of the no-wrong-door policy is to provide them with an avenue to ensure that, not necessarily that their issue is somehow magically evaporated, but rather that that perpetuation is not occurring, that other victims are not being made as the perpetrator goes forward.

So I think I have mentioned how much of a contrast that is to the previous NDP government. I think that's something that we should all be proud of, certainly on this side of the House. But I suggest the members of the second opposition should also embrace that no-wrong-door policy and should recognize it as a significant step forward.

Proof's in the pudding, of course, and that's—that is what we really want is—and we really want to raise the confidence of people who are prepared to bring forward their concerns, is that they will see others bringing those concerns forward anonymously if they desire, not anonymously if they desire, that the victims' wishes are certainly given great consideration as the issue is resolved. That's the kind of workplace, I think, that is going to be conducive to people bringing forward these kinds of issues and having them dealt with and preventing the perpetuation of bullying and harassment in this building and in governments across the province.

Now, I should also tell you that the Department of Municipal Relations under the leadership of the minister, the member for Gimli (Mr. Wharton),

has already sought feedback from elected council members and municipal public servants through a questionnaire that was distributed at the Association of Manitoba Municipalities June district meeting. It was also done online. So far we've received 315 responses, so certainly that's a broader level of engagement, I think, than that the member who brought it forward was able to conduct, and that's no concerns necessarily with the work that you've done—that she's done, rather. But it is something that I think that we as government understand that a broader consultation is going to result in a better amendment to the municipal act and a better environment overall.

So I thank you all for the opportunity to speak to this bill. Thanks.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): So, in the very limited time that we have to debate this bill, I do want to just get up, and it is an honour to speak on this bill.

And, again, Madam Speaker, I just want to take a moment to lift up my sister from Kewatinook and say miigwech for her bill, and, as I said to other women members in the House, I always do get a little bit extra special when it is a woman that's putting on a bill. So I just want to give you those props.

So I think that this is a—an important bill. I'm looking forward to having this bill go on to committee so that we can hear from a variety of different folks that want to talk about safety in the workplace. And I think that, you know, in this current climate and where we sit right now in respect of the #MeToo movement, the Time's Up movement, in respect of women's safety and, really, just not putting up with the harassment, either physical harassment, mental harassment and, certainly, sexual harassment that many women have dealt with and continue to deal with on a daily basis.

I know that some of us on this side of the House attempted to bring up those issues in this Chamber and were, I guess, very disheartened—it was disheartened to—or disheartened to hear some members opposite actually go against that and actually even make claims that this was somehow a political stunt for several members on this side of the House to bring up concerns that they felt, you know, rendered or warranted attention, including intimidation and bullying in this Chamber. But, again, as I said, members opposite chose to actually just dismiss those concerns because it didn't suit their particular narrative on their side.

So I think that it's important that we all live in a harassment-free environment, either within our personal lives or certainly within the workplace. And, again, Madam Speaker, we look forward to hearing the—this bill go to committee and what folks in our communities have to say about this.

Miigwech.

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): I'm pleased to rise today and put some comments on the record in response to this bill.

First, I would like to thank the member for bringing this bill forward to discuss such an important issue.

In my experience, before coming in—before elected to the Legislature, I was a school trustee, and one of the issues that we dealt with on a regular basis was establishing a code of conduct for our employees not only for, certainly, the related staff, but also, too, we had—certainly responsible for young men and women who we were—it was our responsibility to protect. So, certainly, this is an issue that I take very, very seriously and am certainly familiar with a lot of the criteria and discussions that need to take place when developing such authority.

In my experience, when we had to come to terms with a code of conduct we took into consideration and discussed with a lot of different groups their feelings on it. We had meetings with our union, MTS, as well as the other unions that we had dealt with and had a very open, frank discussion on the whole issue and tried to determine some of the challenges and tried to come to terms with something that really made an awful lot of sense ultimately—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

As per the written notice, debate on Bill 231 is concluded and we will now move on to our next item of business.

* (11:00)

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 21—Immediate Action Needed on Climate Change

Madam Speaker: The hour's now 11 a.m. and time for private members' resolutions.

The resolution before us this morning is the resolution Immediate Action Needed on Climate Change, brought forward by the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): I move, seconded by the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard),

WHEREAS the Provincial Government has abruptly cancelled plans to implement a fee on pollution to reduce Manitoba's greenhouse gas emissions even though carbon emissions have been recognized as causing climate change for more than a century; and

WHEREAS over a trillion tons of carbon dioxide have been released due to human activity since the industrial revolution and in 2016, Manitoba's emissions were 17.2% above the Kyoto Protocol target level for 2012; and

WHEREAS William Nordhaus of Yale University is considered the father of climate-change economics and the most recent winner of the Nobel prize on economics has stated that a global carbon tax is the most efficient way to contain climate change; and

WHEREAS the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned that governments must take rapid, far reaching and unprecedented changes to prevent global warming above the 1.5 degree Celsius threshold; and

WHEREAS global net emissions of carbon dioxide need to fall by 45% from 2010 levels by 2030 and reach "net zero" around 2050 in order to keep the warming around 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

WHEREAS even if warming is kept at or just below 1.5 degrees Celsius, the impacts will be widespread and significant including extreme weather, rising sea levels and diminishing Arctic sea ice, more frequent or intense droughts, frequent extreme rainfall events as well as the death of approximately 80% of coral reefs; and

WHEREAS the economic objections to pricing pollution are based on outdated and discredited economic theories that ignore the real costs of degrading the environment; and

WHEREAS revenues from pricing pollution provide governments and communities resources to reinvest in reducing atmospheric greenhouse gasses including carbon, methane and nitrous oxide; and

WHEREAS pricing pollution is the most effective and efficient way to cut carbon emissions and the cost to Manitobans of reducing emissions with other programs such as regulations and subsidies will be significantly higher and more cumbersome; and

WHEREAS a report by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives states that a comparison of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission trends to 2030 shows that cumulative reductions will be greater and actual emissions lower under the federal plan as compared to Manitoba's plan.

