

Third Session – Forty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

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

Vol. LXXI No. 48A - 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 15, 2018

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLUM, James	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
BINDLE, Kelly	Thompson	PC
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy, Hon.	River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
CURRY, Nic	Kildonan	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FIELDING, Scott, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
FLETCHER, Steven, Hon.	Assiniboia	Ind.
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Clifford	Emerson	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott	St. James	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
KLASSEN, Judy	Kewatinook	Lib.
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan	Selkirk	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Burrows	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MAYER, Colleen	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	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, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	St. Boniface	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 15, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Please be seated. Good morning, everybody.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Acting Government House Leader): Good morning, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if you could canvass the House, see if there's leave to debate Bill 212 and 221, in that order, for concurrence and third readings.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to proceed with concurrence and third readings of Bill 212 to be followed by concurrence and third reading of Bill 221 this morning? *[Agreed]*

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS— PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 212—The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act

Madam Speaker: We will then move to the first one, concurrence and third reading, Bill 212, the invasive species awareness day act.

Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk): Yes. I move, seconded by the MLA for Swan River, that Bill 212, The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred on and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Lagimodiere: Madam Speaker, The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act will bring awareness regarding aquatic and terrestrial invasive species to Manitobans. It will help make Manitobans aware of just how real and significant these threats are and the

potential impacts of specific invasive species on Manitoba.

Invasive species cost Manitobans millions in lost production, threaten natural ecosystems and can pose serious health risks. The more Manitobans know when it comes to these threats, the more proactive they can be in prevention, detection and identification.

The mere fact that the member from Wolseley keeps asking members the number of threats that exist with the proposed transboundary water diversion projects is evidence to the fact that he himself believes that Manitobans are ill-informed or not informed at all when it comes to most invasive species.

It is very discouraging to hear the member from Wolseley state that he and his government thought it was impossible to stop zebra mussels from eventually invading Lake Winnipeg.

If this was indeed the belief of the previous government as a whole, one needs to ask just why, then, did the government spend 500,000 of Manitobans' tax dollars on treating two harbours in Lake Winnipeg in a failed attempt to eliminate zebra mussels from the lake.

There are many lakes, rivers, streams in Manitoba still at risk, perhaps an even greater risk than previously due to the close proximity to an already infected body of water. In fact, serious concerns exist over the potential spread of zebra mussels through the entire Lake Winnipeg drainage basin.

There's a great deal of concern over the spread of zebra mussels to a small lake in my constituency called Gull Lake, which is only a few miles away from Lake Winnipeg and is one of the lakes for choice boating if Lake Winnipeg becomes too rough.

Madam Speaker, in the spring of 2014, I found a small mussel attached to a dock barrel while putting my docks in the water for the season.

When I called the department, I was told zebra mussels are not in the Red River.

After searching the Internet to try to identify the species, I was 99 per cent convinced that from the identification criteria that I did have a zebra mussel.

I called and sent pictures in. It was suggested I not overreact since, although not found in Lake Winnipeg, they could not travel upstream and North Dakota was monitoring the Red River and none were reported.

I eventually convinced those in charge to come out and have a look and they found four other zebra mussels and confirmed, in fact, there were zebra mussels in the Red River.

Last year on our property we found a beautiful white flower growing on the shoreline. Neighbours suggested that we add some red flowers as to help celebrate Canada's 150th anniversary. As I researched the flower, I found it was also an invasive species known as unscented camomile. My wife was horrified when she returned home one day to find me mechanically removing every trace of that remnant flower on my property.

Again, last year while visiting a farmer making hay, I noticed a large yellow flower in his hayfield. I asked the farmer if he knew what it was. He said he did not, but didn't seem concerned.

I took some time and investigated and was able to determine it was also an invasive species known as common tansy. I also found that this plant is extremely difficult to eliminate since it spreads both by seeds and by rhizomes, or the roots.

And just the other day, while doing some reading, I read an article about a fungus that is new to North America. The fungus is infecting the skin of amphibians and leading to their inability to control moisture and breathe properly. Frogs across North America are dying in large numbers due to this new invasive threat believed to have been brought to North America on imported amphibians.

The stories I cite are just some of the many examples of invasive species and how we miss more from not knowing. We all need to be very concerned over invasive species spread within our province and the general lack of knowledge regarding an invasive species' ability to show up undetected and cause serious threats to our ecosystems.

Manitoba has an environmental, economic and social interest in protecting the ecosystems in Manitoba. This bill works to protect Manitoba's environment by raising awareness to the public of

the issues of invasive species in Manitoba and their effects on Manitoba's environment.

We recognize the importance of identifying invasive species because invasive species are harmful to local ecosystems. They can have both environmental and economic consequences and approximately 40 per cent of threatened endangered species are at risk due to invasive species, and early identification can help mitigate harm.

This bill continues on the path of protecting Manitoba's environment by raising awareness of invasive species to the public and Manitoba will be the first province or territory to enact a law declaring an official invasive species awareness week.

Madam Speaker, let's do all we can to spread the word and not the species. Thank you.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): And another chance to speak, albeit briefly, to this bill. My colleagues want me to speak at length to this, kind of—there's not a whole lot of material to riff off of. This bill is all of a page long and while well-intentioned, my earlier comments stand.

* (10:10)

What this government needs to be doing is preventing further invasive species from arriving in Manitoba, rather than telling people that, lo and behold, they haven't done anything to prevent invasive species from coming to Manitoba.

The member, I think, has brought this forward in good faith. I have no reason to doubt that at all. And, as the MLA for a constituency that is located right along the Red River, a waterway, I understand the connection that he has with the issue and his motivations in bringing it forward. He will certainly want to appear to be doing something about an issue that his government is actively ignoring.

And we had a debate on a private member's resolution which my caucus colleagues very kindly allowed me to bring forward where we tried to highlight again for this government, for this member, for this Premier (Mr. Pallister) and for the relevant ministers that there is a massive threat to the health of Manitoba's fresh water, not just in the Red River but throughout the entire Hudson's Bay drainage basin. And we got nothing, absolutely nothing, from this government. Not even an acknowledgement that they've dropped the ball on the issue, not even an acknowledgement that they've had every opportunity

to do the right thing, to do even the tiniest thing to try and protect the future health of Manitoba's water.

But they're more than happy to support the MLA for Selkirk's legislation which will proclaim the last week of April a week when governments now and into the future will be obligated to acknowledge the mistakes made by this government when it comes to invasive species. So perhaps there is some modicum of success or progress in hoping that this government will be honest with Manitobans, which they will not, but we can always hope that maybe a future government will be.

The project and the threat, of course, that I refer to, are massive water diversion projects in North Dakota which this member from Selkirk just referenced in his remarks a few minutes ago. So I give him credit. Sometimes I wonder if members opposite are even bothering to listen to any of the ideas or concerns or issues that Manitobans have, never mind that we as opposition MLAs have. All of my colleagues raise very valid points on a wide variety of issues, and they're just brushed off summarily by this government. I'll give the MLA for Selkirk credit. It appears he was actually listening to that resolution, and he referenced it in his remarks right now.

Where on earth is the response from this government, Madam Speaker?

We have not one but two massive water diversion projects on the books in North Dakota right now. They would mix waters from the Missouri River system with the waters in the Hudson Bay system for the first time in thousands upon thousands of years. The mix of species in those two different water systems are fundamentally different. The only analysis that we have been able to find anywhere—and we actually had to contact the United States' representatives to ask them to put the study online, because it wasn't, and to their credit, they have done it. The only thing we've been able to find is an environmental impact statement from 10 years ago. And 10 years ago is not an insignificant amount of time.

I would think the MLA for Selkirk, if he actually cared about this issue, rather than trying to just look good to his constituents, he would, at the very least, stand up publicly and say, we, as the Manitoba government, should require an update to that environmental impact assessment. Who knows what species may have been added to the Missouri River system? It's not as if species migrating from there to

our system is the only potential. You could have species ending up in the Missouri River system in a number of different ways.

And 10 years is a not-insignificant amount of time. It is not an unreasonable request. Instead, we get a piece of legislation like this and zero action from the government and silence from the member for Selkirk (Mr. Lagimodiere).

And it's the same silence, it is the same cone of silence that has quite clearly come from the very top of this government, which has been applied to every single member of this government. Because there were government members in attendance at the Red River Basin Commission conference held here, just a few months ago, just down the street from the Legislature, at the hotel Fort Garry, there were Tory MLAs in the room, and when the representative from North Dakota came forward and said, here's the reasons why we don't worry too much about your concerns, Canada.

Here's the reasons why we're going to do this, anyways. Here's the reasons why we're going to move water that hasn't touched your water for thousands of generations. Did any of them—did any one of the them stand up to even so much ask a question, a clarification, ask for more information, or, heaven forbid, actually stand up for the rights of Manitobans now and into the future to have access to clean, safe water? That does not have additional foreign invasive species in it? No. The cone of silence reigns supreme. They sat on their hands. They closed their mouths. They looked uncomfortable. They said nothing. And that is not leadership. That is not responsible behaviour. And that's not good enough. Not even close.

And it's not just one invasive species, Madam Speaker, that we're talking about. It's not just two, it's not ten. That environmental impact assessment from a decade ago, identified 26 new species that could end up in this member's drinking water, in this member's river water going right past the homes of his constituents. If his government continues on its current path of apathy, that is what could happen. It says right on the website for the folks in North Dakota who are pursuing this project, it says right on their own website, they have not decided what type of treatment the water will receive. How much money they are prepared to invest in water treatment. Silence.

