

**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*

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

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
ALLUM, James	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
BINDLE, Kelly	Thompson	PC
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy, Hon.	River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
CURRY, Nic	Kildonan	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FIELDING, Scott, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
FLETCHER, Steven, Hon.	Assiniboia	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

Wednesday, June 20, 2018

*The House met at 1:30 p.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 afternoon, everybody.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

**Madam Speaker:** Introduction of bills? Committee reports? Tabling of reports? Ministerial statements?

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### NDP Health-Care Record

**Mr. Brad Michaleski (Dauphin):** Our government is keeping its word to fix the finances, repair the services and grow the economy of Manitoba. Our PC government did inherit a mess and we're cleaning it up just like we said we would.

It's important to keep your word, Madam Speaker, and just over two years ago Manitobans put their trust in our PC team, and our team is delivering. We're making long-overdue changes to improve patient care and wait times that the NDP was either afraid to or not allowed to make.

In my constituency of Dauphin, Parkland residents, like many Manitobans, felt the sting and heightened anxiety of long wait times and road trips for health care and diagnostics. For over 10 years and three elections the NDP promised but failed to deliver an MRI machine to Manitoba's Parkland region.

For over 10 years Parkland residents would continue to endure long road trips to Brandon and Winnipeg for MRI diagnostics. Many sick, elderly and injured Manitobans were facing growing wait-lists for these scans, but the NDP would not make the changes needed to improve wait times and patient care.

It's a shame, Madam Speaker, to learn about NDP mismanagement and underutilization of provincial MRI services from the Auditor General, but I'm very appreciative of the responsible actions taken by this PC government to address out-of-control spending growth while still making the improvements to improve patient care for all Manitobans. I'm especially grateful for this PC government's firm commitment to providing MRI services to the Parkland this fall.

Madam Speaker, it's clear improving patient care is not a priority of the NDP and they cannot be trusted to ensure the effectiveness, affordability or sustainability of our health-care system. Manitobans have suffered long enough under the NDP mismanagement and it's great to finally see a government keeping their word to improving patient care. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

#### Lawsuit Against Parker Wetlands Protesters

**Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview):** The last time I spoke about the Parker wetlands in the House it was to pay tribute to all those who had rallied to protect this ecologically significant green space in Fort Garry-Riverview.

Since 2009 community activists from all walks of life had worked tirelessly to preserve the Parker wetlands for important ecological, indigenous and recreational reasons. Sadly, their words fell on deaf ears and the developer's bulldozers succeeded in demolishing virtually all of the wetlands to pave the way for a new housing development.

What does remain, however, is a lawsuit filed by the developer against 49 identified people—and potentially many more—who for a short time last summer peacefully and respectfully occupied the Parker wetlands in an effort to preserve this ecological treasure. Damages haven't been specified, but media reports indicate that the plaintiffs may be claiming in the millions or tens of millions of dollars.

This is utterly preposterous. People of good conscience who were simply exercising their democratic right to engage in peaceful protest should not be punished in this manner. The defendants in this

lawsuit are peaceful people who simply cherish and value Mother Earth above all.

I call on the developer today to drop this lawsuit as an act of generosity and goodwill. Whatever the nominal cost incurred by the developer resulting from the protest, my community and those of us who loved and cherished the Parker wetlands have lost much, much more.

Madam Speaker, I ask all members of the House to join me in thanking those in the gallery today who selflessly fought to protect the natural environment in the face of great odds. May they be forever remembered not as litigants in a pointless lawsuit, but as heroes who fought to protect the beautiful natural sanctuary that was once known as the Parker wetlands.

### **Truth, Trust and Integrity**

**Mr. Doyle Pivniuk (Arthur-Virden):** Madam Speaker, this session has—truly demonstrates the dishonesty, the little integrity and the feeble amount of trust we can have in the NDP. But to be perfectly honest, we should not be surprised. For 17 years they were in government they did not only renege on their own promises, but they ignored the majority of rural Manitobans.

When in government, promised to end hallway medicine; instead turned into highway medicine, with Manitobans travelling elsewhere for treatment they need and deserve. Their temporary ER closures in rural Manitoba turned out to be permanent and—any values that they claim to hold. Moreover, without the real consultation, against rural municipalities' wishes they decided to amalgamate municipalities anyways.

So, Madam Speaker, with a lot of members' statements, this last few weeks of the emergency session is not—it's important to have the importance of truth, trust and integrity. But the reality is: should we not be surprised by this behaviour. It's, of course, the heavy past and it even continues now with this NDP government.

NDP refused to acknowledge the importance of selfless work that the Manitoba conservation officers have in our province. They refused to consider the public awareness of Lyme disease an important issue, despite the over tenfold differences in cases in Manitoba, from five to 52 from between the year 2009 and 2016—a large amount of which are in rural Manitoba.

The NDP lost the last election so heavily because of lack of core values, as they displayed in their political and legislative style. But they did not just end after this last election, they continue now. The NDP continues to show the same lack of respect in regards to well-being of Manitobans that they did when they were in government.

Our government is committed to working with all Manitobans—all Manitobans—including those in my rural 'comucipality'—constituency of Arthur-Virden. After 17 years of debt, 'declay' and decline, we are fixing the finances, repairing the services and rebuilding our economy—all while upholding the integrity, but truthful, trustworthy towards all Manitobans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

### **Petit Casimir Memorial School Graduation**

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** Last Saturday, June 16th, I was honoured to attend the Petit Casimir Memorial School located in Lac Brochet for their graduation. We celebrated students graduating from grade 8, from grade 12 and from UCN. It was great to take part and celebrate the hard work of all the students in this community.

I got the opportunity to present a small bursary to Tianna Thorassi for her excellent academic achievements. Tianna scored 87 per cent on her provincial exams, a remarkable achievement on her part. Tianna is one of six students to graduate from grade 12 this year from Lac Brochet. She is a true leader and role model in her community.

\* (13:40)

I was impressed with the dedication of all students, who showed determination to pursue an education, contribute to their communities in a positive way. This is a resilient community full of talented and bright individuals.

I'd also like to recognize the principal of Petit Casimir Memorial School, Pierre Bernier, who has an—been an incredible support to all the students. Beyond his duties as principal, Mr. Bernier spends a lot of time in the community keeping students engaged and showing them ways that they can make a difference in their communities.

We all know the difference one educator can make in our lives, and Principal Bernier is truly dedicated individual who deserves recognition for his work.

Currently, a group of students from Lac Brochet are here in Winnipeg along with their principal, taking part in a southern experience. Unfortunately, they couldn't make it to the Legislature in time, but on behalf of all members of this House, I hope we can all wish them all the best in their future endeavours.

I look forward to seeing the different ways these young people that will graduate will make a difference in our communities. Who knows, maybe one day one of them will be the MLA for their constituency and represent our communities here in the Legislature.

Congratulations to the graduates and their families.

### **Truth, Trust and Integrity**

**Ms. Janice Morley-Lecomte (Seine River):** As parliamentary—parliamentarians, sorry, we are given a privilege and a responsibility by our constituents to represent them in this Chamber. This is something that all of us should take extremely seriously.

Madam Speaker, we are ultimately accountable to those who elected us. It is up to us to maintain that trust and live up to the responsibilities given to us at the ballot box.

As we saw two years ago, Manitobans no longer trusted the NDP. They had simply broken too many promises for Manitobans to give them another mandate to govern. This was the government that raised the PST to 8 per cent, making life less affordable for Manitoba families after campaigning that they wouldn't.

In Seine River, residents saw how their former NDP MLA was busy playing leadership politics rather than focusing on her own riding. The NDP could barely focus on their constituents, because they were too focused on breaking the trust of their colleagues and rebelling against their own leader.

Our government recognizes the importance of trust, and I recognize how important it is to be accountable to and focused on my constituents of Seine River.

I am proud to be a member of this PC government, a government that values truth, trust and integrity. We value the trust that Manitobans have given us, Madam Speaker, and we do not take it for granted.

Thank you.

### **Introduction of Guests**

**Madam Speaker:** Although our guests in the gallery have left, I do want to indicate to you that for a few minutes we did have seated in the public gallery, from Minnesota, the Minnesota Boychoir. There were 77 visitors under the direction of Anna Keyes, and I think if you heard the singing at noon, that's who was singing and we thank them for being here and lending their voices.

### **ORAL QUESTIONS**

#### **Changes to Health-Care Services Impact on St. Boniface Community**

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** St. Boniface residents will have the opportunity to have their voices heard and they have said clearly they reject this Premier's cuts to health care. Families are worried about the thousands of extra patients that will be diverted to St. Boniface Hospital, Madam Speaker, after this Premier closes three emergency rooms. They know that St. B can't handle the extra pressure, but the Premier refuses to listen to the concerns and his own experts.

We know that the Liberal Party is also responsible for billion-dollar cuts to health care.

St. Boniface residents need a real voice—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** —to stand up for health care.

Will the Premier listen to the residents of St. Boniface and back off his cuts to health care?  
*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Again, Madam Speaker, unfortunately I have to confront the member opposite with the facts not contained in her preamble.

We are making record investments in health care, more than the previous administration ever did, in fact, close to half a billion dollars more in this year's budget alone. We are concentrating emergency room resources in a manner that will provide better services and better care sooner to Manitobans, as was recommended to the previous government, although they did not have the courage to act on that advice and has—as has been done in many other jurisdictions across the country, Madam Speaker.

But I am very, very pleased and I congratulate the member on acknowledging the damaging effects of federal Liberal health cuts. I just wish that the NDP had used the earlier opportunity to join with us so we could have, in a united fashion, opposed those cuts and opposed that decision.

We will continue to speak in favour of sustainable health-care partnerships with the federal government and I encourage the NDP to join with us in the future, even though they did not in the past.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for St. Johns, on a supplementary question.

**Ms. Fontaine:** The Premier's attack on health care in St. Boniface worries families because it is one of their only places to receive primary care in their community, Madam Speaker.

The Premier closed the St. Boniface QuickCare clinic, eliminating primary care that was actively offered in French, Madam Speaker. St. Boniface families value bilingual health-care services because it ensures their ongoing vitality in their Franco-Manitoban community and guarantees basic services in their mother tongue. They value primary care because it helps them stay healthy and out of the hospital. The—this Premier's cuts to that service are having a tremendous effect.

Will the Premier stop cutting the primary health care that keeps families out of the hospital?

**Mr. Pallister:** Well, I do hope the member will not take offence at me confronting the fallacies of her preamble, Madam Speaker.

I want her to understand, as I would hope all Manitobans would understand, that improving access to health care is the goal and, of course, is made necessary by the fact that we have as a province, unfortunately, suffered from the longest waits for many, many services, diagnostic care, many types of treatment, surgeries. And, of course, in terms of wait times for emergency rooms, Madam Speaker, Manitobans know that we've been 10th out of 10 of all Canadian jurisdictions. This is not a system the member should defend, yet she chooses to defend it.

We're not in favour of the status quo here, Madam Speaker. We're diligently focused on achieving better outcomes for Manitobans in health care and in every other file.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for St. Johns, on a final supplementary.

**Ms. Fontaine:** The Premier ordered millions of dollars in budget cuts, hiking fees and cutting services.

One group hardest hit by these cuts is St. Boniface seniors, Madam Speaker. The Premier increased fees for adult day programs that keep seniors healthy and active and out of the hospital. His cuts mean less seniors can afford daily exercise and the socialization these programs provide. This was after the Premier cut tens of thousands of dollars from personal-care homes like Actionmarguerite.

In this by-election St. Boniface families will reject the Premier's cuts on health care.

Will the Premier back off his plans to close ERs? Will he commit to investing in health care for St. Boniface instead?

**Mr. Pallister:** Six hundred and fifty-four million, Madam Speaker. That's the additional amount of investment in this year's budget in health care alone: \$654 million.

The member, in her disinformation that she laid down as a preamble, alluded to the word cuts a dozen times. It doesn't matter how many times she repeats it, Madam Speaker, it doesn't make it any less true. It is a fabrication, an evasion, a distortion. It is inaccurate, and the member has repeatedly put that misinformation on the record much to her discredit and to the discredit of the credibility of her own organization, the party she is now actively campaigning for in a by-election, obviously. But she's using misinformation as a basis for persuasion, something the NDP has tried to do many times in the past. It didn't work in the past. It won't work in the future either.

We're focused on improving health care for Manitobans. That's what we'll stay focused on.

#### **Université de Saint-Boniface Education Affordability**

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** Madam Speaker, parents in St. Boniface want their kids to get a good start in life with an affordable education and a good job. Unfortunately, under the Pallister government the unemployment—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Wiebe:** —rate is the highest it's been in over 20 years and teaching positions and programs have now been cut at St. Boniface university. Education is getting a lot more expensive. Students at the

university will see their tuition raise—rise by 6.6 per cent this year, triple the rate of inflation. On top of this they've lost \$60 million in supports for new graduates. Students are paying more while programs are being cut.

Will this minister just explain why he is cutting education in St. Boniface?

\* (13:50)

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, again, Madam Speaker, I guess it's a lie-election—or, I'm sorry, by-election time, and the member can't confront the truth. He doesn't want to hear the truth. He can't handle the truth.

He talks about jobs and joblessness, Madam Speaker. He fails to talk about the record number of jobs Manitobans are performing and have. We have the highest number of people working in Manitoba in our history as a province.

Our industrial and commercial building investment led the country last year. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** Manitoba industrial investment created over 1,200 jobs just last year. Manitoba commercial building investment created over 600 jobs just last year. That's close to 2,000 additional jobs just in those two categories, Madam Speaker.

Again, I encourage the member to understand that doom-and-gloom pessimism, misinformation, phony information, Madam Speaker, isn't going to get him electoral success and it certainly won't help his candidate in St. Boniface either.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Concordia, on a supplementary question.

**Bureau de l'éducation française  
Assistant Deputy Minister Position**

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** Madam Speaker, the people of St. Boniface are doing everything they can to have their voice heard in this Legislature, and it's our team on this side of the House that will stand with them—

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

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Wiebe:** —and make sure that that voice is heard.

They brought forward, Madam Speaker, petitions to this Legislature: 1,800 Manitobans signed a petition—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Wiebe:** —calling on this government to reverse the cut to the assistant deputy minister position in bureau l'éducation française. This cut was made without any consideration of the needs of the community and without any consultation with the advisory council that was established to deal with these matters.

Will the minister restore the position of the Deputy Minister of Education?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** L'histoire de la francophone communauté au Manitoba est fortement liée à celle de notre province. Entière, cette communauté s'est caractérisée d'une manière dynamique et résolue.

