

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

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

Vol. LXXII No. 36A - 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 9, 2019

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

Tuesday, April 9, 2019

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Please be seated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

**Bill 205—The Official Time Amendment Act
(Daylight Saving Time Abolished)**

Madam Speaker: As previously announced, we will now be considering second reading of the selected bill sponsored by the honourable member for Emerson, Bill 205, The Official Time Amendment Act (Daylight Saving Time Abolished).

As a reminder, in accordance with rule 24 and as previously announced, I will be interrupting this debate at 10:55 to put the question.

The honourable member for Emerson, to move his motion.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): I move, that the Bill 205, The Official Time Amendment Act (Daylight Saving Time Abolished), now be read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Graydon: During the last provincial elections, Manitobans voted for change and were looking for a new way of doing business with the aim of making their lives easier, more affordable and more secure. The constituents of Emerson elected me on a promise to fix the finances, repair the services and rebuild the economy, and these commitments will be to the benefit of all Manitobans.

This bill to eliminate daylight savings time is directly in line with these three promises and clearly

represents the type of change Manitobans hope their provincial government would have the courage to do. The bill is about giving Manitobans a say, a voice in whether there should be—continue to be these major disruptions in their daily lives taking place twice a year. In order for everyone in this Chamber to hear the outstanding support for eliminating daylight savings time in this province or for the multiple first-hand accounts on how it negatively disrupts their lives, this bill should go to committee. Anyone who values the opinions of their constituents should vote in favour of this bill so that the voice of Manitobans can be heard.

Daylight savings time was introduced to save energy in factories in World War I. A lot has changed since then with all the appliances and electronics using electricity, not just lighting. Manitoba Hydro has acknowledged that they have no evidence that energy is saved because of daylight savings time.

Daylight savings time causes a 20 per cent increase in traffic accidents, a 25 per cent increase in heart attacks, 8 per cent increase in mental cases, and an increase in workplace injuries, and an 'overlall'—overall loss of productivity in the economy. In agriculture, there's a loss in production directly related to upsetting the routines of the cattle and the birds, taking close to a month for productions to rebound to the original levels.

Already Saskatchewan, northern BC, northern Ontario, northern Quebec, parts of Nunavik [*phonetic*], Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, and US overseas territories do not recognize daylight savings time. The European Union is scheduled to have its last time change in October of 2021.

I've interacted with Dr. Diana McMillan, a sleep expert at the University of Manitoba. She helped inform my research, most notably that the spring jump to daylight savings time may take several days for some individuals to adjust to, resulting in 'communitive' sleep loss in a society that is already significantly, chronically sleep-deprived.

She also noted that in the fall most individuals stay up but do not or cannot stay asleep an extra hour in the morning. And so the extra hour is not gained at all, and sleep deprivation is potentially

'cumunidlidve' over the first four to five days following the return to standard time.

As I have heard and received support from thousands of Manitobans pledging their support to change the overall time act, and I've also undergone extensive consultations with stakeholders, none were opposed as such: paramedic association, the teachers' association, both Winnipeg and Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, trucking association of Manitoba, the hotel association of Manitoba, the restaurant association of Manitoba, the Keystone Agricultural Producers of Manitoba, and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

A Dauphin 730 CKDM survey—radio survey—found 72 per cent of Manitobans think Manitoba should end daylight savings time, while a Winnipeg Sun survey found 73 per cent of Manitobas support ending daylight savings time.

I've over a thousand signatures on petitions, and also 960 engagements on stop the switch, with more coming daily.

So, if it saves lives and doesn't cost the government anything, why would all the members of this Chamber not vote to take this bill to committee?

Thank you.

Introduction of Guests

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

We have, seated in the public gallery, retired Sergeant Michael Purdy, who is the guest of the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Reyes).

And also seated in the public gallery, from Westgate Mennonite Collegiate; we have 15 grade 9 students under the direction of Jeremy Siemens, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer).

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

Questions

Madam Speaker: A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Questions may be addressed to the sponsoring member by any member in the following sequence: first question to be asked by a member from another party; this is to be followed by a rotation between the parties. Each independent

member may ask one question, and no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

Questions?

* (10:10)

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): Yes, my question, I apologize to the member, I may have missed it in his introduction, but, in terms of consultations, you know, I cannot underemphasize how important proper consultation is when you're considering a change that's going to affect all Manitobans, not just us as individuals but businesses as well, and even educational institutions and the like.

So my question for the member is, who has he consulted with prior to this bill being introduced?

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): I think I addressed that when I was making the introductory to this. It's unfortunate the member hadn't heard that, but I haven't addressed it already. Thank you.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I thank the member for bringing this up today so we can have a discussion about it.

Is the member aware what time the sun would rise in June if this bill passes?

Mr. Graydon: Yes, Madam Speaker, and I'm quite aware of when the sun will rise in June. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Brad Michaleski (Dauphin): I want to thank the member from—for Emerson for raising this issue here today and I know he briefly mentioned the people from Dauphin. The good people of Dauphin have talked to me about this issue, and what I did find out is there's a lot of different aspects and opinions on this issue. And the good people of Dauphin offered a lot of suggestions and ideas about this subject.

So why does the member think Manitoba should act in isolation for its trading partners?

Mr. Graydon: I don't believe that Manitoba is acting in isolation at all. We have a neighbouring province on the west that doesn't address—or doesn't change time. We also have northern Ontario that doesn't change time, and the negativity to the switch is very, very important to a lot of Manitobans.

Mr. Swan: Well, you know, I'd sort of hope when it's private members' hour, the question and answers would take on maybe a bit of a different tone, and I asked the member what I thought was a decent

question. Did he know what time the sun will rise if his bill passes? He said he did, but wasn't going to share it with us. So I'll let everyone know that if this bill was to pass, the sun would rise in the—mid-June at 4:20 a.m.

Does the member believe that there'll be additional productivity from the sun being up between 4:20 a.m. and 5:20 a.m. in June?

Mr. Graydon: I believe that people get up when they want to get up. There is no question about that, and with the sun getting up at 4:20 it isn't going to inhibit people from working, not at all. So, yes, productivity will carry on and, as a matter of fact, in rural Manitoba up until 1963 we were all very productive. Thank you.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): We all know that the member's constituency is directly across from the US border, and I'm wondering if the member can explain why he is proposing a bill that would have implications for cross-border trade. Thank you.

Mr. Graydon: The reason for the proposal of the bill is because of the negativities to the switch, and I'm thankful that the member from Brandon East brought up that question because this very subject is being discussed in the legislature in North Dakota. Thank you.

Mr. Swan: You know, I was listening carefully to the member's comments and, again, I'm hoping we can have a better discussion than sometimes happens in this House. One of the things I'm concerned about is that the member seems to think that this would result in a reduction in traffic accidents and fatalities.

Can the member explain why Saskatchewan, which doesn't follow daylight savings time, actually has twice the rate of vehicle fatalities of any other province in Canada?

Mr. Graydon: Madam Speaker, I'm concerned about the province of Manitoba, and we know that the accident rates does jump when the time switches and that's what we're addressing with this particular bill today.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Southdale? *[interjection]* Oh, pardon me.

The honourable member for Fort Richmond.

Mrs. Sarah Guillemard (Fort Richmond): I'm just curious if the member believes that it's prudent and wise to act in isolation from our trading partners here in Manitoba.

Mr. Graydon: Well, I want to thank the member for the question and I consider Saskatchewan one of our trading partners and northern Ontario one of our trading partners. They are very close to us and I know that there is a discussion in North Dakota as we are speaking so I'm not looking at operating in isolation. I want to work with our neighbours.

Mr. Teitsma: I do appreciate the opportunity to speak or to ask another question but it really will be maybe a different, more specific version of the first since the member failed to actually list anybody that he had consulted with. He claimed he did it in his speech. I did listen to most of his speech, so it couldn't have been very many people because it was fairly brief.

Now, here's some groups that I would think that he should've consulted with. Did he consult with call centers? Did he consult with airlines? Did he consult with airports? Did he consult with cross-provincial businesses through the Manitoba chambers of 'comverce'? Did he consult with IT sectors? Did he consult with golf courses, who, I know the member for Minto (Mr. Swan) said we're going to get an extra hour of sunlight in the morning; well, you lose that hour in the evening and play a round of golf after a normal workday—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Graydon: Yes, I did list the people that I did consult with and I did consult with a number of people in each one of them organizations. And, yes, actually the principals in the schools, for example, said the worst two times of the year was the first week of the switch and the last week of the switch. That was the worst times of their life in—all year.