Silence is all we get from this government. It could be something as minimal as something that

removes sand. Something that removes dirt from the water. That'd cost north of \$23 million, if I'm remembering the website properly, right through to full-scale water treatment: disinfection, chlorination, the whole nine yards. Which one does this government prefer? Oh, no, we're not going to talk about that! We're not actually going to say anything. North Dakota can just do whatever North Dakota's going to do. That's how we're going to play ball. Manitoba's water suffers, oh well, gosh, that's too bad. We'll just blame somebody else for it. Same as we blame everybody else for everything. This government is incapable of taking any responsibility for itself. And boy, are we going to hear about that later on today in Question Period.

So, Madam Speaker, this bill does not match with the government's actions. Not even close. A government which was actually concerned about invasive species would be doing something about invasive species. And this government is doing the worst thing possible: they're not even acknowledging that the threat is there; they're not educating Manitobans on what role we can all play to help our government voice our collective concerns on not just the national stage, but the international stage. There are institutions that are a hundred years old in place ready to help mediate and resolve these types of issues. This government can't even pick up the phone and call the feds to initiate that process. Don't even try to tell me that this legislation is brought forward in anything but a spirit of contempt for the people of Manitoba. This is greenwashing at its worst. It's going to pass, because the government has the majority. But it's not going to do a thing to prevent invasive species from coming to Manitoba.

That's the truth, Madam Speaker, whether the MLA for Selkirk wants to hear it or not.

* (10:20)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I thank the member for Selkirk for bringing this forward. I think this is a good idea. Clearly, when we were dealing with zebra mussels, the government wasn't adequately on the alert and looking out for zebra mussels. When we had zebra mussels in Lake Winnipeg identified and in the Red River, there should have been a really fast, major plan to stop the spread of the zebra mussels.

I spoke in the Legislature at the time about watching the water corridors, the corridor from Lake Winnipeg over to Lake Manitoba, the water corridor up into—through the Saskatchewan River and up

toward The Pas. And yet the government was clearly not adequately thinking about these corridors. It was not adequately acting to prevent spread along these corridors, where it's not just the water corridor, but you actually have fishermen who use those corridors and travel back and forth.

So, for instance, on Lake Manitoba, you've got fishermen from Lake St. Martin, right, who will go to Lake Winnipeg and back and forth. And so you have a natural corridor where people travel as well as the water travels. And so those are the sorts of things that we should have been on top of right away. And what we've seen in the years since the zebra mussels arrived is the spread along some of those corridors up toward The Pas and so on.

And I'm pleased that we have this bill here and that—I'm hopeful that we can pass it and have, from now on, in the end of last week in April, an awareness week focusing on invasive species.

Now, I would hope that each awareness week, there would be a report, and that report would be on the invasive species and on the invasive species which are threatening to come into Manitoba, like, for instance, the quagga mussels. And for each of these species, whether you have invasive species or invasive species which are threatening to come here, there would be a distribution map of where they are currently so that we know where they are. There would be not just that but some sort of a plan in terms of what's the approach.

You know, when we're dealing with invasive species, those of us—and there are many—who are not specifically knowledgeable about the individual invasive species, you know, don't know adequately the details of what we should be doing to prevent the spread.

And so I think that having some sort of a plan associated with each species in terms of what we know at the moment, what we should be doing to prevent quagga mussels coming into this province, what we should be doing to prevent zebra mussels from spreading elsewhere and make sure that, you know, the details of how one should be treating boats, for example, are in there so it can be a reference point for people who are concerned about invasive species. And it can be a reference point that can be passed out as a pamphlet, a report or present on a website so that people can really feel that they've got a grasp in one place of which are the species of concerns, what exactly their status is at the moment and what we should be doing.

And, likely, when you look at the maps and so on in different parts of the province, it will be different species that you're concerned about for a variety of reasons. And it would be important to have some understanding of the impacts of those species because people should know, you know, why it is not a good thing for this species to be spreading because it has an impact on other species, it has an impact on agriculture, it has an impact on fishing, whatever that may be.

And, clearly, with that sort of a plan, if we could get that kind of an annual report, then it would make a major difference in our ability to make sure all Manitobans are aware of not only that this is important but exactly what they, as individuals, can do in terms of stopping further spread of invasive species and protecting the wonderful province that we have and our phenomenal environment, and certainly that would be a particularly positive feature that could come out of this resolution, and hopefully it will.

So, Madam Speaker, you know, those are the words that I wanted to put on the record. I look forward to having this passed—[interjection] Yes. And I look forward as well to being able to have an annual report, hopefully, on invasive species and on species which are threatening to come into here, and it could be, I think, a very positive result coming out of this bill.

So, thank you, Madam Speaker. I will pass it on to others to continue this debate.

Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River): I'd like to thank the MLA from Selkirk for bringing this very important bill forward.

Madam Speaker, education and 'awarement'—awareness is paramount to ensuring that we keep invasive species from spreading at the rate they are capable of. Manitoba has an environmental, economic and social interest into protecting the ecosystems in Manitoba, and this bill works to protect Manitoba's environment by raising awareness to the public of the issue of invasive species in Manitoba and their effects on Manitoba's environment.

The keys to saving ecosystems from invasive species are prevention, detection and timely responses to identification.

Manitoba will be the first province or territory to enact a law declaring an official invasive species awareness week.

Invasive species threaten ecosystems by preying on native species, carrying diseases, out-competing native species for food and other resources and preventing native species from reproducing. Indirectly, they threaten ecosystems by changing food webs or decreasing biodiversity and altering ecosystem conditions.

This week would share prevention, detection and identification requirements and greatly reduce the threats that would become a part of the preventative actions of outdoor enthusiasts and their daily lives in being responsible. Both aquatic invasive species and terrestrial invasive species pose a real significant threat to Manitoba's ecosystems.

When zebra mussels were found in harbours in Lake Winnipeg in 2013, it took a full year, until the fall of 2014, to introduce legislation to—combat this highly invasive species. Other AIS's, like common carp, mosquitofish, rainbow smelt and round goby, are a threat to Manitoba's ecosystems, and a number of terrestrial invasive species are a threat to ecosystems and to the economy. The three most highly threatened are forests, pasture lands and wetlands.

Our government will ensure that all decisions are based on what's right for Manitobans and what science says is best. Our government supports efforts to improve the quality of Manitoba's water bodies, including Lake Winnipeg, and keeping these species out of places like Gull Lake.

Our government is stepping up the fight against invasive species. More leaflets, more signage, more wash stations and quick action will assist in invasive species awareness.

Our invasive species awareness week falls in line with our government's plan to set out a vast array of new initiatives to protect wetlands and watersheds, water quality and wild species habitats.

Madam Speaker, I ask all parties to support Bill 212, and let's fight invasive species together.

Thank you.

* (10:30)

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I wanted to pick up this morning on the frustration expressed by the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), also expressed by the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), and just to respond to the—at least the mover of this particular act this morning and maybe not so much the member for Swan River because,

actually, the words of the member for Swan River (Mr. Wowchuk), I think, actually echo where I'd like to begin and where I'd—what I'd like to talk about this morning. And I think he talked about this resolution in a way that talks about this issue as something that all Manitobans are concerned about. And so I—as I said, I want to express the frustration of the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) because I feel that this conversation and this debate has gotten partisan, and unnecessarily so.

Now I've put words on the record at second reading and at committee of this particular bill because it is something that I feel very strongly about. As I've mentioned many times in this House, I have a fairly new connection—well, I shouldn't say that; I did spend a lot of time growing up in and around Lake Winnipeg—but in particular now as a cottage owner in Grand Beach Provincial Park, talking about the importance of the lake.

And this is not just something that I'm bringing forward as somebody who goes there, appreciates it and uses it with my family, but in talking with my neighbours and talking with the people that are visiting there for the day, as I go up and down the lake and visit other communities along the lake and meet other people who use it recreationally, when I talk to ice fishers, which I did, recreational ice fishermen, as I did this winter when we got right out as far as we possibly could into the middle of that lake to catch some beautiful fish.

But it's that camaraderie that I think we find in not just talking to those people who use the lake recreationally or in a sense of tourism, but when I talk to commercial fishers or when I talk to others who use the lake for their livelihood, when I talk to people who live there year-round and who access the lake year-round, we find that actually, there's a lot of common ground.

There's a lot of consensus. Everyone has a concern for the lake. Everyone cares about the future of the lake.

And that's certainly true. I'm not questioning that in any way of this current government. I think they, the individual members, care about the lake. They want to see it protected and enhanced and, in particular, invasive species are an important part of that. But when they come out and they talk about this in a very hard partisan way, I think it defeats the purpose of something like this, where we're talking about an awareness day—an awareness week, an opportunity to get the word out, Madam Speaker.

And I think that that's not a great place to start. I don't think that's where we should be starting.

We also know that it's not just people who use the lake and appreciate the lake and appreciate the concerns around the lake but it's the science. And flowing from that, it's the science that we use when we talk to our international neighbours. I know there's some members opposite who are going to be joining me this June at the International Legislators Forum, a wonderful conference—I invite everybody who can find the time to come join us in Minnesota this year—where we talk about invasive species. We've talked about this issue, and it's been—I mean, the committee or the forum was created around water issues.

But we've expanded that role, and now we talk about all transborder issues that we as provincial and state legislators have jurisdiction over. And as I mentioned last time in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, I—we had an opportunity to talk about invasive species. I was educated last year, when we hosted the ILF here in Winnipeg, about all of the invasive species. Now, we've heard of some of them.