**Translation**

*The history of the francophone community in Manitoba is closely linked to that of our province. As a whole, this community is characterized by its dynamic and resolute attitude.*

**English**

The member again puts false information on the record. The funding for French language programming has never been higher. We are trimming at the top, Madam Speaker. That's no secret. And it's no secret that the NDP grew our civil service at the top to the detriment of the services at the front line.

And we're changing that. We're inverting the pyramid. We're focusing our resources on maintaining, supporting and strengthening the front-line services, whether it's French language services, health-care services, educational services, you name it, Madam Speaker.

I know that the member clings to the old days when the pyramid was upside down, but, Madam Speaker, that's not the way to get better services to the front line. He may think it's the way to victory in St. Boniface if he wishes, but the people of St. Boniface understand, because they are taxpayers, too, and because they depend on the services of government as well, that things have to change and they are changing for the better.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Concordia, on a final supplementary.

### Education System Class Size Reduction

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** Madam Speaker, parents in St. Boniface want their children to have more one-on-one time with their teachers. They know that the best way to build a strong education system is to keep class sizes small and to make sure that the resources and supports are there for the teachers, but instead this minister is increasing class sizes for the first time in years. His cuts are setting back our education system—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order. Order.

**Mr. Wiebe:** This minister is setting back our education system for years to come and doing major damage to the education futures of our children.

I'm simply asking: Will the minister listen to those parents, to those teachers, to those educators in St. Boniface and make investments to reduce class size?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** In the absence of fact the member has no choice, I suppose, Madam Speaker, to—if he wishes to make false arguments he can, but the fact remains that the class sizes when the NDP were in power were an average of 19 and they're an average of 19 now.

I would go beyond the falsehood in the earlier statement though, Madam Speaker, to say to the member that surely parents throughout this province want better quality education for their children than 10th out of 10 under the NDP. We'll change the education system.

Nous nous concentrons sur la réparation des services sociaux importants comme l'éducation, pour donner aux familles manitobaines la sécurité qu'elles méritent.

#### *Translation*

*We are focusing on repairing the social services that are important like education, in order to give Manitoba families the security they deserve.*

**Madam Speaker:** I would just remind members that the word falsehood is not considered a parliamentary language and I would encourage that it no longer be used in the House.

### Premier's Vacation Property Luxury Home Value Disclosure

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** CBC Manitoba reports the Premier has failed to provide a value for his

mansion in Costa Rica for the past 10 years, violating Costa Rican law, and this—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Swan:** —means more than two months after the issue was raised in the media and after the Premier rather than dealing with it, decided to hire a lawyer and threaten to sue the Winnipeg Free Press for daring to report his non-disclosure for the luxury home tax.

Everyone needs to follow the same rules. There isn't one set of rules for the Premier and one set for everybody else.

Why has the Premier violated the law in Costa Rica—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Swan:** —for the past 10 years? [*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order. Order.

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I've taken all necessary steps to act on the information, some of it misinformation that was reported around the property which I declared publicly over a decade ago and which is no secret.

My wife and I saved for 30 years to invest in a vacation property and we have always paid our taxes and we are investigating and taking all necessary steps to determine if we failed in some way to comply with the requirements in Costa Rica. We'll certainly comply as we have always done, to our knowledge, up 'til now in this country as well.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Minto, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Swan:** The problem for this Premier is he's had more than two months now to deal with this issue and he's refused. In fact, he's done the opposite by getting a lawyer to threaten the media here in Manitoba. Every point he's refused, he's evaded and blamed others for his failures and he's threatened to sue—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Swan:** —when the media have put facts on the record.

The Costa Rican government says the Premier's company was in default in 2009. They say he should have updated his property value in 2013, but never did. Experts in Costa Rica are concerned and we hear

today, on CBC Manitoba, one expert calls this—  
[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Swan:** —a big deal when property owners don't follow the rules.

Will the Premier stop the game and follow the rules? [interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** Of course, Madam Speaker, the member has nothing else and has to resort to these tactics. That's all right. I'm fine with that and—though he shouldn't be.

That being said, I've always honoured my obligations, Madam Speaker. The member's a lawyer. I am a professional chartered financial consultant by training. Our practices are based on our reputation; the member chooses to attack mine. That's fine, he can, but I have 45 years as a record; I'll stand by my record. [interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

The honourable member for Minto, on a final supplementary.

**Mr. Swan:** Well, I'll offer the Premier some free advice: he should go use the Google and follow his obligations in Costa Rica.

The Premier's Costa Rican problems are always of his own making. [interjection] He claimed there was no problem with him taking [interjection] eight weeks of vacation a year—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order. I've asked for order several times. I'm asking everybody, please.

**Mr. Swan:** This Premier misrepresented where he was to the media and the people of Manitoba in the flood of 2014 when he was down in Costa Rica. He said he was in touch with staff while in Costa Rica when, in fact, he was completely out of touch and the only communications he had were through unsecured personal emails to his wife's email account.

The Premier needs to follow the rules. He needs to stop the games.

Will the Premier update the value of his Costa Rican home as the law demands and apologize to people in Manitoba and Costa Rica for ignoring his obligations? [interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order. I'm asking both sides of the House for order, please.

**Mr. Pallister:** Madam Speaker, I've never ignored my obligations. I've always fulfilled my obligations all my life and I won't stop, and the fact is I have a record of trust and I have a record of transparency and the member—I do not choose to respond to the member in kind today, though I would ask him if his leader does. I think that's a fair question.

\* (14:00)

If he wants to make this about integrity, I'm fine with that. If he wants to make this about my record, I'm fine with that too. If this is how he wants to do—  
[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** —politics that's his choice, Madam Speaker, but we don't choose to do politics this way on this side of the House—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** —nor will we.

So, Madam Speaker, I say that what the member has is disinformation, distortion, and that's all he has. I have a 45-year record of always fulfilling my obligations in full and in a timely manner, never had any problem with any tax authority and I've never had a problem with any legal authority either.

And, Madam Speaker, if the member wants to play gutter politics, he does so to his detriment, not mine. [interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

### **Recreational Facility Funding Norwood Pool Replacement**

**Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas):** It'll be 30° this week and kids are about to take their summer break. It's a good time to take kids to a splash pad or a pool. Unfortunately, the Pallister government has frozen communities out, cutting the beauty—Building Manitoba Fund and freezing operation funds for communities. As a result there is simply less funding to build and repair recreation facilities. That's according to City finance chair Scott Gillingham.

The Norwood pool in St. Boniface is facing the end of its service life this summer.

So I ask the minister: Will there be additional revenues—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Smith:** –from the Province so that the City of Winnipeg can replace the Norwood pool?

**Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations):** In the member's preamble she mentioned it was going to be 30° this week, but she mentioned something about freezing. So I'm not sure whether she's freezing or warm, Madam Speaker.

But, you know, the bottom line is our reputation as a government and our consultation process with not only the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, but municipalities throughout Manitoba is warmer than it's ever been, a lot warmer than it ever was under 17 years of the NDP.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a supplementary question.

**Mrs. Smith:** Too bad the minister couldn't answer a simple question that pertains to children.

The taps are now off in south Winnipeg and now Norwood pool is slated for closure. For years the previous NDP government provided reliable increases to the City of Winnipeg for recreation services. Now—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Smith:** –this fund has been cut and operating funds from the Province have been frozen yet again.

Residents of St. Boniface should have access to quality recreation services, but that's getting harder because of the actions of this Pallister government.

Will the minister change course and put the additional resources forward to replace the Norwood pool so that children can enjoy their summer?

**Mr. Wharton:** Again, I'll remind the member opposite that the City of Winnipeg enjoys some of the most generous funding in any jurisdiction throughout Canada, Madam Speaker.

In turn on that, too, Madam Speaker, their operation basket—unconditional operating funding unlike any other municipality or city in Canada; the City of Winnipeg has the full authority to determine where the money should spent. If they choose to put it into pools in Norwood or St. Vital, that's a decision that they can make, not this government. We're very proud of that.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a final supplementary.

**Mrs. Smith:** It's too bad that this minister keeps shirking their responsibility onto the City. Shame.

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

**Mrs. Smith:** Most of the residents of St. Boniface—

**Madam Speaker:** Order. Order.

**Mrs. Smith:** Miigwech, Madam Speaker. We'll try this again.

Most residents—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Smith:** –of St. Boniface can't lounge poolside for eight weeks a year in Costa Rica. [*interjection*] Community pools provide a needed reprieve from the summer heat. But with—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Smith:** –this Pallister government's cuts and operating funds from the Province frozen—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order. I should not have to stand this number of times. We're not even halfway through oral questions. I have asked for order.

I would ask, please, everybody show some respect for this Chair and please heed my cautions. I'm having a difficult time hearing everybody. So I would ask for everybody's co-operation, please.

The honourable member for Point Douglas.

**Mrs. Smith:** Thank you.

For the third time, let's try this again. Children deserve to enjoy their summer. This government's cutting operating funds from the Province. They've frozen funding. Repair and replacement of community facilities is becoming much more difficult.

So I ask the minister again: Will he put additional resources forward to replace the Norwood pool and turn the taps on in the south?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Again, Madam Speaker, the misinformation rampant in the preambles of the members opposite continues.

The funding and support for the City of Winnipeg has never been higher in the history of Manitoba, and our commitment is to continue to make Winnipeg one of the most generously and assured funding recipients of this province as we move forward.

But I do want to say thank you to the NDP for finally coming clean on their genuine goals for municipal budgets today by announcing that their

plan would involve a 7.3 per cent property tax increase. After all, someone has to pay for all these additional services that they're promising: 50 per cent increase in the impact fee; new parking lot fees; and, actually, a proposed fee that the NDP would like to see enacted that would charge everyone who comes to Winnipeg \$1 every time they come.

Now, Madam Speaker—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** —I appreciate the NDP coming clean on their municipal tax-hike plans. I'd like them to do the same for the provincial budget as well.

### **Cross Lake Community Need for Health Facility**

**Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas):** The birth of a child is one of the most joyful and one of the most stressful experiences in life. Members of Cross Lake have to deal with quite a bit more stress because they have to leave their community to give birth when they should be surrounded by friends and family.

Last week I tabled birthday cards for the Minister of Health from members of Cross Lake asking him to help Cross Lake mothers give birth closer to home.

Now that the minister has had a chance to read those cards, can he provide a due date for the people of Cross Lake?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living):** I did have a chance to read the birthday cards—I appreciate them—from the residents of Cross Lake. They were all—well, most of them were quite nice, maybe not all of them. But I did appreciate receiving them.

Certainly the birth of a child is—it can be a difficult thing and a joyous thing. I know my wife had to leave our community to have our child because it was a high-risk pregnancy and that certainly caused some challenges and stress, so I understand that.

In terms of the facility in Cross Lake, I've had some discussions with the federal government following their announcement that they were going to be building a hospital, and we certainly expect that they'll fulfill that commitment, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for The Pas, on a supplementary question.

**Ms. Lathlin:** I recently attended the open house in Cross Lake for the public unveiling of a complete

design presentation for the hospital. I was disappointed that the minister didn't attend and I didn't see anyone from his department. The community is glad to see this facility moving forward, but it still needs funding for advanced emergency care, dialysis, palliative care and support for mothers in delivery.

Will the minister come to the table with resources to ensure Cross Lake residents can get the care they need in their home community?

**Mr. Goertzen:** I know, Madam Speaker, when the federal government made an announcement that they would be building a new hospital in Cross Lake, they did not invite us to the announcement. But they made that commitment to the people of Cross Lake.

We as a department have been at the table in terms of providing information and data that would be helpful in the fulfillment of the federal government's promise, and I'm sure that they will fulfill their promise, Madam Speaker.

\* (14:10)

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for The Pas, on a final supplementary.

**Ms. Lathlin:** I beg to differ; an invitation was sent out.

The Canadian health act and the 1964 agreement establishes that the Province has a role in health care for Cross Lake and the government's Throne Speech is committed providing access to quality care on reserve.

Despite a federal commitment to a health facility in Cross Lake, the 'provin' has not even come to the table in good faith, let alone made a commitment of any kind.

When life-saving care in Cross Lake could cut transportation costs and save the Province money, why is this government refusing to take responsibility and walking away from an investment that will improve health outcomes in Manitoba's 10th largest First Nation?

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable First Minister.

**Mr. Goertzen:** I'd like to thank the member for acknowledging in her question that the federal government did make a commitment to the people of Cross Lake for a health-care facility or for a hospital, Madam Speaker. I haven't heard her make—acknowledge that commitment in the past, but I think that she is right to put that on the record, that the

federal government did commit to building a hospital for the people of Cross Lake.

The federal government has not always fulfilled all of their commitments that they've made in the election, but I am certainly hopeful that they will fulfil this commitment to the good people of Cross Lake, Madam Speaker.

#### **Personal-Care-Home Standards Amendment to Regulations**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, a report released by the Manitoba Nurses Union has shed some light on some of the chronic issues that are harming our personal-care homes. Currently, protocol only requires 3.6 hours of care per resident per day; however, we now know that this number of hours does not reflect the complexity of care that many residents need today.

Madam Speaker, would the minister support amending our personal-care-home standards regulations to ensure that residents who require long-term care will receive the amount of care tailored to their needs?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Very much appreciate the question from the member, Madam Speaker, and this could be an historic day in this Chamber if the member would so decide to make it one.

We have the NDP now on record admitting that the federal Liberal government should not have cut health-care funding in excess of a billion dollars. In fact, actually, it would be over \$2.2 billion over the next decade, Madam Speaker.

If we could get the independent members to join with us today, we'd be able to speak with one solid voice against the health-care cuts that the federal Liberals are imposing on all provinces, not just Manitoba. If we could speak with one voice I think it would support our position in terms of leading the other provinces in the direction of unifying our campaign to work together to restore a genuine partnership to the health-care funding and give confidence to the people who need those services from coast to coast to coast, Madam Speaker.

I'd encourage the member to add her voice today and her colleagues' voices, along with other independent members, to a unified statement that we can put out there that says Manitobans in this Chamber are supportive of Manitobans' need for

properly funded health care from the federal government.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on a supplementary question.

**Ms. Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to encourage the Premier to speak through the Chair in his answers.

We know that three out of four personal-care-home residents are diagnosed with neurological issues, the most predominant being dementia. Health-care professionals who work with these residents are extremely strained to provide high levels of care with limited resources when staffing guidelines have remained the same for over a decade.