Mr. Blair Yakimoski (Transcona): I'd like to ask the member: don't you think it would be at least a little bit disruptive?

We share our time zone with, I believe, 17 or 18 other states. Some of those states could decide to go on daylight savings time. Some of those states could choose to stay on Central Standard Time. Some of those states could choose to change time twice a year.

When it comes to airline travel, the thought of having several different jurisdictions having different time zones can be potentially disastrous for airlines, as well as a very difficult position when it comes to scheduling staff with layover times required between flights. Maybe talk about if you've thought about that at all.

Mr. Graydon: Yes, the schedule—scheduling is an issue for the airlines and they deal with it on a daily basis. We don't all—we're not all in central or Eastern Standard Time or Central Standard Time, and they deal with that on a daily basis so it's not something that hasn't been dealt with in the past and it's not something that they can't deal with in the future.

Mr. Michaleski: Thank you, Madam Speaker—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Michaleski: —again, I—I'm just going to raise some of the points that the member from Radisson raised on the diversity of this issue and I'll go back and talk about the good people of Dauphin who have come to me and talked about this issue and shared their thoughts and concerns about this issue, so.

But one of their questions and comments that they had is—and I'll ask it to the member from Emerson—is why does the member prefer to stay on standard time year-round rather than choosing to stay on daylight time all year?

Mr. Graydon: It—and the reason that I brought this forward was because constituents brought it to me, and that's what I'm elected to do, is to represent my constituents. I've brought it to this House and I believe that it's time for this to go to committee so that all members of this Legislature can hear what the negativities is to this switch and decide what they want to do going forward.

Madam Speaker: The time for this question period has expired.

* (10:20)

Debate

Madam Speaker: Debate is open.

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): Certainly a pleasure to stand up today in this House and speak on Bill 205, The Official Time Amendment Act (Daylight Saving Time Abolished), Madam Speaker—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wharton: —before I get into my discussion on this bill I just want to set the stage a little bit before I speak directly on the bill. And I'll set the stage by again reminding the House that after 17 years of NDP decline, Madam Speaker, our government is moving forward with an ambitious mandate from 2016 and fixing the finances, repairing the services and rebuilding our economy.

We have worked hard to reduce the tax burden on Manitobans, Madam Speaker. July 1st will be a great day; the PST will be reduced to 7 per cent and tax cut will also save Manitobans over \$300 million. It's certainly an issue with Manitobans when the NDP promised not to raise the PST and, certainly, we know what happened after that. By the end of our second term the PST savings will be in excess of \$2 billion to Manitobans back on their kitchen tables, so we look at that as very good news and it's very exciting for Manitobans.

We have exceeded our budget goals every year since taking office, Madam Speaker, and we're on track to balance our budget in our second term—and, again, we know that recovering from 17 years of mismanagement under the NDP will take several years and we'll—of course, we're very—we remain very focused on that task ahead of us and we've made great inroads already.

Manitobans, again, lead the nation in manufacturing capital, Madam Speaker, in spending. In 2017 there is—*[interjection]*

And, if the member from Minto wants me, I could speak up if he wants me to speak a little louder—

An Honourable Member: I'd like you to talk about the bill.

Mr. Wharton: So—and, again, if he was listening to my preamble he'll know that I'm going to get there, Madam Speaker.

And, certainly, in 10 years, in 2018, manufacturing sales increased by 4.5 per cent, Madam Speaker, and again, exceeded \$19 billion in trade. Since 2015 private-sector employment increased by 2.3 per cent. Again, these are great things that are happening in Manitoba.

And now for the member for Minto (Mr. Swan), I will now get into the discussion about Bill 205, Madam Speaker, and on the fundamental issue, of course, of how we keep time, and it's been alluded to in some of the question and answers this morning.

It's important that Manitoba does not act in isolation without considering the economic consequences and consulting with our trading partners, and we know trade these days is a bit of a challenge. We're having issues right across the globe and, certainly, we need to remain steadfast in our challenges to move forward with our trading partners to ensure that Manitobans' manufacturing and agriculture industries continue to thrive and prosper.

Of course, going forward, they need that and, quite frankly, we know that agriculture is one of the largest contributors to our GDP here in Manitoba, so, certainly, we need to be there for them as we go forward

Until there is consensus among North American jurisdictions, Madam Speaker, the best way forward would certainly not to go in isolation for sure. In the meantime, our focus as a government continues to be working on Manitoba and, again, improving Manitoba to be one of the most improved provinces in Canada.

Some cross-border trade issues, of course, Madam Speaker, a permanent time change would isolate us from other jurisdictions and, of course, there are many markets and customers we do business with. This will affect the shipping and logistics sectors and I know—coming from the trucking industry, I know that time and dispatch is very important and certainly we need to have—make sure that our trading partners not only across the world but just here in North America and in the United States, becomes a challenge when the time—when those time differences are changed.

So if we jump ahead, spring forward, fall back, certainly those are areas that we're doing right now, but we're not doing it by ourselves. It's right across pretty much North America that everybody's falling back and springing forward, and there is a global discussion going on and certainly we want to be a part of those global discussions as we go forward.

I'll highlight some of Manitoba's five largest US export markets, Madam Speaker, located in Central Time zone right now, and some of these trading partners that we deal with on a daily basis is Minnesota, Tennessee, Illinois, Texas and North Dakota. And just to give you an example: Minnesota, \$1.4 billion in trade is—we deal with the Minnesota market; Tennessee is \$1.3 billion.

So these are markets that are in the Central Standard Time zone right now and, certainly, as discussions proceed and move forward with respect to the opportunity to potentially move forward on a collective time change, we need to have those discussions and collaboration with our trading partners, particularly in the Central Standard Time zone.

And, again, trucking companies and railways have carefully established schedules that would be disrupted by time change and as I alluded to, the transportation industry would be—would certainly

suffer the most effects of going alone on this particular issue.

Again, if the United States stayed on daylight saving times but Manitoba did not, border crossings that are not 24-hour crossings would be open later during the winter months so obviously there's some challenges there, too, that need to be addressed to ensure that we don't slow down the economy, slow down the good work that Manitobans do every day in their businesses, small businesses and large businesses, Madam Speaker.

Again, airlines as well—I know I heard it in the House this morning; airlines have well-established schedules and critical connection times, global airports and synchronized optimal passenger experience. Madam Speaker, we know what happens when we have a snowstorm, for instance. Thousands of flights get delayed and backed up and it takes us days, weeks, to recover from something like that and, again, it all circles around time. It definitely has an issue and a concern for us.

This, again, is less desirable for passengers for more expensive airlines and when they fly overseas. Again, overseas is another issue that we need to look at as we go forward.

Another couple of quick areas, Madam Speaker, because I know I don't want to run out of time, but there's so much to talk about this morning about this bill. Changes to time zone alignment's important to ensure consistency what with, again, the airlines border crossings logistics necessary, efficient trade as we talked about and as I alluded to.

We understand that there's a great deal of debate ongoing again about this time change and whether or not it should be retained, and certainly those are discussions we want to continue to have as we continue to move forward with potentially looking at this, but again, Manitobans—I've talked to several Manitobans, and this is not necessarily something that is on their radar right now because they know, quite frankly, what our government was left with, Madam Speaker—cleaning up a mess, an NDP mess of 17 years, and they know they want us to continue to focus on that good work. Of course, with their support and collaboration and certainly we're well on that track. We're happy to see those discussions continue, but certainly we'll monitor other developments throughout not only Canada, but North America and around the world until of course there is maybe consensus—North American jurisdictions on the best way forward.

You know, again, we should not move in isolation on this very important issue.

In closing, Madam Speaker, in the meantime, our focus, again, as a government, we'll continue to work on Manitoba's economy and to ensure that Manitobans at the end of the day end up with more money on their kitchen table going forward with reduced taxes. We know that Manitobans are taxed more than any other province east of Quebec, and certainly our government is working hard to ensure that Manitobans can recognize more than \$200 of money on their table every month or every payroll. I think that's important to Manitobans; we know it is, and we've talked and consulted with them and certainly we're going to be there for them as we continue on this journey together.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I'm pleased to speak on behalf of the NDP caucus on Bill 205, The Official Time Amendment Act, the matter brought forward to attempt to abolish daylight saving time.