THAT the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the provincial government to take immediate action to reduce Manitoba's greenhouse gas emissions, including the implementation of a price on pollution to be reinvested to grow Manitoba's economy and make Manitoba a world leader in greenhouse gas storage and in fighting climate change.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Lamont), seconded by the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard),

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the provincial government to take immediate action to reduce Manitoba's GHG emissions, including the implementation of a price on pollution to be reinvested to grow Manitoba's economy and make Manitoba a world leader in GHG storage and in fighting climate change.

Mr. Lamont: Since I originally submitted this resolution, the federal government has stepped in with a price on pollution, so that part of the resolution is frankly redundant at this point. But we've seen nearly 30 years of desperate warnings about climate change, and time after time, efforts to act have been blocked and dismantled. The Kyoto Accord is one; pricing pollution is another.

Mr. Doyle Piwniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

There are real costs to burning coal, gas and natural gas that has sent more than 1 trillion tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere as well as into our oceans, with billions more being discharged each year.

We have known that burning coal and other carbon fuels causes climate change going back over a century. I'd like to table these articles which include a number of articles throughout history talking about the impact of climate change. In 1953, a newspaper headline read: industries warm the world, and another article with the headline, coal consumption affecting climate, read that the furnaces of the world are now burning about 2 billion tons of coal a year. When this is burned, uniting with oxygen, it adds about 7 billion tons of carbon dioxide

to the atmosphere yearly. This tends to make the air a more effective blanket for the earth and to raise its temperature.

That is from over 100 years ago in 1912. And from 1904, it appears that the artificial oxidation of coal will result in some of the profound and far-reaching geological consequences, which are due to the agency of man.

The IPCC recently reported—they made it clear we have 12 years to act, and we have the capacity to act. It does not need to be this way. Manitoba is uniquely positioned to make a difference. I hear sometimes that we're too small, we don't have enough emissions, but the fact is, our province has a larger surfer—surface area than many countries.

If there is a single myth that must be challenged, it is the idea that tackling this issue must hurt the economy, when it is an opportunity for growth, jobs, innovation and reinvestment, especially for Manitoba. Throughout history, we've heard that whenever progressive policies are introduced, they'll crater the economy. In the 19th century, business fought against child labour laws because they said that if six-year-old children wanted to work 60 hours a week and the government wanted to stop them from—that from happening, it was depriving those children of their freedom to make a contract.

Opponents of governments putting a price on pollution have a view of government and the economy that is fundamentally outdated and flawed. Simply put, money paid in taxes is not like energy. It is not like fuel that is used once and burned up. Almost all of it is immediately recycled back into the economy in the form of investment and wages. When that money goes back into the economy, it puts money in people's pockets, and it puts food on tables.

I have received dozens of emails from concerned Manitobans. We've consulted with people across the province on this issue. We've met with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, members of the Wilderness Committee, the trucking industry, the Winnipeg Capital Region and more.

When we put a price on pollution, we do have to take care to make sure we are looking after those who can least afford it. The federal plan does appear to be more progressive than the one that was proposed by the Pallister government. And we do have concerns about the federal plan because it is on a purely per-province basis, which means the provinces that are richer in carbon and that pollute

more will have much higher revenues, though the impacts of carbon and pollution know no borders.

We accept that a price on carbon is necessary, just as the Pallister government did, but we also believe the federal government should do more to equalize pollution price payments. We also believe—Manitoba Liberals believe that if Manitoba can go beyond a low-carbon footprint and find ways to actively remove carbon from the atmosphere in ways that benefit and—the environment and the economy, we can become world leaders.

We believe that Manitoba can and should become a world leader in carbon storage. This requires investment and re-investment. There are many, many people who want to do the right thing for the climate and for the environment but they lack the resources to make the shift to a greener economy on their own, and that is what has been lacking from so many plans.

We know from the Auditor General and his report from a year ago that the previous NDP government did not do enough. The NDP also lowered oil regulations to the point that the only jurisdictions with weaker regulations and more tax giveaways to oil companies were Alabama, Mississippi, Kansas, Arkansas and Saskatchewan.

But it's also clear, when it comes to the Auditor General's report on climate change, that this government had not yet released a plan either. It said: the Department of Sustainable Development was aware by the fall of 2009 that the greenhouse gas emissions reduction target in its 2008 plan would not be met. However, the plan wasn't updated until December of 2015. Following the April 2016 provincial election, the government announced it was developing a new plan, but it has not yet been released. End quote.

A further criticism of the December 2015 plan, which was cancelled by the PCs, was that most of the—quote, "most of the initiatives proposed in the plan were high-level strategies lacking details and estimates of their expected emissions reductions and costs".