When is this government going to review the personal-care-home standards regulations and adjust them to represent our current need and demographic?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living):** Certainly, we've made a commitment to supporting those who were in need of long-term care. We've made a commitment to new personal-care-home beds, Madam Speaker. We've also invested in transitional housing to ensure that those who are in hospital who need a higher level of care, a PCH-like care, can get that outside of a hospital environment. So we as a province, as a government have made a significant commitment to those who need that level of care.

What we aren't seeing the same level of commitment is from the federal government, who has been cutting funding to health care in Manitoba to the tune of \$2 billion over the next 10 years, to the point where Manitobans now fund 81 per cent of the health-care budget in Manitoba where it was supposed to be a 50-50 partnership, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on a final supplementary.

#### **Long-Term Care Budget Funding Concerns**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, every day we are hearing stories of disabled seniors being hurt in elevators, of residents somehow being found more than four kilometres away from their homes and of residents not receiving the proper care that they need.

Madam Speaker, friends and families should be assured that when their loved ones are in a personal-care home that they are being protected and

the staff at these personal-care homes should have accessibility to the resources that they need.

Under what circumstance did this government feel it was okay to cut \$2.3 million from the long-term-care budget?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living):** Madam Speaker, the member will know that there continues to be and will continue to be a record level of investment in health care under this government because we know it is a top priority for Manitobans.

When it comes to the issue of long-term care, not only have we committed to building new personal-care-home residences, Madam Speaker, we've committed and succeeded in getting those who need a PCH-like level of care out of hospitals quicker so they can get it in an environment that is better for them and that they would rather be treated in.

And we continue to look at different models of care to ensure that those who need a level of care that is like a PCH can get it in the best environment for them, Madam Speaker.

#### **Affordable Housing Flin Flon Announcement**

**Mr. Kelly Bindle (Thompson):** Madam Speaker, I'm proud to say that I'm part of a PC government that is working hard on behalf of all Manitobans.

Recently the Minister of Families announced a request for expressions of interest for options to develop a vacant, provincially owned property to provide more housing options in Flin Flon.

Can the minister please share with this House the contents of this argument and how our—this announcement, and how our PC government is fixing the province's finances, repairing the services and rebuilding our economy just like we promised Manitobans? *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister of Families):** I want to thank member for Thompson for such a strong question.

He is a strong voice, Madam Speaker, for the North—not just for Thompson but all over the North and we've been waiting for that for a very long period of time, in fact, 17 years.

Manitoba Housing—our government is truly pleased to provide some innovative and unique opportunities to develop affordable housing in Flin Flon area. We think that's important. This is a truly refresh of this project. We think it's important. We're interested in providing opportunities for agencies and organizations that want to develop housing in the North.

This is an—important for this government. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

#### **Introduction of Guests**

**Madam Speaker:** I would like to introduce to you some guests that just arrived in the gallery and they are from the Manitoba Institute of Trades and Technology. There's 30 adult English language students under the direction of Kamara Jarvis, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Minto (Mr. Swan).

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

#### **Air Quality Monitoring (St. Boniface) Equipment Failure Concerns**

**Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley):** Several weeks ago I tabled documents indicating that the air quality monitoring system run by the Province was apparently no longer working, several of the air monitoring devices were no longer reporting data from across the province.

I'm wondering if the minister has any update from the House on why this keeps happening.

**Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development):** Well, I thank the member for the question and I'm happy to provide an update that we did do air sampling in January, February, but as most people know January and February, those results often need to be re-examined. So we were out in the field for three weeks in May in the very neighbourhood in which this member is talking about and we are analyzing that data as we speak.

Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Wolseley, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** The minister then, I should probably direct her to the Facebook page of the South St. Boniface Residents Association where—

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

**An Honourable Member:** It's got to be true.

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** Really? *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** It's a community group raising concerns about their quality of life. *[interjection]*

\* (14:20)

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Altemeyer:** I know members opposite don't have much to do outside of question period, but they've got three and a half minutes left; let's see if they can get through it.

The residents have posted seven hours ago that several of the devices, again, are not reporting any data. This community has existing concerns about the quality of their air. They are no longer confident the government's looking out for them.

Why are these devices not working and not reporting essential data to the public of Manitoba?

**Ms. Squires:** I've worked extensively with the South St. Boniface Residents Association and continue to work with them to address some of their concerns, unlike members opposite who, in 2008 they found a report where they had lead in the soil in Logan and Point Douglas in exceedance of CCME guidelines.

What did they do? They buried that report.

They resampled the areas in 2011. Again, exceedance of CCME guidelines and they buried the report.

Unlike members opposite we are being very transparent and we're working very hard with all these groups to address their environmental concerns.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Wolseley, on a final supplementary.

#### **Independent Evaluation Request**

**Mr. Altemeyer:** The minister's still not quite getting the point. This is air quality monitoring we're talking about. These devices monitor such potentially deadly substances as carbon monoxide, ozone, nitrous oxides and sulphur dioxides. These are not minor or trivial concerns.

The South St. Boniface Residents Association has repeatedly asked for this government to do a better job of assuring them that the air that they breathe is safe, so much so that they're now asking

for an independent air quality evaluation to be conducted.

I appreciate that the minister has indicated her staff are doing some additional work. Will she also commit to meeting the requests of the South St. Boniface Residents Association to have an independent evaluation done as well so they have assurances that their environment is being properly protected? *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Squires:** All this talk about St. Boniface brings up memories of my last conversation with the member—the former member for St. Boniface. He came into my office just before his departure and he said to me, we haven't always gotten it right on the environment, will you fix it?

And I assured the member for St. Boniface and I can assure the members of this House that we are going to fix the mess that they left behind.

#### **Thompson Manitoba Meeting Request with Mayor**

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** Let's talk about something other than St. Boniface. Let's talk about—

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

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lindsey:** Let's talk about Thompson, Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, Mayor Fenske—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lindsey:** —the mayor of Thompson—maybe the MLA from Thompson doesn't know that, but that's the mayor's name in Thompson. The mayor of Thompson says that this government doesn't care about anything north of the 53rd parallel. It's easy to understand because the Premier likes to spend eight weeks just looking north while he's down south.

We're glad the minister's finally decided to meet with Mr. Fenske, but we'd like some more reassurance.

Will the Premier skip his eight-week vacation in Costa Rica and actually spend a working vacation meeting with the people of Thompson, meeting with the mayor of Thompson—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lindsey:** –and actually accomplishing something for Thompson?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, I appreciate the member again demonstrating that he's taken a vacation from credibility, authenticity and research, and does so on a regular basis in this Chamber, Madam Speaker.

The NDP knows that I was away on vacation last year twice, in January and December, but they just don't want anybody else to know besides them.

Madam Speaker, the fact remains that the congratulations the member should have offered to our minister and to the member for Thompson (Mr. Bindle), he did not offer, but he should know that the housing—affordable housing for the people of Flin Flon matters more to us, perhaps, than it does to him.

And so I thank the member, the minister for their hard work on behalf of the people of Flin Flon—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** –and I thank all our ministers on this side of the House for their diligent efforts for the people of the North.

The only time the NDP ever went north was to buy votes in The Pas, Madam Speaker. That was the last time they were there and that's the last time they ever demonstrated anything moderately along the lines of respect for the people of the North. Well, actually, that wasn't demonstrating respect for the people of the North, was it?

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I encourage the member to thank members on this side of the House when they do something for the North rather than try to criticize them.

**Madam Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

## PETITIONS

### Vimy Arena

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia):** I wish to—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Fletcher:** –present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background of this petition is as follows:

(1) The residents of St. James and other areas of Manitoba are concerned with the intention expressed by the provincial government to use the Vimy Arena site as a Manitoba Housing project.

(2) The Vimy Arena site is in the middle of a residential area near schools, churches, community clubs, senior homes, and neither the provincial government nor the City considered better suited locations in rural, semi-rural or industrial sites such as the St. Boniface industrial park, the 20,000 acres at CentrePort or existing properties such as the Shriners Hospital or the old Children's Hospital on Wellington Crescent.

(3) The Province—the provincial government is exempt from any zoning requirements that would have existed if the land was owned by the City of Winnipeg. This exemption bypasses community input and due diligence and ignores better uses for the land which would be consistent with a residential area.

(4) There are no standards that one would expect for a treatment centre. The Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living has stated that the department of Health had no role to play in the land acquisition for the Manitoba Housing project for use as a drug facility.

(5) The Manitoba Housing project initiated by the provincial government changes the fundamental nature of the community, including park and recreation uses, concerns of the residents of St. James and others regarding public safety, property values and their way of life have not been addressed.

(6) The concerns of the residents of St. James are being ignored while obvious other locations in wealthier neighbourhoods, such as Tuxedo and River Heights, have not been considered for this Manitoba Housing project, even though there are hundreds of acres of land available for development at Kapyong Barracks or parks like Heubach Park that share the same zoning as the Vimy Arena.

(7) The Manitoba Housing project and the operation of a drug treatment facility fall outside the statutory mandate of the Manitoba Housing renewal corporation.

(8) The provincial government does not have a co-ordinated plan for addiction treatment in Manitoba as it currently underfunds treatment

centres which are running far under capacity and potential.

(9) The community has been misled regarding the true intention of Manitoba Housing as land is being transferred for a 50-bed facility even though the project is clearly outside of Manitoba Housing responsibility.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure the Vimy Arena site is not used for an addiction treatment facility; and

(2) To urge the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure the preservation of land along Sturgeon Creek for the purposes of park land and recreational activities for public use, including being an important component of the Sturgeon Creek Greenway Trail and Sturgeon Creek ecosystem under the current designation PR2 for the 255 Hamilton location at the Vimy Arena site, and to maintain the land to continue to be designated for parks and recreation active neighbourhoods and community.

\*(14:30)

This petition has been signed by Diana MacKenzie, Kathy Bolloway and Frank Coopner [*phonetic*].

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** In accordance with our rule 133(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to be received by the House.

#### **Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room**

**Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas):** I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The provincial government has announced the closure of three emergency rooms and an urgent-care centre in the city of Winnipeg, including closing down the emergency room at Seven Oaks General Hospital.

(2) The closures come on the heels of the closing of a nearby QuickCare clinic, as well as cancelled plans for ACCESS centres and personal-care homes, such as Park Manor, that have—that would have

provided important services for families and seniors in the area.

(3) The closures have left families and seniors in north Winnipeg without any point of contact with front-line health-care services and will result in them having to travel 20 minutes or more to St. Boniface's—St. Boniface Hospital's emergency room or Health Sciences Centre's emergency room for emergency care.

(4) These cuts will place a heavy burden on many seniors who live in the North—who live in north Winnipeg and visit the emergency room frequently, especially for those who are unable to drive or are low income.

(5) The provincial government failed to consult with families and seniors in north Winnipeg regarding the closure of their emergency room or to consult with health officials and health-care workers at Seven Oaks to discuss how this closure would impact patient care in advance of the announcement.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to reverse the decision to close Seven Oaks General Hospital's emergency room so that families and seniors in north Winnipeg and the surrounding areas have timely access to quality health-care services.

Signed by Melanie Resus-Ronquillo, Alma Hernandez, Bernardo Hernandez and many, many other Manitobans.

**Madam Speaker:** Grievances?

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**

#### **House Business**

**Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader):** On House business, I just want to indicate to the House that we will be having royal assent on Interim Supply at 4:30 this afternoon.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced that at 4:30 this afternoon we will have Interim Supply—we will have royal assent on Interim Supply at 4:30.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Cullen:** Madam Speaker, would you call Bill 29.

### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

#### Bill 29—The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced that the House will consider Bill 29 this afternoon, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management).

Debate is open. *[interjection]* Oh—the honourable Government House Leader.

**Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader):** Since we've had a long debate on this bill through the reasoned amendment, and that it is clear a main theme from all the members of the opposition is that further consultations and discussions should take place on Bill 29 so that this important piece of life-and-death legislation can continue to committee and hear from all Manitobans who would like their voices heard, therefore, I move, seconded by the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade (Mr. Pedersen), that this question be now put.

#### *Motion presented.*

**Madam Speaker:** The motion is in order and the debate is open.

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** Well, it's my pleasure to rise and debate this motion. I think it's given us a good opportunity to begin, as the minister said, where many members on the opposition side have directed their comments, and that is with regards to the importance of consultation with First Nations.

And it's being done in a way, or it's being proposed in a way by the opposition caucus that is not just something that is the right thing to do, is an important thing to do, is, I would argue, an important part of reconciliation and the process by which we move forward through the process of truth and reconciliation in this country, but it is, in fact, a constitutionally protected right of indigenous peoples. And this is absolutely crucial to the discussion, and I think that's why, as the minister said, this is an important component that we need to discuss this afternoon.

Now, the consultation that we're talking about here is not the consultation that the government is saying that they've done. It's not the kind of consultation that starts and ends with a letter being

sent out to a First Nation or an informal conversation that happens with one First Nation over another, but, in fact, is, as I said, a constitutionally protected right of First Nations to be consulted under the constitution of this country.

And it's, in fact, this government who has said that this is a priority of theirs in other areas. They have conceded that this is something that needs to be done, and, in fact, you know, it was something that they talked about, you know, very proudly and very openly, in theory. However, when we get to the specifics of a bill like Bill 29, we see that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has failed to deliver on this proper duty-to-consult framework with First Nations people.

We know that it's absolutely crucial that the Premier must respect the rights of First Nations, of Metis and of Inuit peoples in this country, and, you know, the former minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade, who introduced this motion here this afternoon, in fact, promised that Manitoba would have a duty-to-consult framework by May 2017. And—but we know that not all ministers have delivered on that promise.

So this has created an enormous amount of insecurity for Manitobans, for business people in this province, for those trying to do trade and work within this province. And, ultimately, the most important and egregious part of this is the fact that it ignores, as I said, those rights of First Nations peoples that are not negotiable, they're not debatable, they're not something that we get to decide what that process looks like. It's something that's constitutionally protected and must be respected.

But we know that the government has moved ahead regardless. They've moved ahead and moved forward without adequate consultation, on a number of items. For instance, Madam Speaker, they opened up Pemmican Island to mining speculation; they cut ties with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation without consulting First Nations fishers; they shut down Grace Lake airport, which is an issue that has been raised in this House multiple times. They've closed rural EMS stations, which affects all Manitobans, but they have closed some that are directly affecting First Nations in this province.