Unlike the government minister who just spoke, I'm going to talk about people and not about money. And even though I think people in this House may disagree with the purposes of the bill, I think we have to understand the member that brought it forward brought it forward for the reasons he said. He had people in his constituency that have raised this with him, and he's quite entitled to come into this House and raise matters of concern.

And in its best form, private members' business can actually provide a forum to start a discussion. And I think of a good example, that was last year when the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) actually brought in a bill on organ donation, and it was a system that at this point neither the government caucus nor the NDP caucus could agree with. However, it raised the discussion and I was very, very pleased to be part of a task force that met, heard from experts, and really considered whether there are things that could be done in Manitoba to make things better. And for that reason, I do commend the member for bringing this forward and starting the conversation.

* (10:30)

I don't—I didn't ask the question of the member in my first question to be difficult. I actually wanted to ask the question so that everybody could focus on exactly what the impact would be on people if there was not daylight savings time in Manitoba.

We are a northern jurisdiction with long, cold winters, beautiful summers which are just a little bit too short for my liking, and I expect for many members in this Chamber. We have a problem of too little sunlight at some times of the year and, frankly, too much sunlight at other times of the year.

And I asked the member the question, if we didn't have daylight savings time, when would the sun actually rise in June? The sun would rise at, what I am going to put on the record would be a particularly useless time for myself, for my family, I think for most Manitobans. Right now, in the summer, when you get around the summer solstice, the sun rises at 5:20 a.m.

Well, we live in an area close to the inner city. We've got large beautiful trees. We have birds, including crows that love to be up and waking everybody up as soon as they see a hint of twilight which, if we didn't have daylight savings time, would probably be close to about 3:30 in the morning. My kids now are 20 and 18. They don't really have a problem sleeping in, but I know that there are members in this House that have kids that are quite a bit younger than that. I know there's some students up in the gallery who probably have younger brothers and sisters who probably drive them crazy by getting up as soon as they see a hint of sunlight in the summer.

And I don't know that getting Manitoba households up an hour earlier in the summer, when that hour is between 4:20 and 5:20, is really something that is going to add to productivity.

And what happens on the other end? Well, there are a few things that are as pleasant, in my humble view, as an endless Manitoba evening. And in the summer, as we get into June, the sun doesn't actually set until about 9:40 p.m. If we didn't have daylight savings time, the sun would set an hour earlier and we would lose a lot of those evenings.

I would, even though I don't have MPI's statistics in my hand, I would dare to say there are more people driving at 9:30 p.m. than there are at 5:30 a.m., meaning that more miles would be driven by more Manitobans in the dark.

And the question that I asked the member was an explanation of why it is that Saskatchewan, which we all know doesn't go on daylight savings time, not just has the highest rate of vehicle fatalities, but has the highest rate of vehicle fatalities year after year after year—and not just by 5 per cent or 10 per cent, but vehicle fatality rates twice as high as any other

province in Canada, and—I'll be honest. I asked the question because I hoped the member would have been able to advance that, maybe satisfy some of the concerns that I and other members of this House might have. And all he said is that he's only concerned about Manitoba, not Saskatchewan.

Well, if the goal is to avoid carnage on our highways, I think we'd want to do a little more thinking about what the impact of not going on daylight savings time would be.

Now, I did receive some of the form letters. The member has a website that's up. I did go and take a look at it—maybe I'm in the counter of how many people—because I wanted to do the research and find out a little bit more about it. I got about six emails from people: five form emails; and one constituent of mine, who actually took the time to write a separate email.

And I responded to each one of them to say that we were going to be debating this this morning. I did raise with each of those people the concerns I had about Saskatchewan and looking if there's a reason why we can explain away an increase in vehicle fatalities.

I also said that, in my personal view, I much prefer an extra hour of daylight in the evening and not in the morning, but that other people may have different views. A couple of people then emailed me back to say, hey, that sounds reasonable. Let me know what happens.

One person wrote me back to say that Saskatchewan having the highest rate of vehicle fatalities was fake news, so I sent him the link to about six articles that confirm that and, hopefully, those people will be satisfied with the debate today.

What else would happen if we did away with daylight savings time? Well, even though I've talked about the long summer evenings, what about the evenings in late August and September and into October when the sun starts setting earlier and earlier?

And I ask—I say this to the member, because actually, some of you may know that the member and I have stood on the sidelines of football games. His grandson, actually, was a very good football player; I'm not sure if he's still active playing football. His grandson's team was actually playing the Valour Patriots, which I consider my home team in the West End.

And I remember when I was playing football, it was a struggle to get in practise times in the evening as the sun sets earlier and earlier. Most football teams in the city—most soccer teams, field hockey teams, baseball teams do not have access to lighted practise facilities or, certainly, lighted playing facilities.

And if, all of a sudden, we're seeing the sun go down at 6:30 or 7 by the end of September, it's going to make it really, really difficult for those teams to be able to practise and practise safely.

You probably know, Madam Speaker, that I'm a runner. I appreciate in the summer when it's light enough to run in the morning, but I don't need more light than I have at 6 a.m. or 6:30 a.m. to go for a run.

I will admit, sometimes, that after a day in this Legislature, going for a run is a very useful and helpful thing to do, and I wouldn't necessarily want to have to wait until well into May, before it's light enough, to be able to go and do a run.

So I don't say this to say that the member doesn't have a point. I don't say this to suggest we shouldn't have a further discussion about this. I've got concerns about the bill.

The member for Dauphin (Mr. Michaleski), I believe, asked a question that someone asked me as well: well, if we're going to change the time, why don't we just always be on daylight savings time?

The problem with that, of course, is in December the sun won't rise until 9:20 a.m., which is also highly depressing, but it suggests that even for people who don't like switching clocks, they still don't really have a consensus on whether you should stay on daylight savings time all the time, or stay on standard time all the time.

We're going to have to discuss this again. As the member has correctly pointed out, the European Union has moved on this. I expect not every country in the European Union has the same view. I expect our friends in Sweden, for example, would be quite keen to retain daylight savings time. If you're in Greece or Portugal, you probably don't care so much about trying to save daylight savings because you have enough sun anyway.

We will be discussing this again; I think it was brought forward and it in a reasonable manner, and I'm looking forward to hear what other members might have to say on this.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, just to—I'd like to put a few words on the record, want to thank the member for bringing this forward.

From a Liberal perspective, we see this as an issue which could be quite nicely dealt with by putting it on the ballot at the time of the next provincial election, and then people all over Manitoba could have a vote, and have their input, and have a say. I think that this is an important issue, and that there is some significant emerging science which suggests that the member may have some validity.

I think the question of Saskatchewan and the accidents will need to be looked into, but if my recollection is right, Saskatchewan has about twice the number of kilometres of roads that Manitoba does, and so that—you know, this is something that would need to be looked at in terms of the differences, in terms of roads, et cetera in Saskatchewan and in Manitoba, as well as other potential reasons for the difference.

I believe that it's reasonable to have this go to committee so we can hear people from Manitoba and get more input. Hopefully, at that point, there will be somebody who can present a little bit about the science in terms of Saskatchewan and Manitoba's accident records and so on.

* (10:40)

I noted that the position of the Progressive Conservatives was that they don't really want to deal with this because they're focused on the provincial budget and getting it balanced. You know, it could be a problem, actually, if everything waited until the Conservatives got their budget balanced. First of all, we're very skeptical that's actually going to happen the way the government is decreasing funding in a lot of areas. It's not investing in research and other areas which can contribute positively to the economy, and this government is decreasing the government revenue from the PST and it is likely—with what the government is doing and the economy is slowing down, in part because this government is not investing that the government revenues from other taxes may decrease—and so we're likely to have a deficit under this government if they were to stay in power for quite some time.

And we shouldn't get enamoured of some mythical approach that they will have to actually balancing the budget because it would be, I think, not good what they're doing generally speaking in terms

of cutting back in terms of critical expenditures and making mistakes in terms of where the cutbacks are being made and those cutbacks being made are harming not only our health-care and education system, but also our economy because we're not partnering with the federal government.

We're not investing in infrastructure adequately. We are not investing in research and other areas adequately so that our economy seems to be slowing down from the evidence that we've got. And as a result of that it is likely that tax revenues overall will be less and it is likely that the budget deficit could well continue under this government.

So it doesn't really make a lot of sense not to talk about this until the provincial budget is about balanced, but we should talk about it now. I think it's reasonable to have a discussion of this and to get input from people.