Unfortunately, that also describes the government's current green plan. It lacks timelines, it lacks goals and the high-level strategies in the PC green plan are virtually identical to the NDP plan that didn't work before. Efficiency Manitoba is in there, electric buses, organics diversion, biodiesel, sustainable agricultural 'brack pactices' and a coal

phase-out. They're all the same and they also lack timelines, they lack results and they lack goals. And one of the major concerns about this plan—about the PC green plan is that it actually lets the results be determined by Internet poll.

I would add—one comment that I included in the preamble for this resolution: that the objections to this—to carbon-pricing or even to acting on climate change are based on outdated economic ideas.

Paul Romer recently shared the Nobel Prize for economics last week for his work on price and pollution. He's also the chief economist for the World Bank, and two years ago he wrote a scathing essay, talking about the colossal failure of mainstream economics over the last 30 years.

He said it had been degrading over—into—it had been in intellectual regress for 30 years, and one of the things that's most important to understand about the failures of the way we think about the economy is that we don't value people, we don't value the environment and we treat everything as if once it's all used up, it can just be replaced with something else.

That is actually one of the premises of modern economics. If we run out of one kind of wood, we can replace it with another kind of wood. If we run out of one kind of energy, we can replace it with another kind of energy.

We can't do that with water and we can't do that with people. There are all sorts of things which are not—which are finite, and we have to recognize that. And we only recognize that—or we pretend that money is finite, but that the capacity of the environment to withstand development without ever putting anything back in is unlimited.

Every single—again, every single advance throughout history, in terms of progress, has faced such kind of resistance, but we reap what we sow. If we sow nothing, we will reap nothing, and there is a huge cost to doing nothing. The cost to doing nothing, when it comes to climate change and the environment, far outweighs the cost to doing something.

This is something we owe to our children and our children's children, to leave the planet better than we found it. We have not been doing that for a long time because people have been too timid to act, or they've been willing to put their political—or temporary, short-term political gain ahead of the interests of future generations. We have to stop doing that. We know the time to act is now.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and willing to take any questions.

Questions

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

* (11:10)

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development): Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I appreciate the member's reflections on this very real issue that we're faced with here in Manitoba. But could the member talk about his thoughts on a ceiling for the carbon price or what—how high he would be willing to go on—in terms of a carbon tax.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): At this point, it's—because the—it's out of our hands because the Premier (Mr. Pallister) took his hands off the steering wheel. There was an opportunity to negotiate with the federal government about what they could do, and that didn't happen. So it's not to say how high would we go on a carbon tax. That's now in the hands of the federal government. It's not in my hands.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I want to thank the Leader of the Second Opposition for bringing this motion forward and raising the profile of this issue, and there is some congruence in our thinking on this.

I guess my first question might be relating to the WHEREAS where he notes the IPCC recommendation. What are some of the initiatives he would like to see happen in Manitoba so that we do reduce our annual total emissions by 45 per cent within the next decade or so?

Mr. Lamont: Thank you very much. There are a number of things that we can do. Some of them are within the capacity of the provincial government, some of which would actually require—one might require federal assistance in terms of financing, but certainly we can invest in transit to get more people on buses and off the roads, is just one simple example. There are a number of ways we can use—encourage farmers and provide incentives,

agriculturally, to draw carbon out of the air. There are also—to encourage planting crops or pilot projects, the respiration of wetlands. But one project that has been proposed would simply be—to return the floodway to natural grasslands. That it would—

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

Mr. Ian Wishart (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the member, given that greenhouse gases know no boundaries, why he feels it's equitable that provinces in eastern Canada get recognition for some of the work that they have done in terms of changing to hydroelectric power, and we in Manitoba don't get recognition for very comparable projects, as in the case of Newfoundland and now more recently the work that has been done in Nova Scotia on tidal bore work, which doesn't look like it's turning out to be very successful, but they're still getting recognition for it. Why is that equitable?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for—leader of the official—second opposition.

Mr. Lamont: I can't speak to how equitable it is because I'm not—I don't have—I'm not sure exactly what all the deals are in—with the other provinces, but I also can speak to the failure of this government to do a good job of negotiating with the federal government. They—as far as I understand, the federal government thought they had a deal, and this Province walked away for it—from it.

I don't—I mean, for example, there were territories like Nunavut which were allowed to—basically, they requested of the federal government that they keep the—that the backstop go to them. I don't know why that—the—that's up to the Province or the Premier why they—why that didn't happen.

Mr. Altemeyer: For sure, this government's performance on climate change has been, shall we diplomatically say, convoluted and ineffective to date, right when the world and our citizens, current and future, desperately need real action. I'm wondering—again, seeing one of the whereases in the resolution today, it looks like the Manitoba Liberals are noticing that carbon revenues can give governments and communities an opportunity to reinvest and reduce emissions. Is that the approach that he would like to see with carbon revenues, rather than the direct rebate going to individuals that will not actually leave any resources available to reduce emissions in specific projects?

Mr. Lamont: Ideally, yes, we need funds that actually—that engage in reinvestment. I understand that under the federal plan a certain percentage of it is going to be reserved for municipalities, universities and so on, but again, I'm not an expert on the federal plan. But it is absolutely critical—I had a meeting with the trucking industry, and their frustration with the previous plan, as proposed, was that it was going entirely to tax reductions and that there wasn't assistance in helping people actually get over that hump or be able to change—make the change in technology that's required to reduce emissions.

I mean, I just wanted to answer—one of things that we would like to do is that if we could actually make Manitoba carbon negative, our argument would be that the—

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

Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk): Does the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Lamont) think there can be an effective climate plan that does not include a carbon tax, or is creating a new tax the only thing the member is able to bring forward?