So it's very clear that this would be an opportunity to have a true duty-to-consult framework in place, something that could be called upon in these situations to ensure that the constitutional obligations of the province are being met. You know,

it goes and on and on. The Premier (Mr. Pallister) fought with the federal government over important First Nations health issues, without even speaking to First Nations people.

We know that MKO Grand Chief Sheila North Wilson asked to speak with the Premier repeatedly, and yet her requests were denied. He—she goes on to say, he can't talk about indigenous people and how sick they are without talking to the indigenous people themselves to find out what's making them sick and see what the solutions are. And that was reported in CBC—on CBC in March, Madam Speaker.

\* (14:40)

We know that the former minister for Sustainable Development sent a letter to the people of Fisher River Cree Nation stating that, quote: They don't have a right to fish for economic purposes. And this was reported in the Express Weekly News on March 9th, 2017, Madam Speaker. That doesn't speak to a true willingness and obligation on the—on behalf of this government to consult with First Nations in a way that's meaningful. That speaks to a government that simply wants to impose its will on those individuals.

And, again, this isn't something—they do this across the board. There's no question about that. But when it's done with—for—in the context of First Nations and that nation-to-nation relationship, that is where this government falls well short of their duty to consult.

We know that, of course, the Premier himself, you know, he personally disrespected First Nations and Metis people personally in a number of ways. He described the issue of night hunting, as we know, as a race war, Madam Speaker. He described indigenous hunters as young indigenous men with criminal records. And then he refused to apologize and said there is nothing to apologize for.

Now, I am going to spend more time this afternoon talking about that specific point, but what I wanted to bring this—all of this context about the duty to consult back to is the fundamental point that the bill that's before this House, and the urgency with which this government wants to push this legislation through, fundamentally skips a part of the consultation process that will ultimately cause it to fail in practice.

And this is very important. And I think I spent enough time talking in my—

**An Honourable Member:** Me, too.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Well, you know, there may be an argument for that from the Minister for Finance, and I appreciate that. But he can look forward to a lot more speeches on this by myself and by my colleagues. But there—in my previous statement, I did spend some time talking about my own experience with hunting, with the importance that I place for myself and for my children on hunting safety.

So—and I only mention that because, in the context, that it is so important to me that any legislation that we bring forward on this issue is successful. We want it to be successful. We want it to improve hunting and safety around hunting in a safe and a sustainable way. That is the Manitoba that I'm raising my children in, and that is fundamental to what I think is important and to who I am.

But by bringing this bill forward in this manner—and, you know, to have the minister so flippantly say, well, yes, you know, let's move it on to committee, let's get to the next stage of this bill, without actually acknowledging the important points that have put on—been put on the record now by, I think, every single member of the opposition caucus. And every single member has come to this in an honest way, in a way that says, look, if you want this bill to be successful, why don't we start from scratch. Why don't we build this—not as a top-down, you know, political issue—why don't we build this from the bottom up and build it in a way that actually brings everybody on board, makes sure it's successful and, again, survives a court challenge, survives the obvious holes in this government's duty to consult that would be—would render this bill completely useless if it were to be brought forward?

So I think that's where this—members on this side of the House are coming from, but I—but it just—it worries me when it's so flippantly put that this should just move forward, this should be—well, you know what, our next batch of consultation will be by having committee hearings in this Legislature.

Now, you will not hear me denigrate the committee—public committee hearing process in this province, in this Legislature as part of the legislative process. I will not do that because I am so proud that that is a part of our system. That is an important, crucial part of how bills are disseminated to the public, information is shared, but, most importantly, how we as legislators hopefully can sit at that table, listen to some really good ideas and actually maybe

make some amendments or make some changes or, in some cases, back off of the legislation altogether.

So that's one venue. That is an important venue that we have, as legislators, to create that dialogue between us and the public.

However, to suggest that that, in and of itself, would satisfy the constitutionally protected duty to consult of this government is ludicrous and it would fall apart in an instant if this was brought forward in a court challenge.

So that is the concern that Manitobans have. That's the concern that this—members of this caucus have been bringing forward over and over and over again to this government, and yet they refuse to budge, they refuse to move and, again, this minister just flippantly says let's move it on, let's move it along, let's get this done and let's throw it out there to the mercy of the courts. I don't think that's the way that Manitobans want us to conduct our business. They want us to be in—to adhere to the constitution and to make sure that any legislation that we bring forward meets those requirements so that it is good legislation, it accomplishes what we want it to accomplish.

*Mr. Dennis Smook, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

So where I wanted to go back to, Mr. Speaker, was this idea of good ideas, you know, coming from any place in this House, and there's a lot of folks who have preached that mantra. They have said that that is something that they believe, and so I would hope that this would be an example of one of those times where members on this side of the House have brought forward a number of great suggestions, ideas about ways to really engage First Nations to have these issues ironed out before we get to the—to court challenges and conflict with others.

And I wanted to raise this because I think there's the—one of the best ideas that I've heard—and there were many. I don't want to say that there weren't many, but the one that I heard and I'm quite, quite—actually quite interested in was the idea of co-management that was spoken about by the Leader of the Opposition. And I mention this because, depending on how the business of the House goes, there is an opportunity for the International Legislators Forum to meet this year in the great state of Minnesota, and that would be happening very shortly. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look to you as somebody who I know is very active with that group. You've put in a lot of time as an organizer and

somebody who's supported and promoted the work of the international legislator—letters—legislators forum.

And as I heard the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) talk about this idea and the success that they've had in Minnesota with this program, it got me interested in bringing this issue down to the International Legislators Forum where, for the very first time, I think, we are going to have band councillors or representatives from their reservations in that state. Part of the American Indian nation will actually be partners in the International Legislators Forum, maybe not in an exact formal way as full partners but certainly as presenters, as those who are seated at the table with us as legislators. And to me that was something—and I know the Deputy Chair—Deputy Speaker was supportive of that idea and I know we spoke about this idea on—with other legislators from the participating states.

We thought this was an idea that made a lot of sense, to have those First Nations partners at the table with us so that we could hear their concerns, you know, a lot of concerns that maybe would be similar, I would imagine, and ideas that we can exchange. I also imagine there's going to be a lot of differences in the relationship, and maybe this is just me as a proud Canadian, as a proud Manitoban, you know, being—you know, thinking that we are doing a good job, but I think we in Canada are a lot further ahead in a lot of respects than our American counterparts.

That being said, I think by them presenting this idea of us sitting at the table together is a phenomenal first step and I look forward to this. And I'm excited, then, to—I—to not only learn more about what the member for Fort Rouge was talking about, but to actually sit down and talk with those individuals about what that co-management strategy looks like, because from what I understand, they have developed a system where First Nations aren't simply, you know, there as part of the system. They're not hunters in the same sense as we treat all hunters as stewards of the land and those who wish to protect and hunt in a sustainable way. As I said in my comments previously, I do believe that is the starting point for all or most hunters in Manitoba. There are bad apples out there, but I would say the vast, vast majority are there to follow the rules and hunt safely.

\* (14:50)

But instead of just treating them in that way or even treating them in the sense of the constitutional requirement for us to consult with First Nations, they've gone an actual step further and say look, you are stewards of this land; you have been for thousands of years; we trust your traditional knowledge; we trust your intent that for you this is an important issue to make sure your people are safe and that you can hunt and fish and trap alongside others as well.

And, you know, this is a great opportunity for us to learn from them about what that actually looks like in practice, and I'm absolutely excited that this is a step forward for us, that we have an opportunity to listen to them, to hear from them. As I said, depending on the business of the House and how things go, but I know whether it's myself that goes there, whether it's our esteemed Deputy Speaker who represents all of us in this Chamber down at that conference, which I'd be very happy to designate him as the representative. I know he represents us very well, so I'd be happy to let him do that. But I think to bring this issue forward, to ask how that is done, and then to bring that information back to his caucus and share that information and give that information to the minister and say this is a way forward. This is a way for us to meet those—that duty to consult, to be constitutional in our bill, to bring forward a law that will stand in Manitoba, that will be strong and will actually accomplish what every single member in this House has said is the most important thing, and that is to have safe hunting practices in this province.

But that is not the process that has been proposed to us here, and that is a real shame because I think, as I said, there are members on, I would venture to say, on all sides. We haven't heard from every member opposite yet. I do look forward to every single member standing up, putting 30 minutes on the record about how important this bill is to them and giving those good ideas and respecting those good ideas and moving forward on those good ideas.

Has that happened in the House? No, and instead of letting that process go forward, instead of allowing members to bring those ideas forward—we had a great debate on the member's amendment, reasoned and reasonable amendment brought forward last week, and yet just as the debate begins, just as we start to bring those ideas forward on this bill the House leader has the—how do I put this—the House leader comes forward and says no; I want to shut down debate. I want to stop the—those—that flow of ideas and I will not listen to the members of this

House and allow them to put their words on the record.

Now, that may fly in his caucus. You know, I did not see one single person on this side opposite say, whoa, whoa, whoa, no. Let's stop that House leader. We didn't agree to that. I would assume this went to their caucus. They sat around that table of theirs and they said this is what's going to happen. We're shutting down your voices today. We're shutting down debate. We don't want to hear from members. You know, maybe even somebody at the table put up their hand and said but, but I think we heard some good ideas from the side opposite. No, the House leader said. Don't listen to those ideas. Don't listen to the advice of members opposite.

You know, and then maybe there was another member—I think I heard a member in the back row here this afternoon say, well, I raised my hand and I wanted to put some words on the record this afternoon. The House leader said, nope; you are not allowed to speak. We are moving this forward. We're jamming it forward despite the good points that have been put on the record by the members opposite, despite the good advice that we've gotten, despite the fact that this bill actually is going forward in a way that doesn't meet its constitutional obligations. They said no; we're shutting down debate. Democracy is done; we will not entertain any more speaking from the members on the government side.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I mean, this is a real shame because when I—for the few members that did speak to the reasoned amendment, I heard, again, a genuine concern. I heard the member for—one of the members come forward and say, you know what, I'm speaking—he said, I'm speaking for my constituents; I'm speaking for the people of my constituency that want a true resolution to this issue and want true safe hunting to come forward in Manitoba for all peoples. And I respected that, and I said that at the time. I respected that.

I respected when he put on the record and he said the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew), the Leader of the Opposition, had travelled the province, had talked to chiefs, had talked to councillors, had talked to reeves, had talked to mayors, had been all across this beautiful province talking to people about this issue, learning from them, gathering information, gathering good ways that we can work together. That's what the member said. He put those words on the record. And when he did so, I acknowledged those to say that he was right to bring those

forward as a member representing his constituency. I appreciated that and I learned from that and I—you know, as I said, I was willing to acknowledge that.

This isn't—doesn't have to be a partisan place all the time, and when, you know, somebody brings forward something that I think is truthful and is honest and real, I think it's worth acknowledging.

So he did that. He brought that forward.

And I—you know, I can't say I remember every single speech that was given. You know, I'm—I wait for every speech that's still to come. But instead of having that opportunity, instead of the leader or the minister of—the House leader—my apologies, Mr. Speaker—instead of the House leader saying, yes, let's bring this bill for debate, let's hear from every member, let's make sure that every single member puts 30 minutes on the record, let's hear from every single member that fills that time and tells them all about their experiences hunting, how important they think this is, how important it is for their family, for their relatives, for the future of this province—well, that's not going to happen if this House leader has his way. Because he's, in fact, shutting down the democratic process. He has stopped us from speaking.

Now, I may be wrong in the assumption that every member opposite wants to speak to this bill. Maybe they do—maybe they are happy with just jamming it through—

**An Honourable Member:** They all want to speak.

**Mr. Wiebe:** —and getting through. Well, you know, the—I—the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) is being, I guess, optimistic in saying that this is a priority. And when it was brought up at their caucus table and they said, but, Mr. House Leader, we want to speak, I would imagine it was probably the Premier (Mr. Pallister) who said, no, it's not happening, you're not speaking.

But I do know, because I've had a chance to canvass here my members—*[interjection]*

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** Order.

**Mr. Wiebe:** —that are in the Chamber, because I thought, well, maybe I'm wrong, maybe everyone on our side doesn't want to speak to it. So we got a list. Let's see. The member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine) has indicated that she is excited to speak to this particular bill. The member for Elmwood has indicated that he wants to speak to the bill. The

member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin) is, I know, very excited to speak to this. I know that the member for—

**An Honourable Member:** Got a short list there, Matt.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Well, you know, the—I'm just working through this.

I think every single member on this side of the House wants to speak to this particular bill: the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum), the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino), the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), the member for Logan (Ms. Marcelino), the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith), the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Lindsey). These are members who, because this House leader has—

**An Honourable Member:** The member for Maples.

**An Honourable Member:** What about Maples?

**Mr. Wiebe:** —my apologies—because this House leader isn't allowing for debate, who are saying, we want to discuss this; we want our time in the Legislature to discuss how important this bill is to us. And are they going to get their chance? If it's up to this House leader, apparently they won't get their chance.

\* (15:00)

And that is undemocratic. What are we here for but to debate the legislation that's put before us? And, instead, we're debating whether it should be debated. That is a new level of anti-democratic action on behalf of this government, and I call out the government for trying to pull that here this afternoon.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to return to the importance of this legislation, the importance of this issue and the unfortunate way that we begin and end these conversations in this House, the Premier has said many, many times that tone is set at the top, that he intends to lead by example, that it is him, he is in charge, no one else has a say; it's him and him only and his government that steers his ship.

And when the Premier, as leader of this province, as leader as—of his caucus, fine; he has absolute control. But, you know what? He is the leader of this province. That means he is the leader for every single Manitoban, and for him to begin the conversation on issues such as this, on bills that are fundamental to the relationship that we have with indigenous people, to begin that conversation by

using terms like race war, about criminalizing and trying to paint all young indigenous men and people in a certain way, just absolutely takes all of the oxygen out of the conversation. It totally sets us back. It's 10 steps backwards before we even get that first step forwards. And, you know, that just—that hurts because I think there are so many Manitobans—you know, there's a—it's a long journey, there's a lot of people who need to—still have a lot of learning to do. I include myself very much in that category, Mr. Speaker. I have a lot to learn, and I hope that I can learn how to better, you know, understand indigenous culture and understand our relationship with indigenous people and to respect all Manitobans, and I intend to take that journey. I know so many other Manitobans who are doing that.