I noted that the NDP position on this, they seem to be opposed to this bill from what I could read, in part, because the MLA from Minto likes to sleep in and make sure that he gets plenty of rest.

An Honourable Member: So does the member from Transcona, by the way.

Mr. Gerrard: But—well, that may be, I—
[interjection]

Anyway, we're looking forward to being able to have a vote and see where people will actually stand.

So thank you, Madam Speaker, merci and miigwech.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further members to speak in debate?

Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 205, The Official Time Amendment Act (Daylight Saving Time Abolished).

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Gerrard: A recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, I must advise the House that according to rule 23(7), a division during a private members' hour on Tuesday must be deferred to the private members' hour the following Thursday. The deferred vote shall take place at 11:55 a.m. on Thursday.

* * *

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Deputy Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, would you seek permission to call it 11 p.m.–11 a.m.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to call it 11 a.m.? [Agreed]

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 6—Reducing the PST

Madam Speaker: The hour is now 11 a.m. and time for private members' resolution. The resolution before us this morning is the resolution Reducing the PST, brought forward by the honourable member for Radisson.

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): I move, seconded by the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Yakimoski), that,

WHEREAS Manitobans work hard to support themselves and their families; and

WHEREAS the previous NDP Provincial Government made this more difficult for Manitobans by taking money from the kitchen table and putting it onto the cabinet table; and

WHEREAS the previous NDP Provincial Government ran on a promise to not increase the PST; and

WHEREAS the previous NDP Provincial Government broke its promise to Manitobans, increasing the PST without the required referendum, after first expanding the tax to everything from home insurance to haircuts; and

WHEREAS the previous NDP Provincial Government routinely failed to balance the budget and forecasted increasing deficits; and

WHEREAS the previous NDP Provincial Government demonstrated a pattern of spending more and getting less resulting in higher taxes, but lower

quality service for Manitobans with the highest ER wait times in Canada, the highest ambulance fees in Canada, higher children in care, and education results last in the country in math, science and literacy; and

WHEREAS the current Provincial Government believes Manitobans deserve a break; and

WHEREAS the current Provincial Government ran on a promise to reduce the PST back to seven per cent; and

WHEREAS the current Provincial Government believes in fixing the finances, repairing the services, and rebuilding the economy; and

WHEREAS on March 7, 2019 the current Provincial Government kept the promise to Manitobans to reduce the PST back to 7%; and

WHEREAS a tax cut of this magnitude is the largest tax cut in Manitoba history, and will save Manitobans \$300 million annually; and

WHEREAS the current Provincial Government's reduction of the PST will save a family of four \$3,000 by the year 2024.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba congratulate all Manitobans for finally receiving their well-deserved tax break when the PST is reduced to 7 per cent on July the 1st, 2019.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Radisson, seconded by the honourable member for Transcona,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba congratulate all Manitobans for finally receiving their well-deserved tax break when the PST is reduced to 7 per cent on July 1st, 2019.

Mr. Teitsma: Madam Speaker, congratulations are in order: congratulations to Manitobans, congratulations to Manitobans for finally getting a break, congratulations to Manitobans for finally seeing that PST that was increased in the wrong way six years ago finally being reduced, congratulations to Manitobans for finally having a government that does what it says it's going to do, for having a

government that has the integrity to fulfill its election promises.

You know, no matter what the members opposite might say, it's this government that's taking Manitoba in a new direction. It's our government that's actually giving Manitobans the change that they were looking for. Change for the better, I think is the phrase that we used, and change for the better, indeed, it is.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

Because that 1 per cent PST reduction is the largest single tax break ever in the history of Manitoba. That is one-eighth, or 12 and a half per cent, of the total PST collected and that's a significant impact to Manitobans. That'll save an average family of four about 500 bucks a year, and all together individuals and families will save an estimated 1.36 billion by 2024.

After years of the previous NDP government's overtaxation, after years of their broken promises, Manitobans deserve a break. And our Progressive Conservative government is giving them just that, by reducing the PST on July the 1st, keeping our promise to do so, and then some, by getting it done within our first term and well before what is forecasted to be the end of it.

Now I should also maybe spend a bit of time talking about the history of how we got here in the first place. Now, six years ago, we had a—I guess it was eight years ago, that we had a—that we had an NDP government that was desperate to cling to power and apparently they were willing to say stuff they didn't mean, quite frankly.

So they promised not to increase the PST, but not only did they increase it but previously they'd even broadened it. Now the net effect of both of those changes and other various tax hikes that the NDP introduced, after promising no tax hikes at all, was basically equivalent to a 9 per cent PST. And we know now that a 9 per cent PST, indeed, was contemplated by the Selinger government of that day.

The Manitobans, I don't think they knew quite what to expect when they elected us as their new government. I think they had hope and now they are seeing that their hopes were well placed, because what they've got is a government that does what it says it's going to do. I'm proud to be a government that keeps its word. I'm proud to be a part of a government that is fixing the finances. I'm proud

to be a part of a government that is repairing its services. I'm proud to be part of a government that's rebuilding the economy.

And you know what? I believe every government should be doing this. Every government should be fixing the finances. Every government should be ensuring that their services are as well delivered as possible. Every government should be ensuring that they've got the right infrastructure in place, the right tax structure in place, to ensure that their economy will thrive. Every government, not just the provincial government here in Manitoba but our federal government in Ottawa needs to do that, and I would also say, as a member—or as a resident of the city of Winnipeg, that our municipal government needs to fix its finances and repair its services, as well, and I believe I've made that clear.

Now members opposite may claim otherwise but they are still headed in the same direction. They still have the same voice. They are still the same party that they were under Greg Selinger, when he was their premier.

* (10:50)

How do I know that they're the same? Well, let's take a look at their record on taxes. Under the previous administration, you know, they increased taxes. They increased the PST; they broadened the PST. So what do we know about the NDP and taxes? We know that they will go up, up, up and that's exactly what they're continuing to do. They don't want us to reduce the PST. No, no, no. They believe that 8 per cent is good. They've contemplated even putting forward another kind of tax, maybe a death tax to just get them on the way out.

Oh, let's look at the NDP record on deficits. Now, the projected deficits when we came into government—and we got a first look at some of those Treasury Board documents, what did it have to say about deficits? Well, under the NDP government deficits were going up, up and up. That's their record. That's what they stand for. That's what they believe in and the craziest thing is that those deficits that were caused—or that were in the projections, they didn't actually include any of the promises that were made by the NDP in the 2016 election.

It's the same direction on taxes. It's the same direction on the deficits, and, sadly, it's also been the same direction on quality of services.

An Honourable Member: Point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Point of Order

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Minto, on a point of order?

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I believe that we're debating Bill 205, The Official Time Amendment Act (Daylight Saving Time Abolished). I think it would—*[interjection]*

Have we moved on? *[interjection]* Oh, okay, all right. I stand corrected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: So there's—so there is no point of order.

Mr. Swan: I'm sorry. I took my lead from the Minister of Municipal Relations (Mr. Wharton).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: So from the member from the—member from Minto, there's no point of order.

* * *

Mr. Teitsma: Well I—thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the reset there.

As I was saying, the NDP government, same direction, same voice, same party as always and sometimes maybe the same lack of attention to detail.

In any case, so we talk about deficits going up, up, up. We talk about the deficits going up, up, up. But what happened to the quality of services, did that go up? No, unfortunately not. On ministry after ministry we look at Justice, we look at Child and Family Services and Families; we look at education outcomes under the NDP government, what was the result? Down, down, down.

Sadly, one stat kept going up, though, and that's the stat that's very important to me personally and it's one that motivated me, quite frankly, to get involved in politics in the first place, and that has to do with the number of children in the care of CFS.

Under the previous government the number of children under the care of CFS went up, up, up. Under our government, for the first time in years it's starting to come down. And the changes—some changes are being made that will actually continue that trend, I believe, because if you truly have those children's needs in mind, if you truly want what's best for them, then you will make sure that you're operating your Families Department in a way that is actually going to benefit the children of Manitoba, and that's not there just to benefit the minister.

Now, the same direction on taxes, the same direction on deficits, the same direction on quality of services, the same direction for kids in care, that's what we have seen under the previous NDP government and that's the same positions they continue to advocate for today.

They—just last week, what did they use their voice for? They have the same voice they've always had, which is they want to have money on the Cabinet table for the government to spend. They want to have money on political parties for the political parties to spend. They want to take money away from Manitoba kitchen tables and put it into their own pockets, put it into their own ability to decide what to spend it on. That's not the direction—that is not the direction that Manitobans want. That is not the voice that Manitobans need. Unfortunately, the NDP are the same party as they've always been.