Mr. Lamont: As I made clear in my opening remark is that I—that when I brought forward this resolution it was prepared before the federal government had made their announcement, so it's actually redundant at this point. There is going to be a carbon tax or a price on pollution.

And I don't—*[interjection]* I understand that it's been extremely effective in BC, for example; it was cited by the Nobel Prize winners. It was brought in by Gordon Campbell, who this government has engaged to—for two and a half million dollars to work on Hydro. So, clearly, they have a lot of respect for Mr. Campbell and his opinions.

It's only—as I—it's a component. It's one thing that needs to be done. But I have said that what one—what we need to do, ideally, if we can make Manitoba carbon negative—

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

Mr. Altemeyer: Well, the MLA, the government MLA from Selkirk, would perhaps be wise to provide his Nobel Prize in Economics to the Chamber, demonstrating that, in fact, carbon pricing is not the most efficient way of achieving greenhouse gas reductions. I'm sure we'd all like to see a Nobel

Prize in Economics in person. I don't think the MLA for Selkirk has that.

What his government does have is a phony counting system for emissions called cumulative reductions, which I note is also mentioned in the Liberal motion here today. Does the Leader of the Second Opposition have anything further to say about the validity or invalidity of using that rather deceptive approach—

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

Mr. Lamont: Well, it has been—it's extremely difficult just because there have been no timelines. There are no goals. There aren't specific results and lots of it has—when you actually read through the climate plan it's filled with could's and maybes and we're considering. It actually has no solid commitments.

For the member for Selkirk, I will read this, quote: A carbon levy is simpler and more effective for Manitoba. It can cover more emissions in our economy, leading to more reductions, which is the goal. It gives price certainty to business, helping them plan and invest accordingly and it costs less to put in place than any other system. That is from Mr. Pallister's—the Premier's (Mr. Pallister)—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Just want to remind the member that if he's addressing anybody in the Chamber here to address either by their title or by their constituency name.

Mr. Lamont: —page 17 of the First Minister's made-in-Manitoba green plan.

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): The Liberals in Ottawa have acknowledged that our plan is the best in Canada, but they also announced they won't pose their higher and rising carbon tax on Manitobans after one year, which is why we are saying no to a carbon tax.

Why does this member want a one-size, fits-all approach that doesn't take into account the steps Manitoba has already taken?

Mr. Lamont: I don't. One of the things I've said—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont: Sorry. I'll just—I do want to correct the member. He says that it's a higher tax. In fact, it's the lower tax that this government was going to bring in

a \$25-per-ton tax starting out, and it was—which is going to be higher, I believe, for the first two years—or first year at least, and that was how they said that they were going to make it better than—or more effective than the federal plan. I expressed my reservations with the federal tax. I think the major thing that we need to do is engage in reinvestment and that's what I want to see from this Province.

Mr. Altemeyer: One of the first questions that I had when I heard about the federal government's announcement was trying to understand where the additional revenue will be coming from. If citizens will be receiving more money back than they pay in a carbon tax, what is the revenue source to make up that difference at the federal level? I haven't seen an explanation of that yet in the media articles that have been written. I wonder if the Second Opposition Leader has any additional information on that—he might be able to share with us here in the Chamber this morning.

*(11:20)

Mr. Lamont: I don't. I don't know if—I have to make this clear that the Prime Minister is not now, nor is he ever likely to be, a member of the Manitoba Liberal Party. And I don't know that—I have not—I have looked into it. I've seen the—I've seen most of the federal carbon plan, as far as it—only as far as it reflects Manitoba. And, as far as I know, there's been all—there's also a lot of misinformation put on the record about it.

As far as I understand, it will be entirely revenue neutral. It will be returned entirely to Manitobans. Ten per cent is going to be reserved for reinvestment, and then there's a fund that will also be set aside of various types for other projects.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time for question period has expired.

Debate

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The debate is open.

Any speakers?

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development): It's an honour to get up this morning and talk about a very defining issue of our times. And it's a bit of a carry-over from last night's robust discussion that we heard at committee. I was very fortunate to hear from many presenters last night who articulated very passionate arguments regarding climate change.

And so one thing that we can all agree on, I believe, in this House, is that climate change is a real, defining issue of this generation of our times. It's something that this House is dealing with and something that all Manitobans are dealing with. And finding a path forward is something where we disagree on some of the points, but we all agree that we do need to find a path forward.

I'd also like to point out that, while the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) and I don't agree on a lot of points, that the thing that we can agree on this morning is, is that both of us are a little puzzled on how it is that this federal scheme can take—give back more money than it's taking in a tax, and how it's going to fund that. And I think it's being espoused on many social media platforms and whatnot about the other—you know, it's—oftentimes it's Nigerian princes and emails that I get from, you know, spams that say if you send us a little bit of money, we're going to send you a lot more back. And usually I just disregard that, because we know that there's no validity to that.

And so, you know, in this instance, it's very tough to believe that this scheme is going to work from Ottawa. And it was a little disappointing that the Liberals here in Manitoba weren't able to offer any clarity into that. And I thought maybe he would have had some insight into how that would have worked and—but, unfortunately, we're still left as puzzled as we were earlier.

But I do appreciate the members opposite's reflections on the importance of fighting climate change. We know that climate change is real and having its impact today. And we see evidence of that all around us. Recent years in Manitoba, we've seen fire seasons start earlier and burn with even greater intensity. To the south of us, we see hurricanes hitting with record strength and increased frequency. And, to the north of us, the Arctic ice sheets grow smaller every summer, putting the incredible northern ecosystem at risk.