The member from Selkirk mentioned some of them in his speech. But there's so many more that exist in either just in Minnesota or in South Dakota that are completely separate from our ecosystem right now altogether. But if we wanted to look at sort of a window into the future, you could imagine that that might be one of the places that we would look to.

So this is a concern, as I said, that's coming from the scientific research that's done. My colleague from Wolseley mentioned that, mentioned the good work that's being done on the academic side and in the scientific side. And that information is brought to us as provincial legislators. And it's our duty now to act on that science.

Now, again, I take the member from Selkirk at his word that he sees the science as being primary, being the driving factor, and that is what will drive his government's action on this issue. And I hope he does that.

But, as I mentioned in committee, the awareness week, as good as it is to build awareness—and this is an issue where public awareness can make a difference in invasive species in terms of transportation of invasive species awareness, what to look for, what to know about—awareness is important, but it only goes so far. And it's this

government's commitment in terms of real dollars and real money that will be spent. And in an era of austerity across the board, you know, I question whether that's there. I question whether that commitment will bear fruit or whether it's just simply another opportunity to talk about this issue rather than act on it.

So I am concerned. I think there is a lot of work that remains to be done and I think this is one part of it, and I can see that. This is one part of it, one way we can talk about it as Manitobans, as legislators. We can get some awareness and some lift to the issue. But to come to this conversation in a partisan way I think defeats the purpose. I think it defeats our goal as legislators.

I just wanted to share—I see my time is getting short. I just wanted to share, Madam Speaker, just recently I had the opportunity to read the book *Mistehay Sakahegan*, which is a fantastic book written by—I think it's Frances Russell, a former Free Press reporter, somebody—and there's a number of journalists, actually, who have come to the lake in later years or appreciated it throughout their lives. But she wrote a fantastic book. As I said, it's called *Mistehay Sakahegan*. I recommend it to everybody.

And what it does is it takes a history of the lake right back from indigenous times throughout the first Europeans coming over, the fur trade. It talks about the amazing Icelandic settlement on the west side of the lake and the hardships that they endured. It talks about the age of trade and commerce on the lake and some of the tragedies that have occurred on the lake.

But I mention it simply this morning, Madam Speaker, because—as, again—as somebody who cares so much for Lake Winnipeg, who feels that it's part of our future as a province, our heritage that we're leaving to our children—specifically, in my case, I feel that I'm leaving it to my children because they're growing up there.

They just spent Sunday—all Sunday down on the rocks collecting clams. Not zebra mussels, but shells and different things. They were critter dipping, as the kids call it these days. And they were just having a blast. They spent their entire day on the lake down by our cottage. But this is our heritage.

And the other thing that this book talks about is the importance of understanding the sustainability of the lake as being primary. And there's some great insights in there. I think it's worth a read. If the member from Selkirk hasn't had a chance to look at

it, I could borrow my copy. Actually, I think we have it in the library here—at the Legislative library. So it's available to anybody.

But I just want us to say that it does—it touches all of us. It touches all of us in a very deep way. I would even say, maybe, a spiritual way for many. And that's certainly the part of the message that comes through in the book. And it's something that we need to come to as legislators in an honest, open way, to follow the science, to follow the lead of the great research that's being done. But then to put the resources in to act in a truly non-partisan way.

And I hope that, you know, as we move forward on this particular bill, that we see that new, renewed non-partisanship come through and that moving forward when we talk about these issues. When we talk about environmental issues, we don't talk about them as Conservative caucus members or New Democrats, but instead that we talk about them as Manitobans, we see the need that's out there, we put the real resources towards it. And I believe that there is a real difference that can be made.

And I think that, if we all work together and we all work in a way that benefits our lakes, our rivers, our forests, that we certainly can make a difference. I'm certainly eager to do that, and I look forward to moving forward on that.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is the House—oh.

* (10:40)

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): So I just want to begin with, you know, giving a shout out to our life givers because water is life and women are the ones that carry the water. Our women have been protecting the water for thousands and thousands of years. Without that water, none of us would be here, and it's our job as human beings to take care of the resources that we have, and I must say, we're doing a pretty poor job of it.

As a child, I remember playing in the Red River. I grew up in the North End of the city. I now represent that constituency. And I can tell you, I was not afraid to swim in that water. I would take a piece of board and I would paddle across to the other side rather than walking. I would fish in that water and I would eat the fish from that water. Ask me today and ask anybody in the North End, probably in all of Winnipeg, if they would do that same thing today. Your answer would probably be no because we

know what's getting put into that river. And that river feeds into, you know, our Lake Winnipeg.

I had the good fortune to work at Marymount and spend a lot of time on Lake Winnipeg with many, many children, giving them the experience of canoeing, swimming in that river, kayaking, and didn't have any thoughts of, you know, zebra mussels or any of the invasive species that could have been in that water. You could almost see, you know, right through that water. And it's—now, I wouldn't even walk on that shore without having shoes on.

Last summer, I was out at the lake, and I cut my foot on a zebra mussel. And we just saw on the—in the news a few weeks back pictures of, you know, three or four feet of zebra mussels piled up. And these are places and spaces that people in Manitoba love to go to. They enjoy, they go there for the summer, they relax there, they take their kids to the beach.

And, I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that you've probably taken your children to that beach or to a beach that, you know, your children have enjoyed going and swimming in the water without having to worry about something being in their bathing suit, under their bathing suit, or cutting their feet or being attached to their body, for that matter.

So, you know, I had the great fortune a few years ago of walking with some women here in Manitoba that walked across Manitoba into Ontario that were walking for the water, and there were some children as young as two years old walking and carrying this pail. Everyone took turns carrying this copper pail of water, being careful to not spill it because every drop of that water meant something to our community. And, you know, praying over that water and stopping at different places along our way, along the highway, and more and more women joining us as we walked on the highway. And we stopped, and we prayed, and we put ribbon ties up. And we were praying that this water would, you know, sustain us and sustain our future generations, those yet to come.

And, you know, I remember years ago that this wasn't—you know, many years ago, I never saw this done. Now, women are having to do this work because of what's being done to our rivers and our lakes.

And as the member from Selkirk was, you know, bringing this bill forward, it's an awareness week, but really, in the indigenous community, we create

awareness every day around water. We know that water is one of our elements that helps to keep us live—helps to keep us—our lives going. You know, without water, we wouldn't be able to live. So, you know, Manitobans are very proud of our lakes. Many people buy cottages out by these lakes because they want to enjoy leaving the city, what we call a concrete jungle, and going somewhere out into nature where you can, you know, have lots of greenery around you and breathe fresh air and not worry about having to worry about going into a river that's polluted or a lake that's polluted. Lots of people raise their families there. We know that—you know, we value the environment. We want to make sure our environment is a safe place that is going to sustain us.

I think about—my granddaughter's two years old, and this summer is probably going to be the first time that we're going to take her out into the lake just because she hasn't been out to the cottage yet. Her mom was—you know, when they're under two, she's a little worried about kids getting sick and, you know, going into the water. They would come out to the lake but just not let her go into the water.

So I don't know, maybe this'll be her first year going into Lake Manitoba. Maybe her mum will decide not to when she gets to the lake and sees all of these zebra mussels all over the shore.

We also go—we enjoy fishing out at lake manito—or Lake Winnipeg. So every year we go ice fishing. We set up our ice-fishing tent. We have a heater that we put in. Some of the community from Lester Beach comes out and they come and fish with us. And we set up this camp and it's really a community. It's this little village, we call it. Everybody knows everybody. Everybody's fishing together, and at the end of the evening, everyone throws their fish together. We fillet it and we just cook it on one of our stoves, our propane heaters. We just put it on the top with a cast iron frying pan and we fish it up and everyone eats and, you know, I don't know if that's going to continue to happen.

You know, a week is good, but we need to look at what are the other invasive species that are possibly coming into our lakes and our rivers? And our government can, you know, put in an awareness act week, but really what is that doing for our environment, for our lakes? It's not really doing anything.

So we need to walk more of the talk, instead of—you know talk doesn't go anywhere. We sit in this

House; we talk all the time, but where's the action behind it? So we need this government to put some action behind, you know, this awareness week.

There's been changes, especially within our waters that are really beginning to threaten the vulnerable aquatic life. And I often talk to commercial fishermen in the different communities. I know a lot of people. I spent a lot of time in Norway House Cree Nation. My dad married a woman up there and then I have some cousins in Lake St. Martin and I've visited many of the First Nations: St. Laurent. Many of those communities rely on commercial fishery for their livelihood. They don't do a lot of fishing in the winter, but during the summer they do a lot of fishing. And that's what feeds the community. So in our communities, when we go hunting, for instance, we don't just take that food for ourselves. We make sure our elders in our community are fed, that their freezers are full, that they have the food that they need, before we get any of that.

And then, whatever's left, that's what's sold out to different places. But it's a part of who we are as indigenous people, being able to have access to, you know, fish in the rivers. And if we're not taking care of our rivers or our lakes, we're not going to have access to those fish any more.

And we already know that people are getting sick in our communities due to processed food and not being—not having access to the natural foods that we so rely on. We know that we get our water from Shoal Lake and that, you know, we can't drink the water here. But we certainly can make sure that we're getting that water to a place where, at least, fishermen can go in that water. And children can go swimming and enjoy that lake for years and years to come. But this government isn't doing much to protect our waterways. They continue to, you know, say that they're doing stuff around the environment. They continue to say that they're taking care of the waterways, but we've seen little action that actually shows us that.