In any case, this bill is about congratulations—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: —congratulations to Manitobans for electing a government that does what they say they're going to do. And there's a word for that: it's called integrity, and it's something that matters to me deeply.

I'm proud to be part of a caucus that values integrity, proud to be a part of a caucus that values teamwork, because the only way we could have even accomplished this financial objective of reducing the PST, this commitment that we made to Manitobans, was by working very hard, by doing difficult things that were necessary things, by listening to the advice of experts, by listening to Manitobans, by turning the canoe and getting our finances back on track, getting our services back on track where they belong.

Manitobans—over 50 per cent of Manitobans have less than \$200 of discretionary income every month. This PST reduction is for them.

Questions

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before we go on to the question period, I just want to remind anybody who came in the Chamber that we are on private members' resolution right now—so, not the daylight savings time.

So, okay, now a period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Any questions may be addressed in the following sequence: the first question may be asked by a member from another party; any subsequent

questions may follow a rotation between parties; and each independent member may ask one question and no questions or answers shall exceed 45 seconds.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Thank you. I'm not sure if I've recovered from daylight savings time, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I wonder if the member could tell me why his resolution doesn't thank other Canadian provinces for growing their economy so much more quickly than Manitoba, resulting in a windfall of equalization for this government.

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): I thank the member for the question. Certainly, this government is been very focused on meeting our obligations and meeting our—making our promises come true.

And now that means that we are taking the steps necessary to control the rate of growth, to control the rate of growth. Under the previous NDP government the original Treasury Board projections that we had would have us, this year, in a \$1.7-billion deficit, and that is without fulfilling any of their election promises—not that anybody expected them to keep them anyways.

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm wondering if my colleague can share why he believes Manitobans deserve this kind of tax reduction at this time.

Mr. Teitsma: I believe Manitobans deserve a break because they're overtaxed. They're taxed to the max. The previous NDP government treated them like they were some kind of ATM—that whenever they needed a little extra money they could just dip in there, make the PST wider, make the PST higher. It was shameful conduct, especially in light of their promises not to do so. And then, to make matters worse, they refused to even listen to Manitobans, as they're required to by law. That's why Manitobans deserve a break.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I ask the member, why is the government using borrowed money to reduce the PST?

Mr. Teitsma: Well, I always appreciate a question from the Liberal members about deficit spending. But in any case, I know I had a conversation with someone in my constituency just as we were getting set to announce this PST reduction.

He told me, he said: look, you know, some might tell you to lower the deficit. And I said: we are going to lower the deficit. And we have lowered the

deficit. And some might tell you to lower the PST, and I believe that's what you should do, because that's what your word is. And others might tell you to spend more on services. And I said we are spending more on services; we're spending more than a billion dollars, more than any NDP government ever did on families, on health and on education.

Mr. Swan: Yes, does the member for Radisson believe that cutting the PST by 1 per cent is more important than keeping the Concordia ER, that his constituents depend upon, open?

Mr. Teitsma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Health care for Manitobans is very important, and it's very important for me and my constituency as well. I want to make sure that my constituents get the best health care that they can get, and they can do it in a sustainable way. I'm very proud of the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen), and the current Health Minister as well, for their work that they have done in making changes that were necessary in our health-care system.

But this debate is about the PST, and the PST was increased wrongly. It was increased under the guise of, effectively, misinformation by the previous government. They refused to talk to Manitobans and that's what this is about.

* (11:00)

Mr. Andrew Smith (Southdale): Can the member please tell the House how our government was able to keep this important promise by reducing the PST?

Mr. Teitsma: I thank the member for Southdale (Mr. Smith) for that question.

I think I spoke to it in my speech. It's hard work. It's hard work to get control of the government finances. It's hard work to make difficult decisions to change the direction of government. It's teamwork and that's what we have demonstrated on this side of the House. When you look at what was happening on the other side of the House in the dying days of the previous government—shameful conduct, millions and millions of dollars flying out the window to purchase Tiger Dams, to purchase things that didn't even work—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was just wrapping up there, but it's teamwork, it's hard work.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes, Madam—Mr. Speaker, first of all, yes, the government has borrowed money in order to be able to reduce the CST, but the government has also broken solemn commitments that it's made to the City of Winnipeg. The government committed \$40 million to the City of Winnipeg and then just chopped, chopped, chopped, broke that commitment.

And, you know, why, I ask the member, is the government breaking solemn commitments—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gerrard: —that it's made to the City of Winnipeg in order to reduce the PST?

Mr. Teitsma: You know, yesterday I did tweet a little, as some of you may be aware, and I think I made a mistake. I thought, at the time, that perhaps Mayor Bowman was the only one who actually believed the NDP's pre-election spending promises—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: But, apparently, I'm incorrect in that regard because it seems that the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) does as well.

Mr. Swan: I'm just wondering why the member's resolution doesn't thank the federal government which is actually giving this government \$800 million more than government was just receiving just four years ago. Why wouldn't the member include that in his resolution?

Mr. Teitsma: I'm always happy to answer a question about relationships with the federal government from our NDP colleagues away—along the way. But—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: —in any case, I think what the member should know, because he's been around for a long time, so he would remember the way that equalization formula works. He would remember that it's—I would hope that he would know that it's the responsibility of government to conduct themselves in a way that it's—effectively allows for and insulates itself from changes that the federal government does. That's what we've done, because if we ran the government the way you were, we—sorry, but the way the previous NDP government was—we'd be at \$1.7 billion in deficit and that's—*[interjection]*—that—\$1.7 billion—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: —billion. That's what the Treasury Board papers said. That's the material, frankly, that the previous premier, Greg Selinger, had in front of him when he was going into the 2016 election.

Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk): Can the member from Radisson explain to the House how reducing the PST will help benefit the ordinary Manitoban?

Mr. Teitsma: I thank the member for Selkirk for that question—and I ended the speech deliberately on that point.

We know that many Manitobans struggle financially. I know I grew up in a family like that. The Premier (Mr. Pallister) grew up in a family like that where there was not a lot of money left at the end of the month, not a lot of money left on the table at the end of the month. And the recent work by MNP shows that roughly 50 per cent—a little bit more, I believe—of Manitoba families have less than \$200 of discretionary income on their tables at the end of the month. For those people and for the people that I was when I was growing up, when I was in a household that was poor, that's the kind of households that are going to be positively impacted. And I know when you're—when we're all in this—

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

Mr. Swan: I want to thank the member for Radisson (Mr. Teitsma) for finally putting on the record the fact that his government's entire plan is to make Manitoba a have-not province so they can get more equalization from the federal government. Can the member then explain why equalization has gone up \$519 million in the last four years which has paid for this PST cut and, actually should have paid for keeping emergency rooms and—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —urgent care clinics open?

Mr. Teitsma: I see that the member is running out of, perhaps, speaking points on his part.

But in any case—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: There is that, as well.

Well, I do want to say to the member that when he was in government, he had an opportunity to speak up in a principled way, but he failed. Well, he spoke up but he didn't quite do it in a principled way, wouldn't you agree? That's what I believe that we

saw from his government when he was in charge—
[interjection]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Teitsma: —and now he tries to hold us to account. I don't buy it.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, the government has borrowed money in order to reduce the PST. The government has broken a commitment to the City of Winnipeg. I have a letter from the mayor calling on all Winnipeg MLAs—[interjection]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gerrard: —to provide support to the City of Winnipeg and I would ask: Why did the member not support the City of Winnipeg and instead supported the breaking of the promise and the commitment to the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Teitsma: I thank the member for that question because I do very much support the City of Winnipeg. The Province supports the City of Winnipeg: 90 per cent more funding this year than in 2002. That is three times the rate of inflation; that is support.

I support the mayor in giving him good advice. Just last night I gave him advice to fix his finances like our Premier (Mr. Pallister) has, to repair his services like our Premier has for his province. That's what's needed with the City of Winnipeg and that's what I believe I can give to the mayor: good advice and unprecedented levels of support through the Municipal Relations Department. Thank you.

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

Debate

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

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I think I'm going to do something that's really going to upset members opposite and I'm actually going to quote from their budget, and I know nothing makes them more upset than to actually have their own numbers put on the record.