And I want to pause on that for a moment and say, in Manitoba, we do have a very vulnerable population of polar bears who are coming off the ice earlier and being on land a lot longer. And what that means is greater challenges for not just the public safety component of all the people that live up in that area, but it's also detrimental to these bears.

And so we have a real motivation to ensure that climate change is mitigated and that we don't allow the permafrost to begin to melt and release all the

carbon that is sequestered, but we also need to make sure that that ice is forming so that those bears can have—can, you know, get onto the ice as early as possible to access their food source.

But we know extreme weather patterns as a result of climate change threatens the Manitoba—the safety to all Manitobans, and is a threat to our economy as well. And, as Progressive Conservatives, we are focused on leaving this province better than we found it. We don't believe in leaving a financial deficit to our children and grandchildren, and we don't believe in doing the same on the environment, either. We want to leave the planet better than we received it.

That is why we developed a plan that focuses on the four pillars of cleaner water, conservation of natural areas, effective action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and strengthen our economy at the same time.

It is a plan that will continue our investments in renewal energy, while encouraging Manitobans to reduce their consumption of fossil fuels. It is a plan that improves how we manage and protect our watersheds. It is a plan that will increase recycling and reduce the amount of material that is needlessly sent to the landfill. It is a plan that will establish \$100-million conservation trust that will be held in perpetuity at The Winnipeg Foundation to finance habitat and conservation 'effos'—efforts all across our beautiful province.

Manitoba already has the best green record in the country. We have invested billions in clean energy including hydroelectric power. We recently shut down our last coal plant, and we will keep working to do our part in this global effort to fight climate change.

We have listened to Manitobans and they've been very loud and clear. They want us to fight climate change, but they do not want Ottawa's carbon tax. We believe that Ottawa doesn't have a right to impose a carbon tax on provinces that have a green plan, and we have one of the best green plans in Manitoba, as acknowledged by our Prime Minister and the environment minister.

And so, while I appreciate the member of the second opposition for bringing this issue to the Legislature today and with a resolution entitled Immediate Action Needed on Climate Change, we couldn't agree with him more that immediate action on climate change is needed, and we just suggest that

he get on board with our plan and help us get to work and deliver on the priorities of Manitobans and fight climate change together.

So thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for allowing me to have an opportunity to put a few words on the record.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): I want to start by thanking the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Lamont) for—on their first morning have a chance to bring issues forward for making climate change a priority for us to discuss. I also want to extend my thanks to the minister and to the government members of last night's committee. We work, I think, in a really co-operative way to make sure presenters understood the process, that we accommodated people who had scheduling conflicts. I think everyone who wouldn't have been able to come back tonight was given a chance to speak last night instead in addition to our usual practice of allowing out-of-town presenters to speak first.

And, as I said in committee and as I will say again here and as many, many presenters said last night, the facts of climate change compel a far less partisan approach to this issue. Whether all of us realize it or not yet, this is an active part of history in the making. How we as a society, how we as government officials respond to the challenge of climate change is going to be noted and repeated for decades to come, simply because we are on the cusp of what is literally life or death decisions for life on this planet.

And I would encourage all members, whether you are officially assigned to committee duty tonight by your respective whips or not, to do your best to attend, to listen and to consider the facts that are being put on the record.

There were many, many passionate pleas last night from people of all ages for proper action on climate change. And it was not just the passion that we should note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was the knowledge, the experience and the hope and optimism that people also expressed, that we do still have time to correct our course, that we can still create thousands of new green jobs for Manitobans, young and old, to participate in, and that we can leave a path for a future for our children that will not be nearly as dire as what the science is telling us we will end up in if we do not smarten up and do so quickly.

* (11:30)

And it is on that scientific note that I want to point out just how far away right now the discussion in Manitoba is from where it needs to be. The scientific community, the best minds that the world has to study this issue, had said that if we want to have a 67 per cent chance of avoiding runaway climate change, we cannot allow global average temperatures to rise above one and a half degrees Celsius.

We have already increased the earth's atmosphere by one degree. We have half a degree left.

Now, the Paris Agreement, which is what the nations of the world have agreed to, does not go that far. They have only agreed to strive to minimize warming at two degrees Celsius, and the nations of the world have also not made enough commitments to reduce emissions enough to keep us at two degrees.

With the commitments that have been made so far, we are on a path to four to six degrees warming of average global temperature. That means anyone here who is a farmer, anyone who represents rural farmers and producers, people who grow our food, you're going to have one heck of a time growing food under four to six degrees of average global temperature rise.

Any of us who need water are going to have a heck of a time tracking the extreme weather patterns that will come—far too much water in one location and not enough in others. The impacts globally will be absolutely atrocious.

So we are on that path right now, and we would only be on that path, Mr. Speaker, if all of the countries of the world actually delivered on the promises that they have made which are not strong enough to avoid runaway climate change.

And Canada, one of the most technologically advanced, supposedly most developed countries in the world, is nowhere close to meeting its commitment to reduce emissions at the pace that is required to even meet two degrees Celsius as a target, never mind one and a half.

And then here, locally, in Manitoba, we have a Premier (Mr. Pallister) who is fighting with every ounce of his being, the only action to come out of Ottawa yet that might actually reduce emissions a little bit. That is how far this Premier and this government are from the scientific reality of where we have to go.