We stood today just this morning, myself and colleagues from the NDP caucus, at City Hall to sign the City of Winnipeg Indigenous Accord, and it was a powerful moment for myself. It was a further way that we could show our support for the path on—of truth and reconciliation in our city and in our province. I was proud to do that as the member for Concordia, and I hope it's small steps like that, small actions by each individual member, that will show that, in fact, we do not support the Premier's words, we do not support that kind of language that sets us in conflict and that if we truly do want a better province for our children in terms of their safety and security and sustainability, in terms of their participation in hunting in this province, we cannot stoop to that level, we can't start with that level of conflict. We have to start with a true partnership. This minister knows that simply moving this bill through and forcing it through the legislative process does not meet those obligations under his obligation to duty—for duty to consult with First Nations.

And so I would hope that he stands up, he puts some words on the record that maybe he was wrong to bring this forward, that he will allow every single member of this Legislature to stand up, to stand behind a true partnership with First Nations people and to have a true path forward that protects all Manitobans. I know we want to do that, Mr. Speaker. I hope they will as well.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Just a few comments on this. I note that in his motion, which we are debating, that the Government House Leader (Mr. Cullen) has suggested that—correctly—that one of the things that was deemed important was having additional consultations and discussions over the summer. The way to do that is to not pass it through

to committee, but rather to make sure that those discussions are undertaken and that peoples' views are adequately considered. It is, sadly, something of a pattern that this government has got into, to introduce measures without being able to look at and consult with people who are knowledgeable in the area.

I would give you an example. The government is—has tabled a report from KPMG which the government is considering cutting personal audiology equipment, specifically children's hearing aids, bone-anchored hearing implant processors and FM transmitters. The problem is that the government has not adequately talked to people in the field, people who are knowledgeable about the impacts of what this would mean. They have not considered what the cost-benefit analysis would be, or from what we can tell undertaken any cost-benefit analysis. All they have said is, you know, how does Manitoba compare to other jurisdictions? Other jurisdictions could easily have made much poorer decisions than Manitoba in implementing coverage in these areas. So that's a very poor choice of reason in terms of making a decision to cut a program. You should surely do the analysis, you should surely do the consultation and you should surely do the cost-benefit analysis.

And, Mr. Speaker, in the case of this legislation that we're looking at, you know, we believe that there should be additional consultation. We've heard this from many people in the North. The government says it has consulted all the chiefs in Manitoba, but from what we hear, many feel that they were not adequately consulted and that there is need for some additional discussion with regard to some of the items in this bill, and as I said, the government is moving not just in this area—and it's relevant to this debate—the government is moving not just in this area, it is moving in a whole lot of other areas without adequately talking to people who are experts in the field, people who are going to be affected.

There is an orthopedic shoes for children subsidy program that the government has—with the KPMG recommendations—looking to cancel the subsidy for. But there hasn't been adequate discussion and consultation with people in the area who'd be affected, with people who are receiving that help with their orthopedic shoes currently, and the result, Mr. Speaker, is, you know, poor decisions. And that's exactly what we're talking about here, that it is really important to be able to discuss and to have that

dialogue which is so necessary with people who are going to be affected by this.

We all know that the safety considerations are very important. We want to make sure that the measures here will adequately deal with those safety considerations. We want to make sure that people who are knowledgeable and involved in this area are actually consulted with. That's what we should be doing this summer rather than immediately passing this bill at second reading.

I can go on and on. The KPMG report is another example, cutting eyeglasses for seniors. This is a really essential program for seniors, and yet the government is going to cut this without actually having talked to seniors, talked to people in the area, talked about the cost-benefit analysis of what's the impact of having seniors without eyeglasses.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a situation which would likely be—lead to more falls by seniors so that the cost-benefit analysis would, on a preliminary estimate, suggest that it would be much higher costs.

\*(15:10)

And so that the—so that, you know, it's important to know, if you're going to cut something, you may end up with bigger costs elsewhere. And this would be an example. And we want to make sure that we don't end up with a bill which is going to have—address some areas but leave safety loopholes in other areas which are not addressed.

So I can mention other things: orthotics subsidy programs, telecommunications subsidy programs—all in the KPMG report, all being cut without considering the views of people who are affected, without considering the views of experts in the field, without doing a cost-benefit analysis. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not the way that we should be proceeding. We should make sure that we have, you know, good consultation, that we've looked very carefully at these issues, we've made sure that we have respected properly the chiefs and others in this area so that what we're going to proceed with is going to be a piece of legislation which is widely and broadly supported, will be respected and will be effective.

So, you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't need to say a lot more than that, but I did want to bring those points to the record, that the importance of having the summer to be able to look carefully at this important piece of legislation and to make sure

that it's properly considered, you know, is a very reasonable proposition, and it can end up with a better approach, a better management of costs, better results in terms of safety and people supporting the legislation and better overall situation for people in Manitoba.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the proper approach here is not—*[interjection]*

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** Order. It's—

**Mr. Gerrard:** —to support this resolution but to proceed with further consultations over the summer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** Before I recognize the next speaker, it's getting a little loud in here, and it's a little difficult for me to hear the speaker, so if you would please tone it down or keep your conversations to the back of the room. Thank you.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** So I just want to—good afternoon; how are you? I'm pleased to put a couple of words on the record.

I do just want to actually continue the line of thought and words from the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe). I think that that is the gist of or the salient point of us on this side of the House, alongside our colleague brother from River Heights getting up in opposition to the motion that was just brought forward.

I think it is imperative that everybody has an opportunity to speak to Bill 29, and I know that on this side of the House each and every one of our members bring a different level of expertise or knowledge or spirit or compassion or whatever it is to this issue embedded in Bill 29 alongside, actually, our Liberal members. And, in fact, everybody in this House, I would suggest, if they took the time to stand up in the House and use their 30 minutes to speak to the bill, we'd get many different perspectives.

And I would suggest to you, Deputy Speaker, that, as has been suggested here on this side of the House before, that there seems to be an attempt to, you know, I don't know if it's muzzle or, you know, ensure that members opposite don't really speak to these government motions, when I would submit that many members on the opposite side actually probably have some fundamental issues with this as well, particularly those members in which in their constituencies they have First Nation communities. Because certainly those First Nation communities,

I'm—and that leadership, chief and council, hunters, elders, I'm sure that they have reached out to members opposite to outline some of the concerns that they have in respect of Bill 29.

So it would be good to stand in this House and to hear from every single member in this House. It is a privilege to be sitting in this House. It's not something that I take lightly. It's not something that members opposite—or members on this side of the House take lightly, and we do take our responsibilities as MLAs very seriously. And so we're glad to stand up to talk to the Government House Leader's (Mr. Cullen) motion.

I do want to talk a bit about, actually, each of my colleagues. Because I—like I said, the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe), you know, was starting to but he only had five minutes left. He wanted, you know, unlimited speaking time, but we still have that as well. But I do want to kind of follow up on some of the points that the member for Concordia was bringing up.

And I'll begin with the member for Concordia. So I will talk about, you know, the level of—you know, the member for Concordia talked about hunting and going into the bush with his own children. And so we know that this bill is important in the sense that, you know, that is in many respects for many families a right of passage, right? It is a right of passage that parents teach their children—not everybody, obviously. I never taught my children that. I don't know how to do that. But, certainly, I think it's something to take into consideration, and I do want to honour the member for Concordia for bringing up his children and talking about and sharing with this House how this bill would impact him or how he sees it, and particularly in the role as a father. And I know we just celebrated Father's Day and I know that he had a great Father's Day, and so, belated happy Father's Day.

But I would suggest to you as well that the member for Concordia brings to this House a level of humility and, you know, he has the ability to lighten up things. So where the debate on 29, you know, sometimes is very difficult, and I think that, you know, both sides sometimes get very passionate about it. You know, one side more than the other sometimes kind of goes a little lower than we would have liked, but, you know, the member for Concordia always kind of brings us back within his humility and his gentle touch and his humour,

actually. So he's able to lighten the mood in respect of 29.

But I do want to just acknowledge the member for Concordia and what he brings to this debate—and, really, every other debate in the House as we go along, as we execute our—again, I know I say it all the time, but our sacred duties as MLAs in this House. It's not a right for us to be here; it's an absolute privilege, and for some of us it's taken many, many generations to be able to sit in this Chamber.

And so I thank the member for Concordia for what he brings to the debate, and I'm proud to say and I'm glad to say that we got to hear his 30 minutes on the motion. I'm not sure if the member has spoken to Bill 29, but I—no, he still hasn't spoken to Bill 29. So I look forward to his 30 minutes on 29, as well, which, again, is very important. That's what the electorate put us in here for is to speak to these government motions and government bills, and so I look forward to his 30 minutes.

I do want to, you know, make a little comment in respect of the member for Minto (Mr. Swan). The member for Minto is—I'm blessed to be able to work with him as our caucus whip, and the level of expertise, both legal expertise—obviously, as you know, Deputy Speaker, he is a trained a lawyer—but also the expertise that he brings in the House and in this building as a whole. And so, certainly, I think that when the member for Minto spoke to our reasoned motion, you know, he outlined some pretty substantial and critical court cases in which the courts decided and rendered decisions in respect of consultation and the need for consultation in First Nation communities on anything that impacts on First Nations communities. So, certainly, the member for Minto brings that reasoned, measured, legal argument to Bill 29.

I'm not sure if he's spoken on the actual bill or if he's only spoken on the motion. However, if he hasn't spoken to the bill, I continue to also say that I look forward to his 30 minutes as is his privilege and his right to be able to stand in this House and to talk about it.

\*(15:20)

So he certainly does bring that legal perspective on the impacts of 29, but also he certainly brings that level of expertise in the need to consult thoroughly, robustly and comprehensively with indigenous communities and peoples here in Manitoba. I don't

think that anyone, and I would hope that, you know, there wouldn't be any members in this House that would, you know, argue against a robust, comprehensive regime or strategy with First Nation communities, particularly as we, you know, put into practice reconciliation.

Certainly, I think that those are the antithesis to one another, if we were to stand in this House and argue that consultation is not really that important, or what we deem to be consultation, which is sending letters out to chief and council, and there's been no response but there's no follow-up or, you know, a couple of meetings—I would suggest that, you know, I would hope that in the era of reconciliation that people would understand in this House that that's not sufficient. It's not robust. It's not comprehensive.

And certainly, in 2018, we need to go beyond that and to engage in consultation in a respectful, thorough manner with First Nation communities, indigenous communities. And I think that that's what the member—or I know that's what the member for Minto (Mr. Swan) attempted to do when he spoke to our reasoned motion. And, you know, I say *miigwech* to the mentor—member for Minto for everything that I've learned from him, and I'm sure that all of our caucus, you know—it is a blessing to be able to work with him as well and he does give us those insights that maybe we would not have thought about or made those connections because he is, you know, trained legally.

I do want to also mention my colleague from Point Douglas. As many people know, obviously the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) and I—and myself have been very close. We've been in each other's lives for about 10 years, since her sister Claudette Osborne went missing. And I don't think it should be lost on anybody in the House that when the by-election for Point Douglas occurred last summer, Bernadette—the member for Point Douglas became only the 60th woman ever elected in the Manitoba Legislature and became, you know, the fourth indigenous woman elected in the House. I could be wrong on that. But certainly, the level of community engagement that the member for Point Douglas brings to our caucus and in her comments in the House warrant, you know, speaking up in opposition to the Government House Leader's (Mr. Cullen) motion today. It's important that the member for Point Douglas has an opportunity to speak to Bill 29 and to bring those perspectives and those levels of expertise and conversations and insights that she has, as an indigenous woman, you

know, living in the city but also going back and forth to and from our communities. And so I honour her for her voice that she brings not only to our caucus but to the House as well.

I will just say as well, I think it's important, since I did mention that she is only, you know, one of 60 women ever elected to the Manitoba Legislature, and it is a statistic that I always talk about when I'm asked to come and speak about being an indigenous woman or just a woman in politics. You know, in our history in this building, there's been upwards of 834 men—34 or 35—men elected to this House, and only 60 women, and so certainly we can unpack that and, you know, try to understand it within the confines or the realms within patriarchy and typically how politics have—has been the realm of men.

And so I do want to put it on the record, you know, to honour each and every one of those 60 women that have been elected. It's certainly something to be proud of. However, having said that, it's certainly a reflection that we have to go further in this House within our own parties to ensure that we have equitable representation of women in this House, because the fact of the matter is that women make up, obviously, quite obviously, you know, 50 per cent of the population of Manitoba and Canada and across the globe. And if we—in my—I would submit to the House that if we don't have equitable representation of women we miss out on just a huge amount of expertise and wisdom and commitment and dedication and loyalty to the jobs that we do as women, and so, you know, I'm looking forward to 29. I don't think the member for Point Douglas has spoken. She hasn't spoken to Bill 29 so I am looking forward to hearing her comments on the bill.

So it's important that, again, we talk in respect of, you know, the motion that the Government House Leader just brought forward and how it's really the antithesis to democracy when we're not going to allow other folks to be able to bring their comments forward.

I want to say a couple of words on the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) who, certainly, I would suggest to the House, has a level of expertise on the environment that I know that I have learned so much and I—

**An Honourable Member:** Yes, indeed.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Yes, the member for Wolseley has an incredible breadth of information and knowledge

and expertise and commitment in respect of the environment. And every day in our caucus, you know, when we are contemplating these and pathing the consequences of these different bills Rob—or the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) is always at the forefront of ensuring that we understand all of the interconnectivity of what's being presented by the government. And, certainly, I learned a lot from the member for Wolseley, and I would suggest that he has a lot to say on 29 as well, and I would further say and I would suggest to the House that to deny the member for Wolseley his 30 minutes in this House would be actually a shame. It would be a shame that we wouldn't have the wise words and the expertise of the member for Wolseley.

And I think that it's important to put on the record as well that the member for Wolseley, when he speaks in the House, doesn't only speak from just that knowledge that he has or that, you know, expertise that he has. He always, if you listen to his speeches in the House, he always draws in the community that he works with, and so he'll talk about the organizations that he works with and he'll talk about—and he'll bring those organizations' voices to the House. It's not only what the member for Wolseley thinks. He will talk about the myriad of different stakeholders and what those stakeholders have told him in a particular bill.

And so, you know, I think to shut down any kind of debate where the member for Wolseley isn't given his 30 minutes to talk on Bill 29 would be tragic. And I would suggest to you, Deputy Speaker, that I imagine that everybody in the House probably wants to hear more than anybody the member for Wolseley talk about Bill 29. I know that members opposite, you know, enjoy when the member gets up, and I think everybody in the House learns something when the member for Wolseley gets up and talks about the environment, and I think that the member for—or I know the member for Wolseley in this House is actually the voice for our Mother Earth, for our earth in the sense that he is so dedicated to protecting our Mother Earth that he, in every way, shape and form tries to bring those very serious and critical and timely issues to the House. And I would suggest to the House to not have that expertise or that wisdom, again, would be—it certainly wouldn't serve any of us no matter what side of the House we sit on. It wouldn't serve any of us any good not to have the member for Wolseley's, you know, 30 minutes on the record.