So we'd like to see this government actually walk the talk and actually put some actions behind this bill and put some things in place that are actually going to change the face of what our lakes are in Manitoba. Miigwech.

* (10:50)

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I'm pleased to put a couple of words on the record in respect of

Bill 212, The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act. I do just want to mention a couple of things that my sister colleague from Point Douglas mentioned and in respect of indigenous women's roles as life givers and as water carriers.

I actually just want to take a couple of minutes just to acknowledge some water carriers in Manitoba that are pretty phenomenal indigenous women. And the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) mentioned that women go on walks, ceremonial walks, spiritual walks, in—praying for our water. And some of those women I'd like to just officially name for Hansard and just to acknowledge these women that have done that work.

So I'd like to acknowledge Elder Thelma Morrisseau, who the member for Point Douglas and I are very blessed to call one of our elders. And, actually, just at the top of this particular sitting, Thelma Morrisseau and her husband Stan, you know, did a pipe ceremony for the member for Point Douglas and I just to prepare us to do the work, the sacred work that we really all do in this Chamber, being—having the privilege of being MLAs and all of that that encompasses.

And she is a phenomenal woman. She is so humble, so kind, so compassionate, so loving. And, actually, when you have the opportunity to talk to Thelma, Elder Thelma Morrisseau, she always embeds teachings of water in everything that she talks to you about. You'll be talking about whatever, and somehow, she'll bring it back to the importance of indigenous women as water carriers.

And so I really appreciate the teaching that she's given myself, and I'm sure that the member for Point Douglas is very appreciative of the teachings that she's provided.

Also, her sister, Katherine Morrisseau Sinclair—they're sisters, and Katherine Morrisseau-Sinclair is the wife of Senator Justice Murray Sinclair. They, alongside Chickadee Richard, alongside another elder from Ontario—[interjection] So, yes. Oh, yes. There's a couple of elders that went on this walk, but there's also a phenomenal elder from Ontario, and for the life of me, Madam Speaker, I can't remember her name. But she's been walking for years now—years—from Ontario across Canada. This particular elder in Ontario will go into the States. And I'm feeling very bad that I can't remember her name, but I actually sun danced—I used to sun dance with her in Pipestone, Minnesota. And, actually, Pipestone, Minnesota is where all of our sacred pipestone

comes when we make our pipes. That's where all the pipestone comes from. And that's where I'm a sun dancer and a member, and that was where I first met her. And, again, she's another elder who, every time you talk, she embeds teachings on water and how important it is for indigenous women to be able to take up that responsibility of fighting for the water, you know, honouring the water, celebrating the water.

And, you know, as we sit here and we put words on the record in respect to Bill 212, I, you know, feel that in some respects, maybe I haven't done enough lately. I think that we get so busy with our particular roles and responsibilities as MLAs, as mothers, as partners, whatever different roles that we play. I know that my schedule is, like, I'm sure many members in here, it is just crazy. And I feel that I—as we sit here and we talk about water and we talk about our beautiful lakes that we have, I feel like I actually haven't done enough lately.

And, you know, I feel like the teachings that I've been given over these last many, many years in respect of my role as an indigenous woman in protecting water, I haven't really done a good job. And so I'm glad to be able to get up this morning and just kind of recommit to myself, recommit to myself actually standing up more for our water and participating in those ceremonies.

And, actually, some of the other elders that participate in walks for our water is Leslie Spillet and her daughter Tasha Spillet. And, actually, the elder that I was speaking about—and I thank the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) for it—for reminding me—her name is Josephine Mandamin, and she is just a phenomenal woman.

And I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, when you sun dance, you may or may not know, or members may or may not know, you go for four days not drinking or eating. You start your morning at dawn; you go into sweats and you start your day and then you start dancing right away. You do get breaks, but sometime—*[interjection]*

Point of Order

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Rossmere, on a point of order.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Acting Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, we are discussing this morning The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act, and I appreciate the anecdotes from the member

but I'm having trouble seeing how they're relevant to what we're meant to be discussing this hour.

Madam Speaker: I would indicate the member probably does have a point of order, and I would ask the member to bring her comments around to the bill that is before the House.

* * *

Ms. Fontaine: So what I was trying to do is use the opportunity to actually talk about how indigenous peoples understand their connection to our lakes and to our waters, so actually I would disabuse that it is not relevant; it is absolutely relevant because I think that as we talk about the health and safety of our waters, I want it to be noted that indigenous people and, in particular, indigenous women, have always fought for our waters.

So it is completely relevant and I—you know, I feel sorry that the member opposite didn't understand or couldn't even take the time to talk about a little bit of teachings here. And that's okay; that's fine, but that's kind of indicative.

So I will move on in respect of—I kind of don't want to, then, talk about any more in respect of ceremony if it's going to kind of—if I'm not going to be allowed to finish those teachings. So I do just want to say that I honour all those women that have been doing that work for a very, very long time and, you know, I know that all of us, or I would imagine that all of us are so proud of our many lakes and rivers and our wetlands.

I know that I've had the opportunity, when I was an environmental researcher working in Sagkeeng, to do a lot of work in Lake Winnipeg and looking at the health of a traditional medicine called wikay, and harvesting wikay from the waters. And I actually had the opportunity, as well, to work with some researchers looking at health, the health of fish species in Lake Winnipeg.

So I always take those memories with me in respect of how proud we are as Manitobans and that no matter who you are, that we should all have a connection to our waters and we should all have a commitment to protecting our waters and ensuring that they are healthy for everybody that relies on them, not only, you know, the species that are—that rely and live in our lakes and rivers and wetlands, but, obviously, all of us that rely on it as well.

I do want say as my first degree is in environmental studies and so, you know, I am

committed to the health and well-being of our lakes and rivers, and so I think, you know, I do want to just take a moment to acknowledge the member for Selkirk (Mr. Lagimodiere) and tell him congratulations on this bill. I think that it is something that is important and I thank the House for listening to me today.

Miigwech.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 212, The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act.

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

I declared the motion carried.

* (11:00)

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 14—Trans Mountain Pipeline

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

The resolution before us this morning is the resolution Trans Mountain Pipeline, brought forward by the honourable member for Arthur-Virden.

Mr. Doyle Piwniuk (Arthur-Virden): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook),

WHEREAS pipelines are the safest and most environmentally friendly way of transporting oil and gas over long distances; and

WHEREAS total oil industry expenditures in Manitoba in 2017 were approximately \$850 million, with a total of 240 wells drilled, adding to an overall total of 3814 producing wells; and

WHEREAS Manitoba ranks within the top ten of 39 jurisdictions, in the category of "relatively small proved oil and gas reserves," within the Global Petroleum Survey of the best places to invest for oil and gas; and

WHEREAS transmission pipelines deliver 97 per cent of Canada's onshore oil and gas from producing regions to markets throughout Canada and the United States; and

WHEREAS the expansion of the Trans Mountain Pipeline will add an additional 590 thousand barrels per day (b/d) of capacity to the existing 300 thousand b/d, and;

WHEREAS the eventual construction of the expanded pipeline will help Canada achieve its future potential as an energy producer and get more Canadian oil to where demand is expected to grow; and

WHEREAS over forty First Nation and aboriginal communities support the Trans Mountain Pipeline; and

WHEREAS the Trans Mountain project gained approval of the National Energy Board in late 2016 following a 29 month review process, as well as adhering to 157 conditions; and

WHEREAS the recent British Columbia NDP/Green party coalition vowed to use "every tool in the toolbox" to stop Trans Mountain; and

WHEREAS the constitution of Canada gives the Federal Government the unequivocal jurisdiction to move the project forward, while having the responsibility of being fiscally responsible in any proposed compromise.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the British Columbia government to withdraw opposition to the Trans Mountain Pipeline and support this nation building project while calling on other relevant levels of government to ensure that the Trans Mountain Pipeline is built efficiently, without delay, for the benefit of all Canadians.

Motion presented.

Mr. Piwniuk: I'm so proud to bring this resolution to the Legislature today because the importance of oil and pipelines in the constituency of Arthur-Virden.

It's the economic impact that we have in our constituency, even at the time that I moved there in—1994 was the first year I moved to Arthur-Virden and bought a business there. And I don't think my business would be where it is if it wasn't for the oil industry and the pipe—the oil industry and how it grew in the last number of decades, actually.

We had a boom back in the 1990s, late '90s into 2000. And I saw around me the amount of businesses that were propping up, new businesses, the economic spinoff that we had because of oil, the oil industry. And many individuals are employed by the industry,

the oil industry, for instance, Tundra, who is owned by the Richardson family here in Manitoba, one of the well-known families, business owners here in Manitoba. Tundra, who was probably when I went to Arthur-Virden—probably had about 20—some employees, 25 employees. Now that—it's so funny because every so many—every five years, six years, they had to actually add on to their headquarters, the oil quarters for Tundra. And it had to be built about four different additions. And now Tundra employs more than—hundreds of people in the Arthur-Virden area.

The other thing I'll say, too, is that other companies have come in to the Virden area. Corex, for instance; they bought up a lot of smaller oil companies, which really benefited a lot of the small companies because they actually had a exit strategy when it came to selling a business and retiring. And Corex now employs tens of—you know, maybe about 50 people right now in the Arthur-Virden area.

One of our biggest employers, also, in Arthur-Virden is the—is Enbridge. Enbridge actually has a pipeline that goes right through the constituency of Arthur-Virden and to many constituencies with my—member—fellow members here, too, that it's going to be, especially this coming year, they're actually going to redo a line, and it's going to create many, many thousands of jobs across the country. And that's how important the importance of having a pipeline industry here is.