And somehow, all of us as legislators, all of us as Manitobans, have to find a way to bring the Premier into the 21st century or else the rest of this century is not going to be a future that any of us is going to be proud of. And those of us who plan to be alive 12 years from now, 15 years from now, 20 years from now, we are going to live to see the beginning effects of runaway climate change, and our children and grandchildren are going to have some very, very difficult questions for us, why we didn't do more. We knew we had to do more and we did not do it.

Now, one of the delusions, unfortunately, that the Premier is sticking to is that he has a plan for climate change that meets anything close to what is actually required, and here I want to get in a little bit more on the language of cumulative reduction, which the government has decided to use.

This is a deceptive way of counting greenhouse gas emissions that nobody else in the world uses. Every other country in the world, they are required to report to the United Nations on an annual basis and say, this is how much greenhouse gas emissions we put into the atmosphere on an annual basis.

What the Pallister government has done is they brought forward a document which counts emissions reductions only, ignores any increases that will happen in the economy, and they want to be able to count the same reduction multiple times.

By going a cumulative route, if they did something or if someone else did something that reduced emissions by one ton, the Pallister government will count that as a five-ton reduction at the end of their first five-year plan. That is completely unacceptable and deceptive.

The only way that the Pallister government could claim that they were going to have an outside shot at reducing our annual emissions at all was through—and this is based on their own documents—was by having a price on carbon, which now multiple MLAs from the government side just this morning have now spoken out against.

So we weren't anywhere close to where we needed to be in the first place; they were using a flawed system that was deceptive and designed to make it look like they were doing things that they actually wouldn't, and now they're opposed to even that.

This is not the direction that the world needs us to move in. It is not the direction that this minister,

I'm sure, is going to be at all proud of when she has to have the same difficult conversation with her family that I will have to have with mine.

And now, according to their own documents, of course, carbon pricing in Manitoba, well, that's been yanked out by the Premier (Mr. Pallister), and all of the other things that they claimed to add up to even one megaton of reductions, that's on a cumulative basis so you got to divide that by four or five years to get an annual number. That's nowhere close to cutting our emissions in half. It's—there's just no logical way that anyone should be claiming that this approach is going to be good enough, and that's what we heard over and over and over again last night. Citizens, whether they were young moms—one woman who just gave birth a few months ago, and, in her own words, is terrified of what the future looks like for her baby, right through to grandparents, long-time stakeholders, all of them calling on all of us to do our share, to do more than our share and to start viewing climate change as an opportunity for our province.

There are thousands and thousands of jobs just waiting to be created if we had a government that was committed to moving in a green direction. We have hundreds and hundreds of workers. We have hundreds and hundreds of students graduating with the skills already, with the knowledge already, ready to go out and make a difference, fixing the mistakes of the past and building the green transition economy. But this government is not changing the parameters; they're not changing the systems; they're not changing the signals. They are, in fact, taking us backwards. And that—

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

Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk): Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns on climate change.

I want to start by saying that protection of the environment for future generations is an issue of importance to all Manitobans regardless of where they are located geographically or their socio-economic background. There's not a day that goes by that I'm not awed by the beauty of our world. But that very world is in jeopardy, in jeopardy not from naturally occurring evolution, but from events that are the result of human activity where humans have been disregarding their impact on the world. Whether it's simply discarding an empty coffee cup out the window, purchasing products from a region

that pollutes heavily because the products are less expensive or using financial excuses to continue to pollute, we all need to do our part.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we look at all of Canada, Manitoba has the best green record in the country. We have invested billions in clean energy, including hydro and solar and wind technology. Our forests, wetlands and agriculture practices sequester tons of greenhouse gases annually.

As a government, as Manitobans, we are saying yes to fighting climate change, but no to the federal government's carbon tax. Trudeau has made it about the federal carbon tax backstop, not about green plans. Under the Trudeau plan, Manitobans could have a net negative carbon footprint, and by paying hundreds a year for green energy they could still have to pay the federal carbon tax. We feel this is wrong. It is not fair to Manitobans who take the global environment seriously. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will stand up to protect Manitobans from unfair federal taxes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, protections—or projections show that climate change will affect the way we live, work and play in Manitoba, from rising temperatures, warmer winter weather and more frequent extremes of weather, floods and droughts. The changing environment will greatly affect our day-to-day lives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitoba is moving forward to address this, and with its climate and green plan, but without a carbon tax. Ottawa has acknowledged that our plan is the best in Canada, but they have also stated that they will impose their higher and rising carbon tax on Manitobans after one year.

*(11:40)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask all legislators, all Manitobans, to think about that. Ottawa acknowledges that our plan is the best in Canada for addressing climate change, yet states they will still impose their carbon tax on all Manitobans. For Manitobans the end result would be twice the tax for poorer results.

The Liberal plan would threaten jobs in Manitoba and economic growth throughout our province.

Manitobans agree, a constructive plan to deal with climate change is needed. Manitobans do not agree with a carbon tax. Manitobans want a plan that

is based on science, a plan that is logical, well-thought-out and will produce the desired results, moving us to a cleaner, greener province and world.

We are told the goal of the federal carbon tax is to increase the cost of greenhouse gases, producing behaviours which will, in effect, modify consumer behaviour by decreasing the usage of these sectors and thereby decrease purchases and subsequently decrease emissions.