\* (15:30)

I want to talk about, as well—so I look forward to the member for Wolseley's 30 minutes. So I'm looking forward to his 30 minutes and—on the Bill 29. I do want to talk a couple of minutes about the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin) and the very unique expertise and experience that the member for The Pas brings to this House. Again, you know, going back to the number of women that have been elected in this House, everybody should know that the member for The Pas is the first First Nation woman, the first indigenous woman, ever elected to the Manitoba Legislature. And I think that that is, in many respects, very poetic in the sense that her father sat in this room. And I had many meetings with her father when he was the minister for indigenous and northern affairs, or Aboriginal and Northern Affairs as it was called, and found her father to be very humble, very kind, would sit and listen when we—for a variety of different issues.

I remember coming to meet with the member for The Pas' father when I was working as an environmental researcher for my reserve, Sagleeng First Nation, and/or as well as the director of justice for Southern Chiefs' Organization and every time that I had the opportunity to meet with the member for The Pas' father, you always felt like you were actually being listened to.

And so we know that the member for The Pas' father dedicated his life to this building and sat in this Chamber with respect and humility and kindness and compassion. And so I think that it is fitting that the first indigenous woman ever elected in this House was his daughter—is his daughter. And she brings a very unique perspective as well, considering that she is from the North, has grown up in the North, has grown up both on and off reserve and has the—that history of growing up, actually seeing this House in a variety of different ways.

And we know that the member for The Pas, you know, is very committed to her constituencies and the people of her constituencies, which include folks that hunt and indigenous hunters and all kinds of folks that participate in that activity, and so I look forward to hearing the member for The Pas' comments and expertise based on those constituents and those stakeholders that she works with.

And also I look forward to hearing her words in respect of growing up under her father and what, you know, she saw when he was Aboriginal and Northern Affairs minister because I suspect that a lot of these discussions may have come up—I'm not sure, but I do

look forward to hearing those words and having those words as a part of our official record in this House, and those are important words to have in Hansard for—from now until time immemorial so that we know what was the debate on Bill 29.

And so I look forward to hearing her speak and so I would suggest to you, deputy House Speaker, that if we don't, again, it is really in contravention of our democratic process to kind of shut down debate and not allow members on this side and members on that side, again, I encourage members on that side to get up and utilize their 30 minutes to speak to this bill and, you know, yea or nay the bill, like—I think that they'll be okay if they also put their concerns on the record of their constituents, which, again, I would suggest to you include First Nation communities that we know have issues with Bill 29, so I would encourage them to get up as well.

I do want to just take a moment again, and again, all of this, deputy House Speaker, is about ensuring that members on this side of the House utilize their democratic rights to speak to whatever bills or motions come from the government.

And so, today, we are talking on the government's motion to just call a question on this bill, but it is important that we put on the record the importance of everybody on this side of the House to be able to speak to that. So I do want to just point out the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) and the expertise that the member for Tyndall Park brings to this House, this Chamber. Certainly, we know that he is also legally trained, and so brings a lot of good information in dissecting these bills as well and the impacts that they have, because a lot of this work is 'unpacting' how these bills are actually going to—these new laws once they're enforced, how they're actually going to impact on the lives of Manitobans and what that looks like.

And so the member for Tyndall Park also is a great contributor in that way, ensuring that—you know, sometimes if we miss something he brings that up. He is always one to bring a little bit of laughs and certainly the member for Tyndall Park always makes sure that we are well fed in caucus. So I appreciate that, that he cares that we are fed, because sometimes I'm sure that, you know, a lot of us go without eating and so he tries to make sure—and he always brings us, you know, little things and little treats. So I appreciate that and I just want to say miigwech to the member for Tyndall Park and that I

look forward to his 30 minutes on speaking to Bill 30 as well.

And, certainly, I want to just put a couple words on the record in respect to the member of Logan, again, keeping in line—keeping in the theme of women that have gotten elected. You know, often when I'm asked to go speak about being elected and a woman in politics, so the two things that I always note is the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin), that she goes down in history as the first indigenous woman ever elected.

And the second thing that I always talk about is the member for Logan (Ms. Marcelino) and how the member for Logan is the first woman of colour ever elected to the Manitoba Legislature. And while sometimes I think that that is downplayed, that accomplishment and that historical importance is downplayed, to me it situates and it entrenches space for women of colour and indigenous women in this Chamber. And so it's not lost on me, the amount of courage and work that it would take for the member for Logan to get elected, to make that decision, to get elected and to come in this Chamber day after day and to execute her duties as the member for Logan. And so I just want to say miigwech to the member for Logan and just officially recognize you, once again, as the first woman of colour, which I think is quite extraordinary. And, certainly, I look forward to her 30 minutes on Bill 30 as well, because certainly from a woman of colour's perspective she would have different experiences as well and those experiences are very—

**Some Honourable Members:** Twenty-nine.

**Ms. Fontaine:** What did I say? Did I? Oh, sorry. Bill 29. I apologize. Have I been saying that the whole time? Are you serious?

**An Honourable Member:** Yes. All good.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Sorry. Let me officially put it—I thought I was saying Bill 29. I apologize.

So, certainly, I think that that is so important and I think—I would suggest to the House that, you know, if we didn't hear from the member for The Pas, we didn't hear from the member for Tyndall Park and we didn't hear from the member for Logan, that would not bode well for all of us here in the House because that is one of the reasons why we get elected is to be able to represent our constituents and our stakeholders.

And so, finally, but not least, I would like to say just a couple of words about the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), who, obviously—I know that everybody in this House—and if you don't, you know, the member for Elmwood is like a walking encyclopedia and he is—his breadth of knowledge historically on political processes not only in this House, but also on Parliament in Ottawa is absolutely fascinating. The things that he talks about and he—the member for Elmwood will remember dates from back in 1983 we did this, A, B, C and—

**An Honourable Member:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order.

### Point of Order

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** The member for Assiniboia, on a point of order.

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia):** I don't know what an encyclopedia is, but I'm pretty sure the member from Elmwood is not an encyclopedia. Though, if he was it might be a 'centipedia', but not an encyclopedia, and I would hope that if the member from Elmwood does have any knowledge on what an—maybe from his generation, they had encyclopedias, certainly not in the House leader or my time. *[interjection]* Well, you're a history student. The House leader has far more education.

\* (15:40)

So I just want to make this point and—to both—I hope encyclopedias haven't been insulted, nor the member from Elmwood in this intervention.

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** I'd like to let the—oh, member from St. Johns, on the point of order. You wanted to speak on it, or?

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader):** Sure.

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** Or should I just do it—the member for St. Johns.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Let me just qualify: that was meant one hundred thousand per cent to be a compliment to the member for Elmwood because he—honestly, it is fascinating just sitting down to the member for Elmwood and listening to him talk about the facts that he knows. And so it was meant as, absolutely, as a compliment.

And I used encyclopedias and—but I don't know if I'm a lot older than the member, but I did use them as well. Miigwech.

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** To the member from Assiniboia on his point of order, it is not a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts. So there is no point of order.

\* \* \*

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** The member for St. Johns may continue with her speech.

**Ms. Fontaine:** So, again, just to get back to the member for Elmwood. It would be a shame, and I know—I have to imagine that everybody in this House, when the member for Elmwood gets up, likes listening to the member for Elmwood because you always learn something. You always learn something about this House and backstories and things about these bills and when this happened and when the House was this and that. So it certainly is fascinating.

And I would suggest to you, deputy House Speaker, to be able to, you know, disallow the member for Elmwood to actually speak on—for 30 minutes on Bill 29 would be, again, tragic for this House. We all have the opportunity to learn more than we know because I would suggest to you that each and every one of us have a lifetime of learning to do. And, certainly, I'm blessed to be able to work with the member for Elmwood and listen to his stories. And so I really look forward to his 30 minutes in this House in respect of Bill 29 and the level of expertise, and certainly that historical, chronological expertise, as well, that he brings to this House. That I would suggest to every member, you know, invite the member for Elmwood out to lunch. Go out for lunch, listen to the member for Elmwood and you will learn a whole bunch of stuff.

So, all of that to say, deputy House Speaker, while I appreciate that the Government House Leader (Mr. Cullen) wants to call question on the bill, we simply cannot support that. And we have to stand with the people of Manitoba, and certainly we have to stand with the folks that are impacted by Bill 29. And, most importantly, I would suggest to you, deputy House Speaker, we have to stand in principle against what is not a thorough consultation on Bill 29 in respect of indigenous peoples' sovereignty and our right as indigenous peoples to self-determining self-governance.

And so we will certainly not be supporting the government's motion. I would say, you know, A for trying. But I would suggest to you, on this side of the House, each and every member that we have on this side of the House brings a level of expertise and

commitment and compassion and passion and dedication to their jobs as MLA, and they want to be able to, and they have the right to speak for 30 minutes in respect of Bill 29 and bring forward their comments on behalf of all of their constituents.

So I say miigwech for allowing me to have a couple of words just on speaking to the government's motion. I don't believe that I've spoken to Bill 29, so I am also looking forward to talking to Bill 29, particularly on how it impacts on my First Nation community in Sagkeeng First Nation.

I say miigwech. Thank you.

**Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook):** Yes, I would like to address this motion. Do I have to ask for leave? No? Okay.

So, you know, I would really like the chance to speak to the bill because it directly affects me and it affects generations to come in my riding. It's quite disheartening that this bill is now trying to be forcibly pushed through without input, and it just goes to speak to the lack of consultation in respect to my people.

Some of the words that the ministers have used are completely repulsive, incorrect, they encourage racism and misinformation. The words that they have put on record in this House and in media should not be tolerated nor accepted. Not only these ministers, but a few have attempted to shame me or caution me about my statements about those legal forces such as the COs, the Winnipeg city police, for example, in this House. But my statements speak truths about what my people face and the issues that many northern residents face.

You know, we should not be shamed, and so I will not use caution in sharing these stories because these stories need to be heard, especially when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) says undignified comments about young indigenous men. Maybe the members across don't know of the widely publicized case when COs with—along with the RCs—with the backing of RCs, marched into the home of a First Nations person and literally went into that person's freezer and took the meat that was harvested. You know, this First Nation member was a chief of his First Nation, and that shows how badly we're treated, and we're still treated like that today.

It—you know, it may make these ministers uncomfortable or offended when I speak about the truth of their—how their departments are mismanaged, but they're going to have to get over

that because there's something to—there's merit into these stories, and so I will not stop sharing my people's stories, nor will I stop holding this government to account. This bulldozing of this bill cannot happen.

The only way to make change is by accepting what's going on and then doing something different. We can't possibly reconcile if the Tories continue to deny that there's a problem. We can't move forward if they refuse to work with others. Case in point: we keep saying that there hasn't been proper consultation, and now they're trying to bulldoze this bill through. You know, we can't move forward. Our caucus tells this government daily how they can make positive change, but they can't even do that simplest piece, which is to listen.

Does this new government really believe that the previous government provided welcoming spaces for us to trust in them enough to share our stories? The previous NDP did not. Rather, they did exactly what this PC government is doing right now. They shamed us without hearing us out. It's what they did then and it's what the PCs are doing to me and my sister colleagues today.

The PCs shamed me for stating a fact about COs. They stated I cast aspersions on a group of people. Then why haven't the majority of the PCs shamed their own member, the Premier, when he said, and I quote the Premier, young, indigenous men, a preponderance of them are offenders with criminal records, are going off shooting guns in the middle of the night? Shaming me and not shaming the minister begs the question, are they perhaps shaming me because I am an indigenous woman?

\* (15:50)

And, you know, the member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine) may argue this point, but I'm the second indigenous female ever to be elected here, and I only say that because I accepted—had my nomination papers completed. And we did try to recruit Nahanni—oops, sorry. But that's where we stand today in that.

So shaming me—are they—do they feel that they have that right, to shame me and not him because he is a Caucasian male and therefore they—doesn't have that? What is the difference?

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** I would like to remind the member to make sure she's using the title or the constituent who is—she's referring to.

**Ms. Klassen:** Are they shaming me because I am an indigenous woman and not shaming the member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Pallister) because he is a Caucasian male? We have to ask that question. That's where we are today—in today's society, and that's what we're trying to call upon to correct. Naming it, and making sure that change happens when we do name it.

The minister did say off-record that she would look into certain cases that I shared with her. You know, there was an incident where a hunter was unfairly charged. But maybe her tune has changed in light of recent events, as she doesn't seem to recall the conversation that took place in its totality. So I'll remind her, as she wanted specifics. But now that I've asked that person to bring it forward to her as she requested, they can't because it's now a matter before the courts.

The minister has the resources to review files and to find out the facts for herself. Will she really find notes in which the CO fully admits to not following proper procedure and protocol? I'm positive that she won't, and her only recourse now is to actually create a space for our hunters to come forth. But again, there is—that trust is—has been completely obliterated. Our hunters do not trust in this government.

You know, they're pushing forward this bill without adequate proper consultation. You know, this minister would not have been so surprised by the backlash, first of all. She would not have been so astonished at my statement during that time in question period. She would have already heard those unjust incidences way before in opposition and now, especially, in government. It is clear she has not. The PCs are not a trusted confidant to the indigenous people of this province.

It is also clear that she has not created a safe place as well. Indeed, in her role as Minister for the Status of Women, she has failed her colleagues on this side of the House due to petty partisan politics. She has publicly demonstrated that she will solely be the judge and jury, without giving a space for the other person to be heard.

First Nations people have always had a special relationship with nature and what the land provides. This is based on needs and cultural values extending back thousands of years. These rights have been law before any of us got here and will be after we leave. Our elders taught us to live harmoniously with the world around us, never taking too much or too little to survive.

When we gathered plants, we did so with care and respect, ensuring that more would grow in the following years. When we hunted, we always remembered to honour the sacrifice of any animal hunted. My people have always believed in balance. Our natural world is bountiful, but it's equally fragile. We always viewed ourselves as caretakers of the—our world.

Ensuring we follow the words of our elders when hunting is crucial. Hunting by night was but one of my—many traditions of my people, one of the ways we survived and lived in this region. Now this tradition is under attack.