I have a good friend who actually owns a electrical company, and his speciality is actually working on pipelines when it comes to expansion of pipelines. And when there's expansion, there's also electronic, and it's a big spinoff when there's actually a new pipeline being built or expansion of a pipeline.

In this case, the one that's going—the Trans Mountain Pipeline, going through British Columbia, is going to be a big impact to many people in British Columbia itself. Like, there's a lot of—going to be a lot of jobs. A lot of trades are going to be required.

The one that's going to be expanding here in Manitoba, they told me you'll be—to know, like, Enbridge told me that you'll be surprised to know that, you know, if there's anybody that has a rental basement or apartment or—because the last few years, the oil industry has been hurting in our industry with the low oil prices, the economic recession that happened, and now oil prices are back, and they're saying that a lot—there's going to be a lot of activity happening because of Enbridge expansion.

But, with British Columbia, you know, the Trans Mountain Pipeline, it's going to be a good impact because the fact is, again, there's going to be a lot of jobs. It's also going to benefit the First Nations communities that are going to be along—that the pipeline goes through. I think that—what I was told that there was over—going to be over \$40-billion revenue that's going to be going to these First Nation—forty—fifty-one First Nation communities in the next 20 years.

For a lot of those First Nation communities, that's a big benefit for them. And I'm sure there's like three First Nation communities in my constituency who would love to have a—maybe a pipeline going through because it creates a lot of revenue.

For instance, the RM of 'pipestein' is one of the wealthiest RMs in Manitoba. Do you know that they get so much revenue from oil, they get so much revenue from the pipe—Enbridge pipeline going through because Cromer, the pumping station, is also in the Pipestone municipality? And they also have a lot of oil wells. They have a lot of royalties, too. Do you know that every single resident in Pipestone gets over \$500 a year, that they get a cheque to every individual? That includes young children in the constituency. So a family of four gets \$2,000 just because they're living in the Pipestone municipality because of the benefit of the oil industry.

You know, the thing is, you know, back—you know, right now, the oil industry in Manitoba is \$1.5-billion benefit. And agriculture is \$15 billion. And in our 'constituency' of Arthur-Virden, we get almost double of revenue coming into our constituency.

If, let's say, 10 per cent of the agriculture is in Arthur-Virden, that makes it double the amount of revenue that we get in our constituency because—because of agriculture and because of oil. But, you know, the previous government, NDP government, you know, they basically took oil—they were happy to take the oil from Arthur-Virden. But they, you know what, they never gave anything back to us. Our roads and our infrastructure were a mess.

I remember when I ran for the by-election, I—one thing—one of the biggest issues Free Press asked me or CBC asked me, what is the biggest issue that you—in the Arthur-Virden area? And probably the one reason why I actually ran for ML—as an MLA is because the deplorable of the amount of money that was coming back with the roads, the construction, the heavy equipment that was part of the oil industry.

Even farmers now are having more, heavier equipment. Our roads were starting to get beaten up. You got up to Swan River or Dauphin, the roads were prestige because they were—are NDP ridings. The revenue that was coming from Arthur-Virden, was amazing how much the NDP actually benefited from it.

And, again, no one reinvestment to our road construction or improvement of our roads were actually happening. And now we're seeing the benefits happening, now that we've taken over government. And even when I was able to talk to the media about our—how bad our roads were. Up to the NDP election in 2016, they invested more money into our roads.

So what I'm saying right now is that it's important that the oil industry—that we continue to support the oil industry and the Pipestone—pipelines that actually send the oil to our markets. Right now, we're not getting the amount of prices on our oil. We're actually discounted because our only market right now is the US market. And 97 per cent of our oil goes—our export oil goes to the US.

And so it's important that we open that up so our other markets, like the Asian markets, who are the biggest growing economies right now, we need that market. We need another market so we can have higher prices for our oil when it comes to selling per barrel.

And right now in Arthur-Virden, we actually have one of the lightest crude. We're part of the Bakken oil industry, and because of the Bakken oil in North Dakota, they've become—the US has become self-sufficient. And now we need to make sure that we have another market.

And that's why this Trans Mountain Pipeline is so important that it gets through, Madam Speaker, because the fact is we'll probably get a—more of a premium on our oil compared to what we're getting right now. And the oil sands right now, they really need that oil to another market, too, because, again, the US is becoming more and more efficient when it comes to finding their own reserves. So, again, it's like supply and demand. We need to look at that market.

And, Madam Speaker, you know, we're seeing that the, you know, the NDP, you know, over the years, you know, they said during their—before the election, they didn't put out a budget, but they put out a financial update. And what I want to—that I have

here, is that the reason why there were more of a deficit in—going up to the 2016 election was reflecting of slower growth in this—in the—some of the—Manitoba's international and interprovincial markets. A lower production of oil extraction—several key economic indicators show moderate growth in 2015. The collapse of the oil prices—and No. 2 on page 8 on that same report—the collapse of the oil prices and the Bank of Canada rate cuts had led to a sharp depreciation of our dollar.

Currently, the dollar is trading approximately 17 per cent lower compared to last year. That pass-through affects a weaker dollar and has major contributor to the boosting of—into inflation.

*(11:10)

And number—and on page 13, it said, according to the latest available data, mining and oil production added nearly \$3 billion to the Manitoba economy. Oil production contributes to about \$1.6 billion or 54–55–54 per cent of the extraction of all of mining and oil—like, together, resources all together.

So we—so the oil is important to this—for the province of Manitoba, and I'm so—I'm glad to bring this resolution to the table and to the Chamber here, and we'll hope that we get support on the other—on the opposite side of the Chamber here.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Questions

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

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Well, I thank the member for Virden for his comments today, and I see in his resolution he tells us there's over 4,000 wells that have been drilled in southwestern Manitoba. Where does the oil from Manitoba go?

Mr. Doyle Piwniuk (Arthur-Virden): Good question from the member from the opposite. The oil mostly goes down to the US. We actually—the oil field in the Virden area all goes to pipelines, and eventually, the pipelines goes to the Enbridge station in Cromer and gets pumped to—down east to the Canadian market and also to the US market.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): How much revenue does the pipeline bring to Canada?

Mr. Piwniuk: Well, the amount of revenue that comes from the oil industry is \$7.4 billion of oil that comes from the oil industry here in Canada.

Mr. Swan: Well, I was interested to hear from the member for Virden's comments about Tundra Oil & Gas and the fact that they've actually had regular expansions—in fact, four times, they've had to expand their headquarters because of their success in Manitoba. I would just like the member for Arthur-Virden to confirm that they haven't had any difficulty getting their product to markets.

Mr. Piwniuk: Madam Speaker, it's not getting difficult to get the oil to market. It's basically getting sub—like a discounted price on our oil because the fact is, there's only one market, basically. It's the US market. And even when it came to the Keystone Pipeline, you know, a lot of times, oil was going to one spot and it was transported by train. And now that's going forward here.

It's getting the—actually how we get it to the market is important. But we need a second market—that's the Asian market—so that we can get a better price on our oil.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): I'd like to commend the member from Arthur-Virden for bringing forward this resolution. I know he speaks passionately. He's an excellent representative for his constituents. I'd like to ask him: How is this pipeline going to be affecting Manitoba oil producers?

Mr. Piwniuk: That's a good question from the member from Lac du Bonnet. And what—the thing is, what this pipeline's going to do is it's going to create more revenue for all our oil companies, all our small companies, because the fact is we're going to get a higher price for that oil. And because we have a second market, it's like supply and demand. It's economics. We're going to get a higher price for that oil. Right now, it's all going to the US, and they can pay us anything. We don't get the international price that they would get if they exported offshore or in the Gulf or—so this is why it's important to have this pipeline built.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, oil can, of course, be transported by truck or by train or by pipeline. Can the member provide the relative amount of greenhouse gas production that is resulting from each of the three different forms of transportation?

Mr. Piwniuk: That's a good question from the honourable member from River Heights. You know, it's important that—you know, we've actually had trains who derailed. And, of course, we saw Lac-Mégantic, who had a terrible disaster where a number of people perished in that fire in downtown. And that's why it's important, one of the safe—safety of pipelines.

And I think that the member who is from—member from River Heights should be putting pressure on the federal counterpart and getting the Trudeau government to look at Energy East Pipeline, because the fact is, why are we exporting—importing oil from another—other countries when we can actually be using—being self-sufficient in our own country? And I think it's important that we have more markets than less markets and better prices.

Mr. Smook: I'd like to ask the member from Arthur-Virden: Why is it so important that we debate this resolution right now?

Mr. Piwniuk: The reason why we want to debate it right now is because there's a deadline on May 31st, that the British Columbia government, along with the Alberta government and the Canadian government, have all agreed that this is the deadline so that we can get that pipeline built by—and what's going to happen is it's actually going to produce more oil, almost—right now there's 300,000 barrels of oil going in the current pipeline; now we can increase it to 600,000 more. And so it's important that we get this pipeline done, and this is why we have brought the resolution here today in the Chamber.

Mr. Swan: The member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk) had put on the record some comments about how members of Manitoba First Nations were receiving some benefits from pipelines that go through Manitoba, including a payment to each member of the First Nation.

How would Manitoba First Nations benefit from the completion of the Trans Mountain Pipeline?