I believe this is a flawed hypotheses, especially for rural Manitobans. Firstly, it incorrectly assumes that Manitobans and Canadians are not able to select measures to protect the environment without the federal government implementing a tax. And, secondly, it assumes that all greenhouse gas emissions are the results of conscious decisions by Canadians and 'Manitobas' to purchase products which are not a necessity and for which viable substitutes are available.

This is 'particular' true in the rural areas of Manitoba which would be hit disproportionately harder by the implementation of a carbon tax. The impact of a carbon tax needs to be examined in light of the essential and non-essential nature of the purchase. For example, a single mother living in rural Manitoba, trying to provide for her children, may need to drive one child to daycare, the other to school, then head off to work. She may want to ensure they have an opportunity to take part in Canada's national sport of hockey. This involves many hours and considerable travel, travel not only to local hockey rinks but also to games in other communities.

We need to ask ourselves: will increasing the tax on gasoline result in a decrease in driving for her, if this is her only option? Should this single mother be forced to either accept the new costs or pull her son or daughter out of from sports?

And what about the seniors having to travel for medical care, be it for cancer treatments or medical therapies such as dialysis? Will imposing a carbon tax in a decreased travel— result in decreased travel, or will it simply penalize them more as they seek medical attention?

Manitobans and Canadians are bright, intelligent people. I believe in Manitobans. Given the opportunity, the information and materials necessary to make logical decisions, they will follow through. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Ottawa's plan to impose a one-size-fits-all carbon tax on one of the

world's most diverse countries, the Liberal member, in an effort to emotionally engage with Manitobans, quoted an almost apocalyptic statement from the IPCC. All governments need to be on board to address climate change and, yet, the member and federal governments are trying to make climate change a divisive political issue. Instead of uniting Manitobans to fight climate change, opposition parties are supporting the carbon tax to divide all Canadians.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Canadians are on board to do their part to do their part to fight climate change. This can be seen in the agricultural industry. I am proud to see prairie farmers are addressing climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Their production decisions are based on protecting the environment while trying to provide food for the world.

Our farmers are focused on nitrogen efficiency. Today's Prairie farmers are highly technical—use highly technical soil analysis to determine which areas of a field need nitrogen and only apply nitrogen where and when it is needed. Farmers utilize new technologies, recently available, that are cost-effective. They purchase premium additives that, when added to fertilizers, decrease gassing off, stabilize nitrogen at the root level and decrease leaching.

Our farmers are growing new varieties of plants that can be directly harvested. They're investing thousands of dollars in equipment that has next to zero emissions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, new technologies are continuing to be adapted by Manitoba farmers, who are the finest early adapters of new technologies for farming in all of Canada and perhaps the world. Yet, they are given no credit for carbon sequestration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, farmers are doing their part; opposition parties are not. Opposition had the opportunity to get on board last year by supporting my resolution on wetlands. Wetlands remove tons of greenhouse gases, are an important ecosystem when addressing climate change, pollution and water quality.

Our boreal wetlands are estimated to store as much as 27.9 billion tons of carbon, yet members opposite showed their true concern for protecting the environment and carbon emissions when they chose to stand in the House and speak out an important resolution focused on recognizing the importance of wetland preservation in our province.

Instead of getting on board, they played politics and spoke the resolution out. To me, this was an important message for all Manitobans. The message from the opposition to Manitobans was playing politics was more important to them than getting on board in a collaborative manner to help address climate change.

It is clear opposition members have no plan to address climate change, are not willing to work together in collaborative basis to set a workable action plan in place, nor do they have a goal to implement a plan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, climate change is real. We see the evidence all around us in warmer temperatures both in the air and in the oceans, in the form of dangerous storms which happen more frequently, in forest fires of unprecedented intensity and in severe flooding and drought. Climate change threatens our safety, and it threatens our economy as well. It threatens our future, especially the future of generations that will follow us. In response to this danger, the world's nations must each do their part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect our fragile environment.

Our green plan focuses on four pillars: addressing climate change, protecting and increasing jobs, cleaner water and conservation of natural areas. Our plan will assist local communities in their efforts to protect our watersheds. Our plan will clean up contaminated sites, increasing recycling and build new schools to the highest standards of energy efficiency and environmental design.

Our plan will establish a \$100-million conservation trust to preserve and to protect our wetlands, forests, waterways, grasslands and wildlife habitat. And it is a Manitoba plan that will be implemented without any significant assistance from the federal government.

Our government will always defend the interests of Manitobans today, tomorrow and for as long as we are privileged to serve our—

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

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): We heard some amazing presentations last night, and one of the things that was very clear is that the government's so-called climate change or green plan is not a plan. It's a legislative framework for producing a plan at some future distant point.

We are facing one of the most urgent situations we have known. In addressing climate change, we actually need a plan, and that plan must have targets and timelines. The government is proposing cumulative targets, cumulative accounting after five years. That would measure the reductions but may not actually measure areas where there's increases. It's not very balanced and not very good. Given that the IPCC report says we need to have major, major change achieved in 12 years—by 2030—five-year accounting is not helpful.

It was clear last night that there was strong support for the need for annual accounting, measuring and reporting. Indeed, a number of years ago, Manitoba Liberals, having seen some of the way that government works, and often when you have an annual report, it comes out a year and a half after, instead of a year, that we believe that, you know, we do for budgets: we have quarterly reports, right? I think we should have quarterly reports, quite frankly, on our accounting and so that we can make and adapt to change quickly and improve the plan instead of having to wait and wait, as this government would do for five years.