It's been obvious over the past two years that this government doesn't use data or facts to draft policy and legislation, so it's important that someone in this Chamber does so. I'd like to think that this government understands that 17 per cent of Manitoba's entire population is indigenous. Forty per cent live here right in the city, making that only about 3.5 per cent of Manitoba's indigenous populations living in our rural areas. So the assertion that these issues are caused by one tiny segment of the population who—and I will quote the Premier's disparaging words yet again—young, indigenous men, a preponderance of them are offenders with criminal records, are going off shooting guns in the middle of the light—night—is—it's ludicrous, racist and ignorant and has even been dispelled by conservation officer Shaun Bobier, who told CBC News, and I quote, it's everybody, it's all different segments, whether you have a record, don't have a record, go to church on Sunday, doesn't matter, he said.

The Premier's choice of words only exists to divide us and hurt the relationship that has been built up between indigenous and non-indigenous people. To insinuate that we alone are responsible for issues regarding wildlife population is extremely misleading and only supports negative views of indigenous people.

It is clear that big game faces ebbs and flows in quantity through the province at certain cycles of life. Indigenous people know why this happens. It is taught in our legends and in our stories. I'm sure if the minister did truly consult with our elders, they would have shared it with her. So when she doesn't make reference to it—indeed, when any PC members don't reference it, it only serves to reflect that they have not done their due diligence. They have not yet—they have not done a proper job of consulting our indigenous people.

I am reminded again of the Sayisi Dene, people who were forcibly removed from their homelands by government. A misunderstanding of their traditional hunting practices and how they lived their lives was used to justify their forced relocation. That relocation forced our 'sayisene'—our Sayisi Dene to survive by eating from Churchill's garbage dump. Let me repeat that: a misunderstanding of the Sayisi Dene's traditional lifestyle and how they lived their lives forced their relocation to Churchill and forced them to survive by eating from Churchill's garbage dump. That misunderstanding destroyed many lives. It wiped out nearly half of that beautiful, strong indigenous group and sent more into despair and poverty that continues to this day.

The Premier's (Mr. Pallister) comments only show that we have not learned from those misunderstandings with the Sayisi Dene and their traditions. While far less destructive than the impacts on the Sayisi Dene, we are yet again moving forward with another plan based on misunderstandings towards indigenous hunting practices in this province.

Not only that, this Premier shows what his true views are towards indigenous people. If this Premier ever bothered to consult with my people, can we truly trust someone who views so many of our young indigenous men inherently as criminals? This—the minister is enjoying her anecdotes and her pictures of dead livestock and bullet holes in houses but has yet provided zero data to support her ridiculous claim that these incidents were specifically caused by indigenous people alone.

I am again reminded of the Sayisi Dene, when inaccurate photos were used to justify actions against indigenous people. This was coupled with the false assertion that they were the ones responsible for a perceived decrease in wildlife population. And we all have to be reminded that this idea was later proven false. And I want to state that again, that idea that the Dene people caused the decline in population of caribou was proven false.

History repeats itself, and that's my very fear today. There were unintended consequences that nearly caused the extinction of our Sayisi Dene. The federal government enacted it, the provincial government sat on their hands and the municipality of that day and age let it continue. It was our Sayisi Dene who walked away from Churchill. They saved themselves.

\* (16:00)

Perhaps people don't know of the horrific orders by the US Army in nineteen—1869, and I quote: Send 10 regiments of soldiers to the plains with orders to shoot buffalos until they become too scarce to support the redskins. End quote.

There's been many instances where the—where they have—the governments have purposely enacted policies such as the—when it was allowed to over-hunt to near extinction our beavers in our province of Manitoba, which caused great starvation in my communities in Kewatinook. And we remember those policies and we remember the challenges, because it is our elders that told us these stories.

We also know of forced starvation tactics in those residential schools and in those medical homes that we had to get sent away to. You know, these are—and these aren't hundreds of years ago, Chair—Mr. Chair. These were 50 years ago, and the effects of those starvation policies are the driving force of why so many of my people continue to have ailments going forward.

You know, it's quite laughable that this government is also using the 44 charges in 2016. They don't seem to realize if those people were already charged it means what they were doing was already illegal. So let that sink in. I know it takes some members some time to digest information.

*Madam Speaker in the Chair*

So the minister continues to shame me for my comments on issues with conservation officers and the treatment of indigenous peoples. I believe it was put as painting a whole group with one brush and casting aspersions. But then, on the other side of her—out the other side of her mouth, she too blames indigenous men for the declining moose population, the bullet holes in barns and equipment and the shot elk that have been left on properties.

Talk about casting aspersions, Mrs. Speaker—Madam Speaker. The actions of a few do not define the majority. This is a lesson my people have been trying to teach for decades and the purposeful negligence of this lesson has perpetuated the negative myths and stereotypes that surround indigenous people on and off reserve.

If this minister understood anything about my people, that—she should know we would simply not leave our meat out to rot. We would enter into a ceremony and then take the food home to our

families. Again, if she truly consulted, she would know what I mean when I state that.

You know, I'm still waiting for that list that she'd provide in an answer to one of my questions during question period. Yes, still waiting. My people are still waiting, but we all know why she hasn't produced it or tabled it.

That department is most likely frantically scrambling to find someone who will publicly vouch for them that an actual consultation meeting took place. Perhaps she found out that at one meeting her staff or presenters literally said, and I quote: Please do not consider this by any means considered a consultation meeting. End quote.

We respect the natural world when we gather our food. Whether hunting at—during the day or during the night, many of our people will always strive to show any hunted animal its due respect. To leave dead elk lying in the woods and fields would be greatly disrespectful to our culture and our traditions and if the minister did truly consult with our people, my people, she will know what I mean when I state this.

There is also great harm done to a hunter if she or he does that. Again, if she does not know what I mean when I say that, that again points to a lack of the trust on behalf of our elders if our elders didn't share that basic knowledge with her. But, of course, this was following a Premier (Mr. Pallister) who referred to this issue as a race war and a great example of the pot calling the kettle black.

Declining moose populations couldn't possibly have anything to do with the fact that Manitoba hasn't had a new land management policy in over 50 years and has allowed for endless farming expansions and now livestock operations. While not totally unexpected for a Conservative government, it is surprising that they would attempt to put their ignorance into legislation that would see a constitutional challenge. Our indigenous organizations are ready for this. I hope the PCs have now realized that their alleged consultations do not meet the criteria.

Madam Speaker, we need—we still need to know who this government has met with. Our First Nations people deserve to hear from this government an open and transparent answer to who they have consulted with. Both Grand Chief Arlen Dumas of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and Grand Chief Jerry Daniels of SCO have both stated that they were not

properly consulted with, in regards to bill. This government keeps claiming it has consulted with our people, but yet we haven't seen a shred of evidence, not even a simple list of who this government has met with. We have only heard they've met with individuals, but no names of any individuals were given. How do we know that these individuals were in any position to make the choice on this legislation on behalf of their communities? From my research, since we can't get a full list of those communities, those 20 communities she has 'previously' mentioned and, indeed, many people who I ask, who hold a trapper's portfolio, have no clue as to what I mean when I ask about a meeting regarding night hunting, which, again, only speaks to the proof that there was not proper consultation.

Consultation is not something that is done quickly or in passing conversations and especially not a letter sent to a First Nation without that First Nation responding, having receipt of the letter. Consultation is an important part of the reconciliation process and must be respected. The Premier and his minister claims to have had extensive consultations, but this was immediately proven false by First Nation leaders. One of the most important issues to our people is also one of the most simplest and easiest to grant, the ability to have our voices heard.

Hunting could be safer, and we would support education and partnerships with First Nations in making hunting safer for everyone. Even in their supposed consultations, my people know that hunting at night is dangerous and it is done in great care. But so is being a metal worker, which has the highest death rate of any profession in Manitoba, but nobody would stop them from supporting their families. We continue—what we do, rather, is to continually strive and endeavour to make it safer. We get together with employers and employees and safety officers and WCB. We look at the stats and develop a policy that works for everyone. We don't simply just blanket-ban welding.

You know, at the bill's briefing, her colleagues that were present talked about some great ideas that were in the process of being implemented. They had great ideas for the practice of safe daylight hunting. I could go on about their words, but it has not gone unnoticed that should an employee not fall in line with whatever this Premier guns for, those poor employees shortly seem to be searching for a job soon thereafter. So, since the minister has a couple of

tolerant, knowledgeable people there, I will simply look forward to their ideas becoming implemented.

\* (16:10)

You know, it's once again, the indigenous people of Manitoba who will pay the price. Did the PCs ever once consider making day hunting safer for my people? How come this government didn't mandate for farmers, you know, impose upon others, as they frequently oppose upon us? You know, it's typically others who are on the bulk of our traditional lands. You know, why can't they allow for us to come and collect our wildlife on those rented lands? Where is an update to the land management policy? And for that, I hope, by then, the minister has learned the meaning of proper consultation when it comes to our lands.

I once told this minister that Crown lands were shrinking, and her rebuttal was that it was not. And then the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) had asked a question about the sale of Crown lands to others, and then the minister says exactly the opposite of what she told me in that response to him. And so, you know, which way is it?

**An Honourable Member:** Yes, kind of confusing.

**Ms. Klassen:** Yes, very confusing. You know, the—this government's doublespeak is becoming tiring when you have a Premier (Mr. Pallister) who will not let the Metis sign away their rights to object to hydro projects, and then we see a bill shortly thereafter that would take away indigenous people's right to hunt.

You know, we really—really, we need—we know that it's because this government wants to blame their issues on my people. If they can't do that, then they blame it on our federal Liberal government. If they can't do that, then they blame it on the NDP.

The—this Premier doesn't want to give First Nations communities an inch but then swings the door wide open to a wild west of livestock operations and expansions that can actually destroy the ecosystems in which these wildlife—our wildlife continually grow their own populations.

I'd also like to work an air of caution as this government has also begun to use night hunting and spotlighting—spotlight hunting interchangeably, which is harmful as not all night hunting is done by spotlight. But this bill makes all forms of night hunting illegal, so even by moonlight, as my people have done longer than this government has ever existed. So, if the government keeps getting it

wrong, how will that reflect when it disseminates to other levels—to the conservation officer levels, for example? This was one of the main contentions that led many to think that this is an assault on our indigenous hunting rights by this government.

The Premier and this minister also enjoy referring to the sport of it and ask, where's the sport in that? Madam Speaker, this is not a sport. Maybe the only hunting that this Premier and his members take part in is for sport. Maybe that's why he believes that and continually espouses that. This Premier can't only think of hunting in that mindset. If he does, then perhaps they should introduce a bill that bans sport hunting. For my people, hunting is a way to feed our families, to support our communities. We do not kill things for the fun of it, as this Premier assumes, and we are grateful for what Mother Earth gives to us. Any indigenous hunter would be horrified to come across a slain carcass that was left to rot after its life was taken. To say we take lives for fun, it's quite disparaging. Part of indigenous hunting practices is to pay tribute to the animal that gave its life so that others may live. Our hunters try to make amends with our four-legged relations by proceeding to do our traditional ceremonial practices. It is not something to be viewed as a sport but a necessity to life.

Indigenous people have a right, protected by the Constitution Act of eighteen—1982 to hunt animals for food at night, provided it's done safely. This is a— a right that cannot be taken away by this government or any government's actions. Our treaty rights are not something that should never be 'affrined' upon—that should ever be infringed upon, regardless of how incorrectly this government views our indigenous hunters and our people.

All people deserve to feel safe and have their rights respected, and this bill, as we can only described as ignorant, does neither of those. What it does affirm is this Premier's and this minister's lack of knowledge of the definition of consultation: consultation that should have a framework, as promised by the PCs while campaigning, yet never materialized.

Many indigenous leaders would immediately come to the table if actual solutions to hunting accidents were presented by this government. Their total lack of insight into First Nation rights and practices do nothing to advance reconciliation or an advancing nation-to-nation relationship that exists between our people. Their continual comments have

proven that—shown very little initiative in understanding how and why my people hunt—

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

**Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park):** Madam Speaker, it's always a very distinct pleasure to spend some time with you about something that's really close to my heart: it's about the law. What's in the law?

I am quoting a justice, one of my favourite justices of the Supreme Court of the Republic of the Philippines. When I was practising law, he was also a professor. He was a very frail man and he was in his 70s when he was teaching me criminal procedure. He said that there's no master but the law and no guide but our conscience and no aim but justice.

And as a graduate of the University of the Philippines College of Law—I actually missed one subject because one of the deans failed me—but I took the bar and became a lawyer, same year as my classmates. And I went back with a certificate of admission to the bar and said, ha, that's it. I'm not going back to school. I am an attorney-at-law.

And the way that I have respected the law is quite simple—always the spirit of the law.

And most of the time our focus in this Legislature is how to react, react to, say, our constituents' concerns. And I found that this law that's being proposed, which is Bill 29, was a reaction to the concerns of some Conservative base during a fundraiser, and the honourable Premier (Mr. Pallister) promised to end the night hunting and the spotlighting practices that were allowed. He said that it was dangerous, and he was right. He said that it was almost like a race war that he does not want to fight. And this law became the result of those musings from our honourable Premier.

\* (16:20)

However, I have praise for those who crafted this law, but not much. It's still missing those ingredients that require consultation with the indigenous population that the Conservative caucus usually call stakeholders. And this indigenous consultation is part of the law. It is not something that we could trivialize. It is not something that we could just say, ignore it, and ride roughshod over it. What we need to do is comply with it, because in accordance with what the Supreme Court of Canada has said, indigenous peoples can hunt. They have the

right to hunt. And they have the right to hunt in their ways in order to survive.

And those rights, although not specifically mentioned in the 1871 treaty that was signed by Canada and the indigenous First Nations of the Anishinabe and the Swampy Cree, it was a whole period of time for all of us to consider that, traditionally, indigenous men and women have the absolute right to harvest for food—whatever it is that they need from the land. And the land that's now occupied by us, meaning us immigrants—because I still believe that we are all immigrants in this province of ours. When we occupy the land, it is by reason of those treaties that we entered into in the first place. We, as in those who were government officials from way back, from 1871. That's only four years after Canada was formed. And I still believe that we should have that taken into account and respected.

Consultation is something that has to be real. Consultation cannot be artificial. It has to be genuine. It has to be pursuant to a very sincere desire to ask those who are concerned for their input.

Now, the main concern that I have is that this law which prohibits the use of spotlights is in contravention of that 1982—is that 1982 or 2012?—Supreme Court decision where the Supreme Court said that we as a society have to allow the evolution of the equipment of the indigenous hunter from a torch light to a spotlight, from bow and arrow to a rifle.