Mr. Piwniuk: I just want to just correct the member from Minto. I just want to say that they would like to have oil pipeline go through their community because they do benefit, because you—they get to actually lease amounts—numbers in there, and they would even like oil wells in their community too. But what I'm saying is that Pipestone municipality is the one that gets the benefits of having revenue from leases coming out of pipelines coming through their community. This is what the nations, the First

Nations in British Columbia and Alberta, will receive.

You know, right now with oil, when it came to the Peace Hills group, you know, they're the most successful First Nation community in Canada. They have peace gardens insurance, they have a whole bunch of other companies that they really benefit. But it also came to having oil and gas production.

Mr. Ewasko: It gives me great pleasure to stand up again and ask the great member from Arthur-Virden another question on his very important resolution that we're debating this morning in the House, Madam Speaker.

So why is it important, as I ask the member from Arthur-Virden, why is it important that all Canadian provinces get on board with this pipeline? How important is it to Canadian industry and making sure that we're striving here in this great country of ours?

Mr. Piwniuk: Madam Speaker, that's a very good question from the member from Lac du Bonnet, if I can get that right.

It's important because, you know, this whole—the West, actually, the Prairies, for instance, grew because of oil. You look at—Winnipeg was the biggest community, biggest centre, of transportation back in the last three centuries ago.

And now, last century, Alberta just came, and cities like Edmonton and Calgary have just grown and flourished because of the oil industry. And there was a benefit not only from that region, but it spilled off to Saskatchewan; now Saskatchewan's been a have-not province to have province recently.

And then also, with British Columbia, they benefit from the oil industry, and for agriculture and being a shipping port, that was important. So I would really—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Swan: I was interested to hear the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk) talk about roads in his community and the importance to oil producers. How does the member for Arthur-Virden think that his government's cut of \$150 million to the highways budget is helping producers in his area?

Mr. Piwniuk: The question coming from the member from Minto, like, I would say right now we have—we're seeing more pavement on roads in the last two years than we ever saw in the last 17 years, basically, of the NDP government. We had

crumbling roads. *[interjection]* I wish the member from Concordia would actually come out of the Perimeter and actually come out to Virden back in those days. But, you know what, I didn't see any of those members in their Arthur-Virden area. And, even when we had the water crisis, I didn't hardly saw any of those members. We didn't have any ministers come out. And you know what, shame on them. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: Well, actually, I'll let the member for Arthur-Virden know I was in his constituency just a couple of months ago, down in Boissevain, with a room full of people, including the mayor and all of the councillors, who are upset that their MLA—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —wasn't saying anything about closing the EMS station and about preserving health services.

* (11:20)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: But what I would ask—I was a bit confused by the member's answer. Is the member saying the Trans Mountain—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —is the member saying the Trans Mountain Pipeline is going to run through the First Nations' land here in Manitoba? Because I was a bit confused. And if he could just clarify that for the record, that'd be helpful.

Mr. Piwniuk: No, there is not going to be any pipeline going through the First Nation communities. Like, it actually goes a little bit north of the reserve just north of Pipestone.

And so the thing was, when it came to the First Nations, 51 First Nations will—the pipeline—Trans Mountain Pipeline will go through 51 nations—First Nation communities in British Columbia and Alberta.

Mr. Ewasko: I'd like to ask the member from Arthur-Virden: Why is it so important to this PC Manitoba government to make sure that we're also looking at resource development and the total contrast between the now PC government and the

previous NDP government in regards to resource development here in the great Province of Manitoba?

Mr. Piwniuk: Yes, thanks to the member for asking that question. And I wanted to clarify, first, the question that Concordia actually had, too, but I just want to let you know that Boissevain was here last week, and we did—the minister did meet with the mayor and the council.

So, for your information, they put in the paper that they were listened to. So, for your information, that's—I just wanted to answer that question.

And for the PC Party, we've actually had—we're feeling that we're open for business. We're actually wanting to—we've actually changed red tape reduction. We want—we're open for business. And this is the reason why I ran for MLA is because the fact is there were so many restrictions from the previous government, and now we have the opportunity to show that we're open for business, and we're getting a lot of investment; the highest investment in any other province, and we're No. 1 for that, and we're going to be more and better—better and more—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

And I would just indicate for the House that when responses are given, they should be given through the Chair, and I would just remind members of that.

Debate

Madam Speaker: Debate is now open. The time for questions has ended and debate is open.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and it's always a bit of a concern if you start your speech in the Legislature with the words once upon a time, but that's exactly what I'm going to do.

Once upon a time, Manitoba actually played a key role at the federal-provincial table. Manitoba, as former Premier and former ambassador Gary Doer used to say, Manitoba always punches above its weight. And that once upon a time actually wasn't that long ago. Unfortunately, that ended just over two years ago with the election of a government which has a very, very different approach to inter-provincial, intergovernmental affairs. And that's not a slight against the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk), and I did put a few comments on the record based on something he said, but I don't hold

him personally responsible for bringing this issue forward today, but I do hold his Premier (Mr. Pallister) and his Cabinet responsible for taking Manitoba down a very, very different path.

Mrs. Sarah Guillemard, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

Before that, and this even goes back to the days of Gary Filmon, when Manitoba Cabinet ministers and Manitoba premiers when to a national table, they were listened to. And they brought forward creative, important ideas to try to bring the country together, to certainly stand up for Manitoba's interests but to also take an important role in building this country.

And I was lucky enough to be a Cabinet minister for seven years in the previous NDP government, about two years as the minister of what was then called Competitiveness, Training and Trade. And I was very proud as the Trade minister to have signed Manitoba on to the provisions of the Agreement on Internal Trade that dealt with mobility. And I was very proud to have the chance to speak about how important mobility is to a province like Manitoba where people come and people go.

We have a military where people are transferred in and transferred out. And we found there were a lot of benefits to, for the first time maybe in Canada's history, actually making sure it wasn't just the flow of goods and services but the flow of people that was made better.

And as Justice minister, I was very proud to play a leading role on the national stage, coming from a smaller province, coming from a province, though with a tradition of being a voice. And so we were able to actually move the federal government, whether it was the Liberal government or the Conservative federal government, in some positive ways in areas like dealing with criminal organizations and working together on things like civil forfeiture and, indeed, taking a nation-building approach.

I was very proud to convince a federal Conservative government to adopt laws that were instituted in Sweden and in the Scandinavian nations to protect women and children and men from sexual exploitation. And you do that, as a smaller province, by actually speaking with a voice that is thoughtful and a voice that's creative and a voice that is able to bring people together.

Fast forward now to where we are now, in a resolution that we have which wants Manitoba to take a position on something which is a dispute

between two other Canadian provinces. And it is truly fascinating that now the Premier (Mr. Pallister) is trying to style himself as a statesman on issues of national importance because, Madam Acting Speaker, for two years now, the Premier has been the definition of a wrecking ball when it comes to intergovernmental relations.

On every file that this Premier has chosen to take on, he's picked political fights based not when it's—what's good for Manitoba or Manitobans, not what's good for Canada or Canadians, but for his narrow political interests and his own ideology, which is being revealed day by day by day in this Legislature, in comments that he makes outside of the Legislature, in comments that he makes from his hacienda in Costa Rica.

This is a Premier who has his own way of doing things, which doesn't seem to accord with the way that other premiers, the Prime Minister, the mayor or pretty much anybody else would like things to be done. Whether it's pensions, whether it's health care, whether it's climate change, whether it's cannabis, the Premier never misses an opportunity to start a fight.

For example, when federal and provincial governments got together and proposed enhancing Canadians' pension, it was this Premier that demanded that his Finance Minister not sign the deal. And it took a lot of pressure from other provinces, from within this Legislature, from the public, to force the government to actually change course and try to get something done. We know that for months and months and months, the Premier fought a very public and a very ugly battle on health transfers. And the Premier wants folks to believe he's a deal maker, but in the end, after the Premier eventually signed an accord, he had nothing more to show for all that bluster.

And we know on cannabis, we've heard nothing from this Premier but complaints: complaints about how he didn't like the bill, how it's too fast, how he wants more money. But at the end of the day, his style of governing and his style of communicating and his style of dealing with people didn't make any difference.

And now, the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk) is the one, the member, the backbench member tasked to carry forward the Premier's battles. We have a Premier who wants to style himself as John A. Macdonald on the issue before this House, but we know on this side that we have a Premier that

is no nation builder. He's not even a province builder, as he takes apart the services that Manitobans rely upon brick by brick by brick.

Now, Manitobans expect to see collaboration and leadership from elected officials, not continuous fighting with other levels of government, or not passing resolutions at this Legislature which are going to take sides and pick fights with other provincial governments.

We want good working relationships with other levels of government, and we have always, and we will continue to encourage the Province to work collaboratively for Manitobans' benefits.

But this Premier doesn't want a good relationship with the federal government. He doesn't want a good relationship with the provincial government. He doesn't appear to want a good relationship with the municipal government, because we had the mayor of Manitoba's largest city, just weeks ago, acknowledging that he actually can't get a meeting with the Premier.

And one might think, well, maybe it's just the mayor. Maybe the mayor doesn't have good schedulers, which I find very hard to believe. Maybe the mayor's tough to reach. But I don't think that's the case at all, because it's not just the mayor of Winnipeg that can't get a meeting.

And it's not just union leaders that can't get a meeting, because given this Premier's ideology, I guess we shouldn't be surprised. It's not just people who run non-profits who sometimes get copies of reports that suggest some things, and all of a sudden see that a very different report suddenly comes forward from this government, that can't get meetings.