And I hear they're getting angry already, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I know how difficult it is. The Premier comes out and says something off the cuff and they all have to run back and figure out how they're going to get out from under what the Premier said, and then one of their ministers will go

out and they'll declare something and they all have to run back and get new speaking notes of how they're going to deal with that.

This private members' resolution is an excellent opportunity to highlight for the people of Manitoba just how poorly this government has managed a true windfall they've been receiving from the federal government, and in fact because of the superior performances of, well, just about every other province in Canada.

This was a Premier who told us all he was going to aim higher, but instead this is a Premier who is dragging Manitoba to dead last, and I don't say that lightly. Because of this government's decision to cut, this government's decision to refuse to invest, this government's often hard-hearted decisions to cut off Manitobans who need assistance the most, the Conference Board of Canada—which is not necessarily known for putting forward a left-wing view, Mr. Deputy Speaker—the Conference Board has crunched their numbers and they've determined that next year, Manitoba is going to have the slowest growth rate of any province in Canada, which is the exact opposite of the line which this Premier and his little Cabinet, and his large—although not as large as it used to be—caucus continue to try to spin and to confuse Manitobans.

If we look at the budget, of course, what do we see? We know from the summary budget detail on page 3 that this government is actually receiving an additional \$319 million in federal transfers this year over last year—\$319 million, or about twice the amount of the cost of the PST cut for this year.

And we know this comes at a time when health funding—when spending on health is being cut by this government both in year and from year to year. We know it's happening at a time that civil service salaries are being frozen by decree of this government without negotiation, and we see that it is really a series of cuts and freezes that are entirely unnecessary. If we break down the federal transfers just a little bit more, we see how all of this government's complaints are, frankly, manufactured.

* (11:10)

We look at federal transfers. Well, equalization was 2 billion, 37 million dollars in 2018-2019. We see this year—thanks to this government's mismanagement of the economy, thanks to this province being lapped by Alberta, by British Columbia, by other provinces across the country—

equalization has increased by 5.1 per cent to 2 billion, 255 million dollars.

We also see that Canada Health Transfer, which has been the fig leaf, if you will, for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the former minister of Finance, and the Minister of Health, and the former minister of Health. Well, what do we see? We see the Canada Health Transfer is actually going up by 7.1 per cent in this budget year.

This was a government that complained that they weren't getting 6 per cent increases in health funding. While they're still complaining, they're not getting 6; they're getting 7.1 per cent this year from the federal government.

And let's take a look, then, at the history. Because of course the member for Radisson (Mr. Teitsma) has put his own strange history on the record, let's actually take a look at the history. Because I think it's very instructive and very useful.

If members turn to page 59 of the budget and budget papers, they will see exactly what happened on major federal transfers to Manitoba from 2009-10 to 2019-20.

And, if the members will take a look, they will see that in 2009-2010, Manitoba actually received more than \$2 billion in federal transfers.

But over the years, as the NDP government in Manitoba continued to grow the economy, continued to diversify the economy, continued to bring more people into the economy by investing in them, by getting them through high school, by getting them into university and keeping them in university, getting them into college or keeping them in college, getting them into apprenticeships and getting through an apprenticeship, more and more people were able to join the economy.

First of all, so that they're not drawing on government services, but, second of all, so that they're paying taxes. It's something you think would be absolutely at the heart of something a Conservative would talk about, but, sadly, that's not the case.

By 2015-2016, the amount of those equalization payments to Manitoba—in constant dollars—had dropped by more than \$300 million. Well, now, of course, enter a new government that has been doing nothing but cutting, doing nothing but reviewing—which is a code for cutting—giving uncertainty to

people working in just about every field from health care to manufacturing to construction. Well, what do we see has happened?

In 2015-2016, equalization payments were \$1.738 billion. Now, in 2019-2020, those equalization payments have gone up by a staggering \$517 million. That's an extra \$517 million that this Premier (Mr. Pallister), and obviously his caucus—who all see themselves as some kind of Horatio Alger, pull yourself up by your bootstraps story—as Bonnie Mitchelson would tell you, we was happy but we was poor—this government has actually been the poorest in the country at diversifying the economy, at growing the economy.

And their entire key to success has been standing there with their hand out, to say to the federal government, please give us more money. We're doing such a terrible job, we are entitled to more equalization.

And they've done that year after year after year after year—*[interjection]* And for the member from Southdale, it's page 59, and it's your own government's budget papers, so I'm assuming you're—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —going to rely on those numbers. *[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: And then where do we get to? If the member for Southdale (Mr. Smith) turns the page, to page 60, you'll have a look at per capita growth and major federal transfers from 2019-2010 to 2019-2020. And there in black and white, what does the government say? Per capita major federal transfers to Manitoba are only 12 per cent higher than they were 10 years ago. This is just over one-third of all the Province's increase of 33 per cent.

And, in fact, all of that 12 per cent increase has come in the last 2 years. Because government revenues—from the Government of Canada—were not only flat, they were actually going down. That was a function of Stephen Harper in office. That was also a function of an NDP government that was growing the economy at a pace that has rarely been seen in Manitoban—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —history. And I know members don't like to address that. It must be very, very painful for the

member for Morris (Mr. Martin) to have to look in the mirror and say, boy, I'm glad I'm part of a government that is doing so poorly that we're getting more equalization payments from the federal government year after year after year.

And even despite that, even despite that windfall of money through their own incompetence, what are they doing?

Well, cutting health care. The member for Radisson (Mr. Teitsma) wouldn't answer the question about what he thought was more important.

Did he—does he really think closing the Concordia ER is not important?

If that's the case, I can't wait to see the reception he's going to get at his doorsteps when he goes around and says, I'm giving you two cents on a cup of coffee, too bad you're going to have to get an ambulance and go to Grace general hospital if you have an emergency.

And there's the member for Morris, who just continues to knock on doors. I can't wait for him to knock on doors around Seven Oaks General Hospital and say, hi—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —I'm here. You don't know who I am. I've got no connection to the community but I'm really proud because I stood there in the backbench and I helped close down the emergency room at Seven Oaks General Hospital. He's going to be really popular. I can't wait to knock on some doors in McPhillips and hear what people have to say.

So what else do we have? Well, we've got a government that's frozen spending for education in the province. A government's making foolish decisions on closing things, most recently, Curriculum Support Centre in my own community of Minto; putting students at risk, taking away resources from teachers, making it more difficult from teachers being able to do the right thing in their classrooms. Teachers who are now faced with more and more students in their classes because this government scrapped the small-size class initiative, even though they had more and more money coming into their hands.

And, you know, it's disappointing to see the—this government holding back students and we've seen it, not just in the K-to-12 system—

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

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Education and Training): I want to thank the member for Radisson for bringing forward this resolution and to have a little walk in history, Madam Speaker. Sometimes when you've been elected long enough, you're afforded that little walk in history and it's important to speak about how much the NDP hate reducing the PST and how much they want to increase the PST.

And, if you go back to 2013 in that budget, and the former NDP finance minister was sitting beside the premier of the day. And when he stood up and said during the budget speech that they were going to introduce the PST—or, increase the PST, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the shock that happened in this House. I mean, it was dead silence. No one could believe at the time when that Finance minister was saying that the NDP was going to increase the PST because they remember, while the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe) says—maybe he wasn't shocked. Maybe he was in the know at the time.

But, certainly, I saw a lot of shock on the NDP benches because of the promise that had been made in the previous election. And then to come out of that budget and to hear the NDP at that time trying to come up with the narrative about why they were trying to increase the PST.

First, they said, well, it was going to help to reduce the deficit and, of course, nobody believed that because of the track record that the NDP had on the deficit. And then they said, oh, don't worry, we're going to put it all into roads and nobody really believed that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

They struggled as a caucus, as a government, to even explain what they were going to do with the money. And, for Manitobans, it seems like they were just taking the money because they could. Of course, they had a track record of having the vote tax and then putting a lot of money for things that would benefit them and their political party, and so that certainly didn't help their narrative. But they struggled for weeks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to try to explain to Manitobans what they were going to do with that money.