Delays by Manitoba is already putting us behind. That was quite clear from people in the audience last night. We are way behind other provinces in terms of the availability of electric vehicle charging stations. We should have charging stations of the different capacities all over the province—at tourist sites, at hotels—as is happening elsewhere.

*(11:50)

One of the big questions is: Why is Manitoba Hydro not partnering with tourist stations and hotels to put up these charging stations all over the province? Just think about the growth in electricity demand that would result, the help that that would be to Manitoba Hydro, which is facing a very difficult time at the moment.

But this government is not thinking forward in the way that they need to be. So we are behind, as was very clear last night, in electric vehicle charging stations and in so many other areas.

The—it is disappointing that the provincial government did not join with the federal government—partner with the federal government. You know, join the price on pollution proposal that was there for the federal government. And if this government had, then the money that would have been brought in could be part of a made-in-Manitoba

approach. And now it's going to be part of a federal government approach, which looks like it will have some very good parts to it. But it would not be a made-in-Manitoba approach, and we heard time and time again last night the beneficial effects of having a made-in-Manitoba approach for agriculture and for truckers and for others.

So it's too bad that this provincial government wasn't ready to partner with the federal government and just wants to divide instead of working together.

Those are my few remarks, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Merci. I'll let others speak now.

Mr. Ian Wishart (Portage la Prairie): It's a pleasure to put a few words on the record regarding this resolution brought forward today on climate change. Climate change is something that I feel very strongly about. I have a long history in working on environmental issues that include elements of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, and also other environmental factors.

And I think it is important, as with our green plan, that we look at the integration all the way across the sector in terms of what we can do as Manitobans and what we can do as Canadians to help deal with climate change and other environmental issues at the same time, and not just pick and choose one or two particular sites. I know that last night we heard a great deal about electric vehicles. Electric vehicles are probably great things, and certainly there'll be, hopefully, structures in the marketplace as we move forward that will encourage them. But that alone probably won't be the solution that we need. And, as Manitobans and as a government, we have chosen to look much more broadly at this whole problem and look at how we can move to mitigate some of the impacts of climate change as we move forward.

And certainly in Manitoba, I think we're all very aware that one of those big impacts, of course, is the frequency of flooding. And we've had a number of instances in the last decade or two where we've had a number of major problems in Manitoba and major costs—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wishart: —in terms of the impact that we have seen from flooding. It has been mentioned earlier that the conservation or restoration of wetlands is a very great step forward. Not only is it good in terms of greenhouse gases, but it's good in terms of water conservation and habitat creation and general

aesthetics for the countryside. And it's something that we can do very effectively in Manitoba.

We've had some pilot projects in Manitoba that, though they were not supported in a major way by the previous government, we managed to run a pilot project, an ALUS pilot project in the RM of Blanshard. And many of the principles of ALUS are incorporated in our green plan as we move forward. And we were told that we would be very lucky if we got buy-in from the landscape owners—mostly agriculture—if we got more than a 5 or a 10 per cent buy-in. We got an 85 per cent buy-in in the pilot project. And we funded that by working jointly—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I just want to remind everybody that it's very hard to hear the speaker when all this conversation is happening. I know there's—we're about ready to wrap it up, but—

Mr. Wishart: We funded that pilot project by working in conjunction with the federal government at the time—a Liberal federal government, I might add. And also, we're working with conservation groups in the US.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. When this matter is before the House, the honourable member for Portage will have seven minutes remaining.

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

(Continued)

Bill 216—The Human Rights Code Amendment Act

(Continued)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In accordance to rule 24, as previously announced, I am now interrupting this debate to put forward the question—selected Bill 216.

The question before the House is the second reading of Bill 216, The Human Rights Code Amendment Act.

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

Bill 231—The Municipal Harassment Policy Act (Various Acts Amended)

(Continued)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now we'll go on to Bill 231.

In accordance to the rule 24 and previously announced, I will now put forward the question, selected Bill 231.

The question before the House is the second reading of Bill 231, The Municipal Harassment Policy Act (Various Acts Amended).

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Second Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a recorded vote, please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested.

Call in the members.

* (12:10)

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

Oh—the question before the House is Bill 231, The Municipal Harassment Policy Act, the various act amendment.

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Klassen, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Smith (Point Douglas), Swan, Wiebe.

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 16, Nays 36.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, October 25, 2018

ORDERS OF THE DAY	Resolutions
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
Second Readings–Public Bills	Res. 21–Immediate Action Needed on Climate Change Lamont 3781
Bill 216–The Human Rights Code Amendment Act Gerrard 3771	Questions Squires 3784 Lamont 3784 Altemeyer 3784 Wishart 3784 Lagimodiere 3785 Nesbitt 3785
Questions Martin 3772 Gerrard 3772 Swan 3772	Debate Squires 3786 Altemeyer 3787 Lagimodiere 3789 Gerrard 3791 Wishart 3792
Debate Martin 3774 Swan 3775	
Bill 231–The Municipal Harassment Policy Act (Various Acts Amended) Klassen 3776	
Questions Teitsma 3777 Klassen 3777 Fontaine 3777 Johnston 3777	Second Readings–Public Bills <i>(Continued)</i> Bill 216–The Human Rights Code Amendment Act 3792 <i>(Continued)</i>
Debate Teitsma 3778 Fontaine 3780 Johnston 3781	Bill 231–The Municipal Harassment Policy Act (Various Acts Amended) 3792 <i>(Continued)</i>

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>