It's blue chip business people in the province of Manitoba, like Sandy Riley, who was hand-picked to be the chairperson of the Manitoba Hydro board, who also can't get a meeting with the Premier and that was one of the main reasons that Mr. Riley and the entire board, with the exception of the member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon), decided they could no longer abide by this Premier's way of doing things, and they all submitted their resignations and moved on.

* (11:30)

Well, we have a Premier who's used every chance to pick a fight. And even when Mr. Riley resigned, the Premier couldn't let it go.

The Premier (Mr. Pallister) decided to pick a fight with Sandy Riley in the media, and to his surprise and, I expect, his despair, Mr. Riley decided he wasn't going to stay silent and told Manitobans and Winnipeggers more about the strange way that this Premier tries to conduct business.

You know, we know the Premier's doing his best to deflect from the very real issues that are affecting Manitobans in each part of this province. And, you know, I've been asking questions on health care. The Premier created an unnecessary feud with the federal government, putting millions of dollars of much-needed support for home care, for mental health, for addictions in this province in jeopardy.

And now the Premier wants this resolution to pass this morning because the Premier somehow thinks that that's going to make the Prime Minister more likely to take his call so that the Premier of Manitoba who's done nothing but obfuscate and make it more difficult for the federal government to move forward, that he thinks that's going to make it more likely that the Prime Minister is going to take his call.

Well, I'm afraid for the Premier that's not the way it's going to work. And the Premier needs to realize that his path over these past two years has been wrong, and not just wrong, but it has impacted Manitobans because as this Premier has been unable to work with the federal government, unable to work with the municipal governments, unable to work with other provincial governments, Manitobans have actually lost out.

So, for the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk), I want to celebrate the fact that his community, his constituency, has done very well over the past several decades, under Conservative governments but also under New Democratic governments.

He put on the record himself that Tundra Oil & Gas has had to expand their headquarters not once but four times. And we've had this member very clearly state that the oil that's coming out of southwestern Manitoba is not going to go over the Trans Mountain Pipeline and across the Pacific Ocean. It's already going to a very clear market in Canada and the United States. And there is no impact, actually, on his community.

So with that, I will end my comments—

The Acting Speaker (Sarah Guillemard): The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): I'm not going to start my speech off today with once upon a time, but I'm going to start my speech off with something that is relevant to today and to all Canadians. I'm going to thank the member for Arthur-Virden who brought forward this resolution entitled Trans Mountain Pipeline.

Madam Deputy Speaker, oil production and the distribution of it is extremely important to Canada and Manitoba's economy. As legislators, I feel it is our duty to pass this resolution that will urge the British Columbia government to withdraw opposition to the Trans Mountain Pipeline and support this project while calling on all other relevant levels of government to ensure that the Trans Mountain Pipeline is built efficiently, without delay, for the benefit of all Canadians.

Madam Deputy Speaker, some may say that we should not get involved, as this is an issue that is under federal jurisdiction. It may be, but this whole issue is important to Manitoba. In 2017, the oil industry spent approximately \$850 million in Manitoba. We have over 3,800 oil wells producing oil in Manitoba. We may be relatively small in proved gas and oil reserves, but ranked by the Global Petroleum Survey as one of the best places to invest for oil and gas.

We all know the gas and oil production is not going to stop tomorrow. Other countries are working hard at increasing production and getting that oil to market. The United States continues to build pipelines so they can get their oil to market. The Trans Mountain Pipeline will increase the value of Canadian energy by providing access to the Asian market.

Madam Deputy Speaker, pipelines are the safest and most environmentally friendly way of transporting oil and gas over long distances. When making decisions on projects, we must use evidence-based emotion—evidence-based, not emotion-based, thoughts. Pipelines today deliver 97 per cent of Canada's onshore oil and gas from where it is produced to markets throughout Canada and the United States.

This pipeline is important to all Canadians, as it will help Canada achieve its future potential as an energy producer and get more Canadian oil to where the market is. Alberta and other provinces, including Manitoba, are losing billions of dollars underselling their oil and gas to American buyers at discounted prices due to lack of pipeline capacity. We need this

pipeline to bring our oil to a port where we can sell it in the world market.

The Trans Mountain Pipeline received approval from the National Energy Board in late 2016. It went through a review process that took 29 months. There were 157 conditions that needed to be met. Even though all these conditions were met, the British Columbia NDP-Green Party coalition vowed to use every tool in the toolbox to stop the Trans Mountain Pipeline.

Madam Speaker, Canada is a democratic country. We live with rules. We have process to follow. When projects like the Trans Mountain Pipeline are proposed, these are conditions—there are conditions that need to be met, and when these conditions are met, the project should proceed. It is about what is best for all of Canada, not just a certain few.

This is not a partisan issue. Federal Liberals, Alberta NDP and Alberta United Conservatives are all in favour of the pipeline being built. This is a project that Canadians and British Columbians support. Recent polling shows that 52 per cent of British Columbians support the project, while only 26 per cent oppose it. That comes from the Canadian energy coalition stats.

Projects like the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain Pipeline are not only crucial for Alberta and British Columbia but has far-reaching benefits to provinces like Saskatchewan and Manitoba through increased demand for goods produced in our province and services provided to firms in the oil industry. The—this project alone will add \$7.4 billion to the Canadian economy.

Kinder Morgan has given the federal government until May 31st to deliver concrete assurances that the line will get built. We as Canadians are obligated to urge the British Columbia government to withdraw opposition to the Trans Mountain Pipeline. We must urge the federal government to enforce the ruling of the National Energy Board to allow the pipeline to be built.

Canada is a great country. We have a precious right to freedom of speech, but we cannot allow a few to hold the rest of Canada hostage. What kind of country would we be if we allowed anyone to stop a project because they disagree with it? So much for democracy. Madam Speaker, what kind of signal would we be sending to the rest of the world? Do you think that investors looking to invest in Canada

would not have second thoughts about investing here?

Madam Speaker—Madam Deputy Speaker, I have a quote I would like to read from Alex Pourbaix, CEO of oil sands producer 'enormus': If the rule of law is not upheld and this project is allowed to fail, it will have a chilling effect on investment, not just in British Columbia, but across the entire country.

This project is critical to Canada and the future of its oil and gas industry. I'm sure that some of our neighbours to the south would like to see this project fail. If the Trans Mountain Pipeline is not built, we will be limited to who we will be selling our oil to. The United States presently buys 99 per cent of our energy exports but at a discounted price. The Trans Mountain Pipeline will give Canada the ability to sell our oil to new customers.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the production of oil is not stopping tomorrow. We should be trying to get the most for the oil that we are producing today. This pipeline will triple the amount of oil that would be available at port to ship to new markets.

There are many Canadians that will lose if this project does not go through. Many indigenous communities stand to lose a great deal if the Trans Mountain Pipeline construction is stopped. According to company sources, 51 First Nation communities have signed comprehensive mutual benefit agreements with the pipeline project, worth more than \$400 million. Trans Mountain has signed community benefit agreements with local governments along 95 per cent of its pipeline route, worth millions.

*(11:40)

Our Premier (Mr. Pallister) has called for the British Columbia government to cease opposition and respect the rule of law regarding the Trans Mountain Pipeline. We in this Legislature have the opportunity today to do the same. I would ask that all members opposite support this resolution because I think it's important for not only Manitoba but for all Canadians.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): What an honour it is to rise once again this morning to talk about another important issue. And I—you know, I appreciate the opportunity to stand up. I'm going to pick up on a few of the points made by the honourable member

for Minto (Mr. Swan) and just expand a little bit on them because I just—I cannot believe, once again, that this is the priority of this government, of this backbench MLA, to come to this Chamber to all of a sudden act as if they are the ones that are going to be the guiding light in Canadian politics and to be the ones that are going to sway the conversation one way or sway it another way when every province across this country, every premier, every minister across this country sees the effect when this government comes to the table and tries to have some influence.

And what has been the record of this government when they've come up and they've stepped up on these national issues, when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has decided that he wants to be the one to weigh in and to have influence on the discussion and on the conversation nationally? What has been the effect?

Well, we can just go back and we can start with some of the big ones, whether it be on the carbon tax, Madam Speaker, on a issue that certainly Canadians are acutely aware of, are interested in discussing and in debating and in seeing good legislation come forward and seeing a progressive way forward on the issue of the environment and using the carbon tax as a tool. This is something Canadians voted on in the last election, and it was this Premier, then, after the fact that said wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Let me weigh in. Let me get involved in this. And came to the table and, you know, I can imagine how he walked up to the table just sort of, you know, stumbled in there, kind of, you know, papers all over the place and just said, no, no, this is how it's going to be done, called it a made-in-Manitoba solution.

And what did it result in? Well, it resulted in no agreement by any other provinces. All other provinces came to the table and said, look, we want to make sure that we do this in a way that is best for our province but actually came to the table and negotiated.

Similarly, on the health accord, Madam Speaker, you know, I can't imagine a situation where it's more important for the Premier to come forward in a way that understands the unique situation that our province is in, some of the unique challenges that we have, and fights for those in a constructive way. Did the Premier do that? No. The Premier walked away from the table, refused to meet with the premier—with the Prime Minister, refused to meet with the minister and didn't get a deal until so late in the game that, in fact, we never got anything else. There was no other

carve outs or no other additional benefits to Manitoba. So what did we do? We just sort of spun our wheels for a while.

What else can we talk about? There's a whole number of these issues. Oh, cannabis, Madam Speaker. No, no, no, we can't legalize cannabis in this province. There's not enough time; we can't do it; there's no way to do it. All the while, other provinces saying, hey, look, this is a real challenge; we need to make sure we get the resources on this from the federal government; we need to make sure it's done in a way that is—it protects people, especially young people in our provinces. You know, and they did that. The other provinces got to the table and they said, look, we don't like it, we see some issues with it, but we want to get the best deal for our province.