And at the same time, they had to change The Referendum Act because under the balanced budget legislation, we had a provision that required when a major tax increase happened, that it had to go to the people. It had to go to a referendum and

it required the government to change that—to take out the referendum requirement. They went to that extraordinary length to try to increase the PST, to take away the right for people to have that vote. Something that had been there since, I believe, 1995, when the act was introduced by the former Gary Filmon government, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

* (11:20)

And then we had the protests. When the referendum was being taken away, people came to the steps of the Legislature. Hundreds of people, multiple times, came and had those protests on the front steps of the Legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm sure the member for Minto (Mr. Swan) remembers them. He must have scurried out the side of the building to avoid them, because no NDP member went to them. No NDP member would show their face at one of those protests to listen to those Manitobans, and they gave them plenty of opportunity—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Goertzen:—they came time and time and time again, and we couldn't get the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe) to come out. He'd scurry out the back door into his vehicle and drive home and not want to face the people. So they went from shocking people in the budget to not being able to explain to where the money was going to go, to trying to change—or changing the legislation so a referendum wouldn't have to happen, to avoiding the public through those protests.

And then the committees started. The committees started in the summer of 2013, and hundreds of Manitobans registered to speak at committee about the PST going up, and the NDP members who were required to sit on that committee went, but the premier of the time never went to the committee.

Many of the government never came to that committee; in fact, they were criticized for being at the committee and looking at their BlackBerrys or iPhones, whatever they had at the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they weren't listening to Manitobans, and that became sort of an issue in the committees because they refused to listen to people within that public opportunity. So they ignored the referendum, ignored the protests, wouldn't listen to Manitobans at committees. These are the extraordinary lengths that the NDP government went to to increase the PST—how much they desired to increase the PST.

And then we sat through the summer and I think I mentioned it at the time, and I'll just say it again, I want to commend the staff of the Legislature, all of the staff in the 2013 session when we went through and sat into September to try to convince the NDP government to follow the law. The staff of this building were outstanding in what was a very difficult time, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And through that summer, through the hot summer in this building, in the hallways where it was well over 40 degrees, the NDP refused; they still wouldn't back off of increasing the PST.

They wanted the money so badly, even though they couldn't describe to Manitobans where the money was going, even though they had to break the referendum law, even though they wouldn't listen to the protests, even though they wouldn't go to committee. They still sat through the summer beholden to trying to get more tax money, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And, when that didn't work, when the House rose in September, when our opposition at the time had done all that we could to try to convince the NDP to do the right thing, to follow their election promise, something that they had committed to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had a look at the courts, and try to get the courts to convince them to follow the law. And yet they rounded up the lawyers, they gave a bunch of money to the government lawyers to go in to not oppose us, but to oppose the public, to oppose people, to say to them: we're going to use your tax dollars now to ensure that you don't get a voice through the referendum. And we went through that process to try to support Manitobans.

And ultimately, what did it do, Madam Speaker? Ultimately—or Mr. Deputy Speaker—PST went up, the money was taken, they broke the referendum law, they didn't listen to the protests, they didn't come to committees, we sat through the summer, they couldn't explain where the money was going and ultimately was one of the key factors in the rebel five and blowing up the NDP party.

Now there were other things of course, there was the issue of Tiger Dams, but there's no doubt that the raising of the PST was a clear division, a clear fault line in the NDP party, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I defy any member who was there at the time to say otherwise. It was clearly, it was clearly a fault line within the party that caused senior ministers of that government to abandon the government and to abandon their premier at the time.

But these are the extraordinary lengths that the government, that the NDP party took to raise the PST on Manitobans. They shocked Manitobans in the budget; they couldn't explain to them where the money was going to go; they changed the referendum law that had been there since 1995; they ignored the protests on the front of the Legislature; they refused to come to committees and listen to Manitobans; they held the Legislature here through the summer into September; they fought Manitobans in the court and then they blew up their own party, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's how much they wanted to take money out of Manitoba's pocket.

And now they have an opportunity to try to not erase that record, not reverse the record, but maybe soften the record just a little bit. They have the opportunity to right their wrong—in a sense, we'll be righting it for them, but to reduce the PST and to support that, to say we actually support the reduction of the PST.

Now, polls would show—and I'm not a huge believer in polls, but they sometimes indicate some things—and yesterday we saw the poll that said Manitobans support this, they support our government in doing—even a significant faction of the NDP supporters who identified themselves as NDP supporters say that they support the reduction of the PST.

And yet, even though they were willing to sacrifice everything politically, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to increase the PST, we see the same actions from the member opposite, we see the same actions. They want to delay, they want to stall, they want to ring the bells, they want to do anything they can to prevent Manitobans from getting that tax break. They don't seem to have learned anything in three years. They gave up everything politically and they still don't want Manitobans to get a reduced PST, a reduced tax.

I don't understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don't understand it politically, I don't understand it economically, I don't understand it in any way that makes sense why the New Democrats would do all those extraordinary things to take the money from Manitobans and now are prepared to do extraordinary things to prevent the money from going back to Manitobans.

They are not on the side of Manitobans; they've proven it through their actions. They've proven it through their actions over the last three years. They gave up everything they could politically to take the

money from Manitobans and they seem to be prepared to do it again.

Now, far be it from me to give advice to the NDP. I'm not here to give them any political advice, but they may want to look back at the history of this, come together as a caucus and finally decide, after all the lessons of those last—of these last six years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to—

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

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): I do want to challenge a number of the statements made in this claim, one of which is the amount of money that families will apparently be getting.

It says: whereas the current provincial government's reduction to PST will save a family of four \$3,000 by the year 2024. There are some serious questions about exactly who pays and who benefits from all these tax changes, but the idea that has been promoted by this government is that people will be able to save huge amounts of money or that they'll be able to suddenly renovate their kitchen and it'll be because of the drop in the PST.

The fact is, as the Premier (Mr. Pallister) himself has noted many times, over half of Manitobans—55 per cent of Manitobans are \$200 a month away from insolvency. So the idea that this is going to be a huge boon for most people when it is based on how much people spend—and there are many exemptions from PST—that the economic impact of this promise have been highly exaggerated.

This is a policy that is one of the reasons—the promise to enact this and to reduce revenues is one of the reasons why Manitoba's debt is—has higher interest rates.

This government has had two downgrades under—from credit-rating agencies; the first because they announced that they were going to run eight years of deficits without a plan to balance the budget—and we still don't apparently have a 'pline' to balance the budget; and the second was that they promised to go ahead with additional tax cuts with no way of replacing revenue or even growing the economy.

So that—for all that in principle it would be a fine thing to lower the PST; when it comes to the calculation of benefits for families, I'm highly skeptical. I don't know that the government has

provided anything at all in terms of their justification for how this'll benefit people.

* (11:30)

The budget actually says that we'll see \$15 million in benefits for labour and \$90 million in benefits for GDP, but that's \$300 million that we're going to be borrowing—more than \$300 million we're going to be borrowing for a \$90-million benefit. That is a negative return on investment.

And the frustration here is also that when it comes to the books of the Province, we're going to be borrowing, with interest, hundreds of millions of dollars in order to pay for a tax cut.

But the bigger picture is that the government's finances have been harmed, not just by the NDP, who also made significant tax breaks—gave tax breaks while they were in office and contributed to a structural deficit, but because the previous federal government seriously harmed and undermined Manitoba's financial position.

And this is—it may not be popular but it—the reality is, I've said this many times, is that tax cuts are part of what contributed to Manitoba's deficit. That in 2008, the NDP announced that they had cut—they had reduced the amount of money coming into the government by over a billion dollars and most of that was not a social, democratic or bottom-up tax relief. It was mostly relief for people at the very top.

In 2015, the NDP had a tax calculator which showed how much people—how much money people would have saved between 1999 and 2015 on their income taxes. And a person making \$500,000 a year would have saved \$70,000. The fact is that this has an impact, an enormous impact on—not just on the bottom line, but while the NDP was in the power, that they did not follow what you'd think of as either Keynesian or social democratic policies that were designed to help people from the bottom-up. They followed—they were essentially fiscal conservatives and they boasted about it.

But fiscal conservatism—there's an old Saturday Night Live sketch called, Theodoric, medieval barber, where Steve Martin plays a barber and every single prescription he has for every ailment is more bleeding. Bill Murray plays a peasant, who's had his legs run over by a truck and when they bring him in, the prescription is more bleeding.

And essentially, that's what this government is doing. It's more and more bleeding. That seems to be

the answer to absolutely everything, which is both nonsensical and dangerous because the premise of this government coming in was that the NDP's deficits were caused by overspending, when the Tories themselves have said, we know that there wasn't enough spending on replacing \$400 million worth of emergency radios. We know that there weren't investments in the infrastructure.