And it's part of how we should consider the spirit of the law. The law itself is very—it's an evolving letter that speaks to us from beyond, and we have to hear the spirit of those who entered into it. I mean, even the treaties. The treaties that were entered into, we have to consider the context of how, why and the wherefores of any treaty. Treaty 1 can never spell out in total or as a whole that portion wherein the absolute right of the indigenous to survive within those lands that they surrendered. Even the word surrender does not really mean surrender because during those times and during those periods, the First Nations, when they entered into that treaty, never intended to give it away because, from their point of view, it was always a sharing type of ownership. And when those chiefs and when those government officials went into it and then concluded those treaties, we have to put some meaning into the context and the intent, not of the word, but of the spirit.

And I guess one problem that we're having as a society today is that we are not really that knowledgeable about where we are and why we are here. But as an immigrant of 38 and a half years in this country, I have that sense of gratitude that I was allowed to keep and settle with my family here, in peace and quiet and in a sharing attitude that really reflects the Canadian way, the Canadian way of sharing.

We have welcomed people from all over the world. And of those who have come here, some have succeeded in propagating even their own cultures and showing us and sharing with us the good things that they can do as a people.

We have the East Indians from the Punjab who have taken over some of the most horrendous types of occupation, which is the taxicab business, where you drive for somebody, and it is known to all that some of those who have—some of those who have exercised and practised their profession of nursing and being doctors were from the Philippines, and I also remember when there were garment workers who came here in 1968 and earlier.

The main concern that I have is that we're living our lives and trying to survive in this society without too much of a perspective. I understand that the backbenchers and the ministers don't care about what a backbencher has got to say. I understand that fully, and the meaning of what I'm trying to tell my friends is that there has to be—

\* (16:30)

**Madam Speaker:** The time being 4:30, we will temporarily set aside the debate on Bill 29 and the amendment thereto in order for the royal assent ceremony on Bill 33 to be held. After the royal assent, we will resume consideration of Bill 29 and the amendment thereto, and the honourable member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) will have 16 minutes remaining.

#### ROYAL ASSENT

**Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Ray Gislason):** His Honour the Administrator.

*His Honour, Chief Justice Richard Chartier, the Administrator of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the throne, Madam Speaker addressed His Honour the Administrator in the following words:*

**Madam Speaker:** Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba asks Your Honour to accept the following bill:

**Clerk Assistant (Ms. Monique Grenier):**

Bill 33—The Interim Appropriation Act, 2018 (2); Loi n° 2 de 2018 portant affectation anticipée de crédits.

**Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk):** In Her Majesty's Name, the Administrator of the Province of Manitoba thanks the Legislative Assembly and assents to this bill.

*His Honour was then pleased to retire.*

\*\*\*

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

We will now resume—[interjection]—I—order, please. Please be seated.

\* (16:40)

#### Point of Order

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

**Mr. Fletcher:** Madam Speaker, I believe it's the tradition in this place that, after there is royal assent for a bill, that we celebrate our monarch, Queen Elizabeth II.

**Madam Speaker:** The member does not have a point of order. It is the end of the session, not after one bill has been passed.

\*\*\*

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Official Opposition House Leader.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on House business.

#### House Business

**Madam Speaker:** On House business.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader):** Pursuant to rule 78(4), I am tabling the official opposition list for government ministers to be called for the next sitting of the Committee of Supply to consider the concurrence motion. The following ministers shall be called: Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living (Mr. Goertzen); Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Wishart); Minister of Municipal Relations (Mr. Wharton); Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen); Minister of Sustainable Development (Ms. Squires). These ministers will be questioned concurrently.

\*\*\*

**Madam Speaker:** Resuming debate on Bill 29, standing in the name of the honourable member for Tyndall Park, who has 16 minutes remaining—but I see that the House leader is standing.

### House Business

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Government House Leader, on House business.

**Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader):** Yes, on House business, Madam Speaker. I'm seeking leave to bring forward a motion on sessional order.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to bring forward a motion on sessional order?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** I hear a no. Leave has been denied.

### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

*(Continued)*

#### Bill 29—The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)

**Madam Speaker:** Resuming debate now on Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management), standing in the name of the honourable member for Tyndall Park, who has 16 minutes remaining.

**Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park):** To resume my remarks, I am reminded of the 104-year-old Australian scientist who was—who wanted to leave Australia in order to die by a doctor-assisted death, and I said something that affected all—almost all of my Facebook friends, because I was really distressed that a 104-year-old cannot even wait for his own death. He was looking how to die early, and here I am, 71 years old, jogging to my ripe old age of 72 come November, still wanting to serve, still wanting to speak.

**An Honourable Member:** Until 104.

**Mr. Marcelino:** Until I reach 104. And my real concern is that this place, meaning this Chamber, this Assembly, may have to reconsider some of those proposals that they have, especially when it comes to the treaty rights of the indigenous people, because those rights were enshrined for a very simple reason: it was in exchange for peace in this land. It was in exchange for an understanding that the indigenous peoples of this land are sharing their land. They never claimed that they owned it; they always made

it a point that Mother Earth is respected, including all the waters and all the animals that live in it. But the main concern I have is that by the introduction of this bill, and it is riding roughshod over all our perceptions of what is right and what is moral and what is legal and what is in compliance with the spirit of the law.

Seems like we are trying to degrade, diminish and reduce the effects of those treaty rights that we ought to respect as peoples, as equally standing peoples on this earth. It's a very simple concept that we must respect each other and treat each other with kindness.

In my—the quality of my life will not be determined by my dislike or like of my existence. I have always tried to be as upfront with what I want, what I need and what am I going to do. This particular bill does not comply—it does not intersect—with my moral moorings. The treaty rights that I absolutely respect, the law behind it, the constitution of Canada has to be respected first and foremost.

So right now, I savour every moment that I have left on my clock, and it means that I am enjoying the company of my relations and I take every opportunity to receive all the gifts that life can give me, and I share every jewel and glitter that I find in the words my friends, and I, of course, enjoy the music in the words of my grandkids when they speak to me.

And, you know, life is so simple. This law will complicate things for the indigenous people of this land and I don't like that. I'd rather have respect for all of us by respecting the traditions and practices, and understanding that when an indigenous person shoots a wild animal in order to partake of the food, it is part of our obligations to see that he does that in every way safe and secure.

Accidents will happen, but the law as it is presented, cannot stand the metric of reasonableness, logic, practicality and universal benefit. So I will vote against this.

Thank you.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** I see my speech has been automatically extended by eight minutes and something. So, I want to put a few comments on the record today regarding this attempt by the government to drive this bill through, and I'm also trying to figure out—we are all, here on this side, scratching our heads trying to figure out, where did this bill come from?

\* (16:50)

You know, there's a process we have here in the House for putting in bills the government wants to pass by a certain day, according to the rules, and a government prioritizes its legislative initiatives on that basis and knows that if it wants to get a bill through at a certain time, it has to present it by such and such a time. Otherwise, there's no guarantee that the bill will make it through that session. And then what happens is they have to reintroduce it for the next session, which would mean that they were to—if they were to withdraw it now, they would have to reintroduce it third week of November after the session—this session ends on November 9th. So, once again, where did this bill come from?

So I started doing some looking back and looking back to the last election and trying to find out, you know, where this could have come from. So I'm looking at that and I'm going through the members—I've gone through the members over here; now I'm looking at some over there on the other side. And, you know, governments, normally, they make some promises during election campaigns, and a normal government that wants to get re-elected at some point, you know, usually has a bunch of boxes they check off. They make a number of promises, and then they accomplish promise No. 1, they check it all off, because—and they know they don't get all of the promises made before the next election, but they try to get enough of them out of the way that, you know, it becomes plausible that they should get another turn.

So I look at the member for Rossmere (Mr. Micklefield), because, you know, he's looking at me right now, and I, you know, and I do spend more than my share of time these days in his constituency banging in holes in his constituents' lawns, putting up nice yellow-looking signs saying: Keep Concordia ER Open. And I know that, you know, during the election campaign he and the rest of his members were out knocking on doors as they are prone to do.

You know, most people out in our area have doorbells, but I guess they—they're Conservatives, right. They're not up with the new technology yet; they're banging on people's doors. And, you know, I've yet to find one of his constituents that said that he told them that night hunting was one of the big priorities of the Conservatives should they be re-elected. I never found a constituent of his that said that he told them he was going to close down their

hospital, the Concordia ER. House after house after house, you know, they scratch their heads and say, who was that man who came to my door and did not tell me he was going to shut down the hospital?

He also didn't tell me we were going to introduce and tie up the Legislature on night-hunting legislation, either, and I really would like to ask a lot of the members over there on the Conservative side, you know, whether or not they went around knocking on the doors, as they say they do, and promising the night-hunting legislation.

Well, now, I have pictures of all of them here. Unfortunately, they don't have their constituency listed, so I'd have to do some guessing here. But, you know, we have the member for Riding Mountain (Mr. Nesbitt). I'd like to know whether he went—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Order, order.

The motion before the House is whether or not this bill should be voted on, and I would ask the member—I've been fairly lenient this afternoon, but this is getting a little out of hand. I would ask the member to draw his remarks into the comments about the motion that is actually on the floor.

**Mr. Maloway:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker, and that's relatively easy to do because the fact of the matter is that the government has not provided proper consultations. It is as simple as that. This is what speaker after speaker today, starting with the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe) got up and spent 30 minutes explaining that members here have not been—have not had—(a) they haven't had the opportunity to speak to this bill, starting with members across the way, okay, but also the government has not consulted. I mean, speaker after speaker has talked about how important it is to consult, and the government has not done proper consultations. So we suggested that rather than trying to drive this through today, that the government should withdraw the bill and start over. Go through all of the consultations that are more or less required—are required in a situation like this, consult with all of the native organizations, and the standard here is supposed to be a very high standard, as high as we've ever seen, not just a, you know, a letter to the band office. Do proper consultations and then come forward, as they should properly do, as I indicated in the beginning, that they should've brought this in, in the next legislative session. The new session is going to start a week or so after November the 9th, and that is the time to reintroduce the bill.

As a matter of fact, that happened last year, too. They missed the deadline. They missed the deadline on a bill, and they let it sit during the session, may have had one day, or not, of debate on the bill, and then they had to bring it in again. I think it was the floor crossing bill that we've been talking about here. And they ended up having to go and do the proper thing and bring it in according to the rules.

So, I mean, what in the world do we spend all this time negotiating a set of rules in the—before the last election, the government of the day and the opposition sat down and were—came up with a set of rules. The old rules we've had for many, many years; they were not working that well because, you know, unlike every other province, we had essentially—one member was essentially running this House, so we said, oh, we can't have that happen; we're going to come up with some new rules so one member can't run this House anymore. Well, how's that working out for you?

But, you know—and where Ottawa, you know, has a more prescriptive form—they have, you know, 130 days of sittings, probably too many, but they have very prescribed—in the federal House of Commons, when the House leader calls a meeting with the opposition House leader, it's basically like a one-way conversation. John Baird would tell the other House leaders, this is what's going to happen in the House today, and there was not really much, you know, room for debate about that. Well, that's not the way things happened under our set of rules that we had for many years.

You know, going back, we had bell ringing; unlimited bell ringing. Someone could challenge a ruling here, and the bells would ring; and the French language debates, as the Speaker knows, would run for days, days and weeks. And, finally, we got the

parties together, and we put a restriction, saying that those bells had to be, you know, limited, and that's why you see the rule now that says there's one hour of bell ringing before we have to come and have a vote. So, you know, it's—rules can—could work reasonably well for a certain amount of time, but at a certain time, you want to take a look at maybe making some changes to them, and that's what we've done. It's not hard to read the rule book and to see that if you want to pass a piece of legislation like this that requires a very high level of consultation, you don't go and miss the deadline.

Like, I would think you should get a House leader who can read those rules, understand those rules and say to the Premier (Mr. Pallister), well, Mr. Premier, like, we're 20 days past the deadline here, why are we introducing this bill? That's a really good question to ask. Why don't the members over there ask their management, why are we doing this? Like, we have a set of bills—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Maloway:** We have a set of bills that we want to pass. We know we've got to get it in by a certain day. We haven't discussed, we have the consultations, we have the legislative arm draw them up, make sure that they're going to be constitutional, and we know we've got to get them in, and we see them—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Order.

When this matter's again before the House, the honourable member will have 20 minutes remaining.

The hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow. *[interjection]* Oh, 10 a.m. tomorrow. Pardon me, 10 a.m. tomorrow.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**

**Wednesday, June 20, 2018**

**CONTENTS**

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Members' Statements</b>		Long-Term Care Budget	
NDP Health-Care Record		Lamoureux	3218
Michaleski	3209	Goertzen	3219
Lawsuit Against Parker Wetlands Protesters		Affordable Housing	
Allum	3209	Bindle	3219
Truth, Trust and Integrity		Fielding	3219
Piwniuk	3210	Air Quality Monitoring (St. Boniface)	
Petit Casimir Memorial School Graduation		Altemeyer	3219
Lindsey	3210	Squires	3219
Truth, Trust and Integrity		Thompson Manitoba	
Morley-Lecomte	3211	Lindsey	3220
<b>Oral Questions</b>		Pallister	3221
Changes to Health-Care Services		<b>Petitions</b>	
Fontaine	3211	Vimy Arena	
Pallister	3211	Fletcher	3221
Université de Saint-Boniface		Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room	
Wiebe	3212	B. Smith	3222
Pallister	3213		
Bureau de l'éducation française		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
Wiebe	3213	<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS</b>	
Pallister	3213	<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>	
Education System		Bill 29—The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe	
Wiebe	3214	Hunting and Shared Management)	
Pallister	3214	Cullen	3223
Premier's Vacation Property		Wiebe	3223
Swan	3214	Gerrard	3228
Pallister	3214	Fontaine	3229
Recreational Facility Funding		Klassen	3235
B. Smith	3215	T. Marcelino	3240
Wharton	3216	<b>Royal Assent</b>	
Pallister	3216	Bill 33—The Interim Appropriation Act, 2018 (2)	3241
Cross Lake Community		<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>	
Lathlin	3217	<i>(Continued)</i>	
Goertzen	3217	Bill 29—The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe	
Personal-Care-Home Standards		Hunting and Shared Management)	
Lamoureux	3218	T. Marcelino	3242
Pallister	3218	Maloway	3242
Goertzen	3218		

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>**