What did this government do? They sat on their hands. They complained about it. They tried to make an issue out of it, a political issue, rather than getting to work and actually getting some good legislation in front of this House. And now, at the last minute, they're saying, well, we've got to get this through, this is an issue, we've got to pass this, in such a ramshackle way that we don't know if we're getting the best legislation coming forward because this government sat on its hands and did nothing.

At every opportunity, this Premier has been a bull in a china shop at best. And it's been absolutely detrimental to these national issues and getting what's best for Manitoba actually moving forward. He is no great negotiator.

You know, I'm reminded of our friend down south there; he says, don't worry I can make the best deals, I got the best people, I'm going to make the best deals.

Well, this Premier came forward and said I'm going to make the best deals for Manitoba. And then at every turn, simply use these issues as a big, blunt hammer to try to hit people over the head and get his ideological message and his political message across. And I just think that it doesn't serve anybody; it doesn't serve the best interests of Manitobans.

So, when we have a resolution come forward from the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk) on this issue, it just lacks all credibility altogether. There is absolutely no credible—now, I understand, he has a constituency in his riding, in his constituency, a group of people and an industry that it is incredibly important to him. And I give him

a hundred per cent credit for standing up—at any opportunity, he does—I can't say that, actually, now that I'm saying it, I don't know if I remember a time that he has talked about this issue or about the oil industry. I'm sure he has. I just maybe wasn't around to hear it. But when he's talking about those issues, I understand that. I understand because I have some important industries in my constituency. I have some important places of employment that I love to talk about. And at every opportunity I can, I want to raise those, I want to lift those up and I want to champion those.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

So I understand why he's bringing it forward. But it lacks—as far as I'm concerned, it lacks all credibility, for him, as a member of this government. And as a backbench member of this government, to bring forward this resolution at this time when all of these other issues, when all of these other issues that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) could have had real positive influence on have been totally bungled.

And the Premier's willing to go to Nova Scotia and get involved in their court case. He's willing to go all across the country and, yet, when he does have any issue that is on the national stage, when there's an issue in our province that's on the national stage, and that is in Churchill, when he has an opportunity to step up and defend the people of this province, defend an important facility and a port here in this province, that has impacts across industry, across so many sectors of our economy in Manitoba, it could not be more important to the future economic success of this province—the Premier, when he has that opportunity on the national stage to make a difference, what does he do? He sits on his hands and he says, aw, we can't get involved in that. There's no way we can get involved in that.

Well, Madam Speaker, actually, there is a way to get involved in that. And it was our caucus that stepped up, that got involved in that, that tried to make a difference when it comes to a national issue, an issue that if you went across the country and you said, hey, have you heard about Churchill? I bet you every province in this country you would find somebody in every province that would say, absolutely, Churchill, this is a big issue. This is a problem. We need a national solution. We need to step up, we need to be united on that and we need to get something done.

And then they might say, wait a minute, where's your—where was your Premier? And we would say,

nowhere to be seen, nowhere at all to be seen on that important issue, and that's a real shame, Madam Speaker. That is a real shame.

So as I said, this lacks all credibility when the member steps up and says, now, on this issue, we are going to show national leadership. Every other issue, we've been—the Premier's been a bull in a china shop, he's bungled every opportunity to have a national influence to—as the member from Minto said—punch above our weight on the national level. He's made—he's missed every single opportunity to do that for short-term political gains within his own province that he thinks he's making.

He can continue to think that. But, when the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Piwniuk) steps up—and again, comes forward in a way—I think he's coming in a way that comes from the constituency. He probably spends time out there, talks to the people who are working in the oil sector, talks to people at Tundra who are, you know, expanding or are trying to improve their industry and says, you know, what are your issues? He wants to bring them forward to the Legislature. And all that credibility that he might've had has been taken away from him by this Premier. And that's a shame. That is an absolute shame.

* (11:50)

And I think there's an opportunity for us to step up as a province; rather than being that wrecking ball in the national—on national issues, we could be the leaders once again. And I think there's a simple way for us to accomplish that, and that would be to replace this Premier with an NDP one who will stand up and get out there and actually work with other provinces to find consensus and get these projects moving forward.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): You know, this resolution deals with an issue which is already being dealt with. The federal government has said that it will ensure that it's working with Alberta and BC and that the pipeline is going to be built.

Our challenge here in Manitoba is to address the issues we have with greenhouse gas production in our province, that we have—we are still very dependent on fossil fuels. We need to convert over to a province which is less dependent. We produce too much nitrous oxide and too much methane. And we need to work out how we will be able to operate, in fact, in a way that's beneficial to farmers so that they

are, instead of seeing nitrous–nitrogen go up in the air as nitrous oxide, have the nitrogen helping their crops to grow. So there are win-wins here.

So we want to move to an economy which is carbon neutral or greenhouse gas neutral and, perhaps, even have an economy which would have a net storage of greenhouse gases. There is a lot of potential, a lot of ideas that are coming from a variety of sources. The government itself has talked about having electric buses in our transit fleet. But so far it's been all talk and no action. We're not seeing additional new buses built. We're not seeing a fleet which is converting over. What's happening at the moment is that nothing is really changing, but there's an opportunity to position a company like New Flyer, which is a major bus manufacturer in North America, to be at the forefront of making electric buses and electric transit vehicles.

One of the things that clearly could be done is to look at the allocation of the money that's being raised through the carbon tax and how you can use some of that money to benefit the development of our economy, the development of our manufacturing capability here to produce electric vehicles and particularly, in this instance, electric buses.

We heard from the trucking industry that their industry is going to be paying an excessive amount, proportionately, of money in the carbon tax, but the—so far, the government has not provided any specific incentives to the trucking industry in this transition period when we will be moving away from gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles to electric vehicles. We know that these electric vehicles are on the way.

Tesla has showed that they're already able to produce electric trucks, and it's not going to be too far in the future where the companies are going to want to use these. And we need to be making the investments and providing the support in order to help our trucking companies be competitive during this transitional period.

There are—in the carbon plan, the climate change plan that was produced by the government, one of the problems was that they had selectively decided to not include any efforts relative to agriculture in the carbon plan. This is a big disappointment because agriculture is a very important industry in Manitoba, and it needs to be included. In fact, the Keystone Agricultural Producers have produced a climate-change approach which they have put forward, but the government so far has neglected.

It is a problem when this government says that the agricultural is responsible for 30 or 32 per cent of the greenhouse gas production, but those numbers only include the nitrous oxide and the methane. They don't include the fossil fuels used in gas and diesel for trucks in the farm, for tractors on the farm, for other vehicles on the farm and for heating farm buildings. And so, Keystone Agricultural Producers told us, when we met with them, that they think that the agriculture probably is responsible for about 38 per cent of the greenhouse gases. I wouldn't be surprised if it's not closer to 40 per cent.

Certainly we need to be paying attention to what's happening in agriculture. We need to make sure that we're providing the kind of support that Keystone Agricultural Producers are suggesting, that there would be support for operations which are working so that they produce less nitrous oxide. We know that there are numerous research studies which suggest that you can cut nitrous oxide production by a third very easily, by two thirds without too much difficulty, and maybe you can go even higher.

But the conversion from the way we farm now to the way we will be farming, I am sure, in the future, where we're much more careful about the generation of nitrous oxide and we're much more efficient in making sure that all of the nitrogen that's put on the crops actually gets to the crops, that there is the possibility of providing to farmers carbon credits from saving greenhouse—decreasing—taking measures which would decrease greenhouse gas production, whether it's nitrous oxide or methane or whether it's related to the use of fossil fuels.

Indeed, we can go further, because there's a lot of discussion about how it's possible to store carbon on the land depending on how we practise—what practices are used in terms of agriculture.

And this also applies to how we manage our forests. And we need the research base so that we can accurately give people carbon credits for doing things which are responsible for storing more carbon, whether it's in agriculture or through forestry management. And, certainly, this is an area which we can and should be focused on because there is a large potential here.

And so, at a time when this government has not even got its figures right in the case of the proportion of greenhouse gases produced by agriculture, we're debating this resolution instead of what we should be doing, is discussing how to have a really good and

effective carbon plan, greenhouse gas plan and climate change plan in Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I'm pleased to put a couple of words on the record in respect of the member's private member's resolution, the Trans Mountain Pipeline.

I mean, I know that some of my colleagues have spoken about, you know, the fact that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) seems to now want to style himself as a statesman on the issue—on issues of national importance, but that is really the antithesis to what we've seen thus far in the last two years.

And, you know, I would suggest to the House that for two years, the Premier has been somewhat of a—really, a wrecking ball of intergovernmental relationships across the country.

And, you know, I think that I would suggest that that's decreased Manitoba's—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 15, 2018

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Resolutions	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Res. 14–Trans Mountain Pipeline Piwniuk	2281
Concurrence and Third Readings–Public Bills		Questions	
		Swan	2283
Bill 212–The Invasive Species Awareness Week Act		Piwniuk	2283
		Smook	2284
Lagimodiere	2271	Ewasko	2284
Altemeyer	2272	Gerrard	2284
Gerrard	2274	Debate	
Wowchuk	2275	Swan	2286
Wiebe	2275	Smook	2288
B. Smith	2277	Wiebe	2289
Fontaine	2279	Gerrard	2291
		Fontaine	2293

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

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