Some of the biggest investments were in increases in spending over those years—were not in anything that would be productive. It wasn't into business. It wasn't into infrastructure. It wasn't even necessarily into health care or education. It was into justice and CFS. Those are two areas where we saw absolutely—where spending actually doubled and those are both areas where it's a consequence of the neglect of social supports, the lack of housing, the lack of jobs and the fact that we had some of the highest poverty in Canada. And this is a record of the NDP, not just in Manitoba, but in Saskatchewan, as well.

The fact is, is that—as I've said many times, that the NDP had not been progressive for a generation. There was even an example of this under the federal NDP in 2008, when we were facing an enormous—a colossal finance—global financial crisis and a huge recession. There's Marc Lavoie who's an economist, said he ran into Jack Layton at a—in September 2008, at a security gate at the Ottawa airport, and he said that to pre-empt a huge recession, he should ask for a stimulus program and in—argue in favour of a large federal deficit.

Mr. Layton responded that provincial NDP governments had run eight balanced or surplus budgets in a row and told me if I held such crank ideas, I had to start my own political party.

In the end, people started to realize that following the absolute disaster of the financial crisis, that there was no choice but to have a stimulus. But the irony here, again, is the hypocrisy of the PC government complaining about the fact that the NDP changed the balanced budget law. The fact is that it's a law that's been changed 10 times under both parties because both parties have been unwilling to accept the actual consequences of running a deficit, which is to say to take pay cuts.

So they've been willing to change the law to make sure that they don't get—take a pay cut, even while running what is basically or sometimes often fairly sensible Keynesian economics. But things like the balanced budget law and things like the

referendum law both force politicians to tie themselves into knots because both of those are attempts on the part of the PCs to create, in legislation, a permanent Conservative government or make sure that governments of other political stripes and different economic ideas have no choice but to enforce bad, discredited, outdated, neo-conservative fiscal policy, which has been proven not to work. It just—but to enshrine those in legislation, to make sure that, no matter who's in power, it—we might as well have a Conservative government on autopilot. This is, obviously—to me—a huge mistake. One of the fundamental things about democracy is that if we cannot change economic policy in election; then, as one person said, there's not much point in having a democracy.

And, when it comes to the question of the PST, well, I think the previous NDP government made a mistake in saying that they would not raise it and then raising it. The issue of having a referendum—the one very important piece of—or, decision that was handed down when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) decided to take the issue to court, was that judge—the judge found that there actually is no basis whatsoever for having a referendum on tax increases.

Again, I mean, this is—if—I mean, in a sense, the Premier has done his opponents a favour, because that law is basically illegitimate. And, as the judge said at the time, Canada's constitution sets out certain powers. And it is not legal, it is unconstitutional for a government to pass the decision on whether a tax will go up or not to the public. In the same way that it's actually—we as opposition members are not able to introduce money bills. It is actually a fundamental aspect of government that cannot be shirked or neglected.

And the fact that the government is—intends on bringing in legislation which is known to be unconstitutional—because the Premier has said he doesn't believe in judge-made law—is extremely concerning. Because this is not even—this is not a question of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms; this is a part of law that goes back hundreds and hundreds of years. The ability to levy taxes is a key—is key to sovereignty, the sovereignty of the Legislature and, frankly, of a democratic—

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

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): It's my pleasure to rise today and put a few comments, brief comments, on the record, in support of my colleague, the

member for Radisson's (Mr. Teitsma), motion this morning. I think the subject of the provincial sales tax is one front and centre before Manitobans in this Legislative Assembly.

Before I get into the details, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it's worth nothing I listened carefully to the member for Minto's (Mr. Swan) comments. And, again, in terms of history, a lot of colleagues here may not realize, actually, the member for Minto actually ran for leader of the New Democratic Party against Greg Selinger and Steven—Steve Ashton and at the time he actually said it's like a marathon. And the member is actually a very avid runner; he's talked about it many times; we've seen each other out on the course and that. But, unfortunately, in this marathon, he—what he does often: quit.

But one of the things that he said in terms of, you know, what is your platform, if you should become leader of the NDP, well, one of his platforms was, well, I would go to Ottawa and I would make Manitoba look as destitute as possible. Our goal is to go cap in hand, and so that we could get as much money as we can.

So, again, the goal was to—let's do everything we can to keep Manitoba as a have-not province which is really an unfortunate agenda of the NDP but, again, no surprise.

Now, we've heard, you know, the comment that, you know, the famous—or infamous—comment from Greg Selinger, that—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martin: —the idea of raising the PST was total nonsense, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's ridiculous; the idea that they would raise a tax.

So, in the backdrop of Greg Selinger saying that, well, the new leader of the NDP, the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew), what was he saying about the PST—proposed PST hike at that time? Well, he said, and this is a quote: How does raising the PST help grow the economy? How was a tax, which takes a proportionally bigger slice of poor people's income, help?

* (11:40)

Now, again, I remember that. So here we have the leader—the new leader of the New Democratic Party—specifically noting that the PST was an attack on the poor, attack on people on fixed and low income. And yet they try and there's a new advertising campaign where, you know, it's a new

leader, New Democrat, new vision and that, but apparently, it's the same old vision of tax, tax and tax. And they don't care if it's taxing the poor, they don't care if it's people on fixed income, low income; they just want to tax people.

And, you know, it's the classic with the NDP, the classic cake-and-eat-it-too, because even just a few weeks ago, again, the leader of the NDP, he said, and I'm quoting: Increasing the PST was a mistake. End quote. And that was just on March 7th.

So today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these members opposite, the former members of the NDP government, had an opportunity, as my colleague for Steinbach noted, they could have stood up. They could have acknowledged their errors, they could have said, you know what, we made a mistake, we broke the law, we rammed through this sales tax, we hurt people on low and fixed incomes, you know, and this is an issue.

Now I can hear the deputy—or, the opposition House leader chirping from her seat about breaking the law, you know what, and I would think their government and their members of all would support a PST hike because they would want to raise that or save that money themselves. I mean, I could imagine that the cost—I believe the cost of being caught texting and driving is in around \$1,000, so I know the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith), I'm sure she will stand and support the PST reduction because nobody wants—and nobody should actually be texting and driving much less having to pay, you know, that \$1,000 tab, so, you know what, safety should always be a first situation in all our driving, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, you know what, my honourable colleague, the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen) did note that it was in 1995 under Gary Filmon that the referendum provision came in, but what he didn't note is actually that balanced budget legislation was changed multiple times. I believe at least four times under the NDP and each and every single time, they retained the referendum provision. They like the referendum provision so much that they extended it to MPI and they extended it to Manitoba Hydro.

So it is a certain sad irony, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they used taxpayer dollars to fight their own legislation, to argue that their own NDP legislation,

their own referendum provisions were invalid, that you couldn't do. I mean, it's a head-scratcher to say the least, but with those very, very brief comments, I do urge all members in this House to look to my colleague, the member for Radisson (Mr. Teitsma), see the wisdom in this resolution, see the wisdom of lowering taxes, see the wisdom of lowering taxes specifically on a tax that disproportionately takes a bigger slice of poor people's income. And with those very brief comments, I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): It's beyond belief, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Radisson, whose community is being directly affected by the closure of Concordia Hospital—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wiebe: —who has limited—*[interjection]*

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wiebe: —voice in this Legislature to begin with—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wiebe: —who has one opportunity to bring that forward in this Legislature and instead he shirks that responsibility.

I'll stand for his constituents. I'll stand up for all their constituents who don't get a voice. The member for Morris (Mr. Martin), who wants to represent a community that's having their hospital closed, will not stand up for them. I will stand up for them.

The minister who was responsible for closing the hospital will stand up here today before the Legislature and refuse to put words on the record about how those closures will affect—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wiebe: —their communities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When this matter is before the House, the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe) will have nine minutes remaining.

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 9, 2019

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Resolutions	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Res. 6—Reducing the PST	
Second Readings—Public Bills		Teitsma	1095
Bill 205—The Official Time Amendment Act (Daylight Saving Time Abolished)		Questions	
Graydon	1087	Swan	1098
Questions		Teitsma	1098
Teitsma	1088	Martin	1098
Graydon	1088	Gerrard	1098
Swan	1088	A. Smith	1098
Michaleski	1088	Lagimodiere	1099
Isleifson	1089		
Guillemard	1089	Debate	
Yakimoski	1089	Swan	1100
Debate		Goertzen	1102
Wharton	1090	Lamont	1104
Swan	1092	Martin	1106
Gerrard	1094	Wiebe	1107

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

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