

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

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

Vol. LXXI No. 86B - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 6, 2018

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 6, 2018

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon, everybody. Please be seated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Madam Speaker: Introduction of bills? Committee reports?

TABLING OF REPORTS

Madam Speaker: I am pleased to table the report of the Auditor General titled Forensic Audits, dated October 2018, in accordance with section 28(1) of The Auditor General Act.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Madam Speaker: The honourable First Minister—and I would indicate that the required 90 minutes notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable Premier please proceed with the statement?

Approaches to Carbon Pricing

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Later today, we'll be voting on amendments to Bill 16, The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act.

These amendments are necessary because the Government of Canada has decided that our comprehensive Made-In-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan, developed by Manitobans and for Manitobans, is not sufficient for its own escalating carbon taxation plan.

The amendments are necessary because the federal government has refused to acknowledge that we are, in Manitoba, already Canada's greenest province; necessary because Ottawa would not recognize the massive investments that Manitobans have already made in such things as clean hydroelectricity; and necessary because Ottawa was unwilling to consider and accept our unique emissions profile.

The federal government has chosen to take its actions because it has refused to agree that our plan would cost Manitoba families and businesses less, would have been more effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions than the federal plan and

because it insists on forcing Manitobans to pay a carbon tax that would rise to at least \$50 per ton, which is double our plan.

This is not the outcome we sought. This is not the outcome we had expected. It did not have to be this way.

On October 27 of last year, our government released its Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan. Our comprehensive plan was based on four pillars: climate, jobs, water and nature.

The plan also included—as you know, Madam Speaker—a flat carbon price, flat like the prairie horizon: \$25 a ton. The price would start at that level and it would stay at that level until 2022. Our plan would have saved Manitoba families over half a billion dollars over five years. It would have provided stability to consumers, industry and our ag sector.

Rather than embrace this effective, affordable plan—the best in Canada—the federal government would not accept our approach on one basis and one basis only: on the issue of its carbon tax. Immediately the same day we announced our plan, they said we had to up our game.

We have repeatedly attempted to persuade Ottawa of the wisdom of a climate plan designed by Manitobans for Manitobans in a province where we have consistently upped our game. We have asked the federal government to acknowledge our clean status, our green investments and our specific circumstances. We've asked them to respect their own commitments to using a collaborative approach based on flexibility.

This dialogue has continued for months, despite federal threats in December 2017, again in January of this year, to withhold funding under the Low Carbon Economy Leadership Fund. The discussions continued after those threats were overcome in February of 2018, when Manitoba joined the Pan-Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change on a clear reservation of rights basis.

We made clear at that time that we did not accept the escalating federal carbon price schedule, nor the application of the federal backstop to impose

that tax scheme on Manitobans. We set out our position, and the federal government confirmed that the funding for the Low Carbon Economy Fund would indeed flow.

Our dialogue continued right through to my meeting with the Prime Minister on September 11th of this year, when, to my great disappointment, he made clear that Manitoba's plan would be rejected and that Manitoba's historic and ongoing investments would not be recognized by his government in determining the adequacy of Manitoba's proposed plan.

He indicated that his government would not look beyond next year in assessing Manitoba's climate plan, and he would not provide assurances that the escalating federal carbon tax, scheduled to rise to \$50 per ton by 2022, would not be applied to Manitobans.

The rejection of our plan by the federal government guaranteed that Manitobans and Manitoba businesses would face the impact of rising, and rising again, carbon prices. Now, these increased prices would compound the debt burdens already borne by Manitobans due to costly hydro investments.

Increasing carbon taxes would discourage private capital investment and would threaten to slow our economy's growth. Manitobans would be forced to pay twice the tax for poorer climate results while jeopardizing our economic growth and our economic recovery. Such risks—the consequences of such unreasonableness on the part of the federal government—we cannot and do not accept.

Accordingly, on October 3rd, 2018, we stood up once again for Manitobans. We said no to Ottawa's carbon tax. We said yes to Manitoba's made-in-Manitoba green climate plan.

The weeks that followed have confirmed the soundness of our decision. Concerns have mounted that the federal government is pursuing a two-tier approach to carbon pricing: an approach that continues to fail to undertake a fair analysis of the stringency of our plan and reinforces why we were forced to say no to Ottawa; an approach that applies different standards, Madam Speaker, across the country; an approach that permits, for example, Newfoundland and Labrador to re-profile their gas tax into a flat carbon price of \$20 per ton, provides offset credits for coal-plant-to-hydro-generation investment, not yet undertaken, and permits a broad

range of home heating, diesel and offshore petroleum exemptions; an approach in which the equivalent pricing value of Quebec's cap-and-trade system, for example, falls below the federal benchmark, yet avoids the federal backstop; and an approach in New Brunswick where, despite application of the federal backstop, emission standards have been relaxed for coal-burning power plants, amounting to an almost complete exemption and making that pollution virtually free.

The federal government's approach is not consistent, it is not collaborative, it is not fair to Manitobans. And that is why our government is standing up for the citizens of our province on this and many other issues. We will continue to work to ensure that Manitobans are treated equitably. We will oppose the imposition of a federal carbon tax that rises to \$50 per ton. We will take all necessary steps to protect the interests of Manitoba consumers, Manitoba families, Manitoba businesses.

I look forward to today's vote, as we say no to Ottawa's carbon tax and we say yes to our Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan.

Madam Speaker: The honourable leader of the official—

An Honourable Member: Madam Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member—*[interjection]*

I think I was recognizing the member—the Leader of the Official Opposition before I heard the member of Assiniboia. I could verify—*[interjection]*

* (13:40)

I had recognized the Leader of the Official Opposition prior to hearing the member from Assiniboia rise on a matter of privilege, and I am wondering if the member from Assiniboia would be all right with us going ahead and then coming back to him on his matter of privilege. *[interjection]*

The honourable member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) has agreed, and we appreciate that.

Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition): Thank you kindly, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate your wisdom in that judgment.

When we talk about global warming, Madam Speaker, we're talking about the issue of our time. Future generations, not just in Manitoba, not just in Canada, but around the world will look back at this

period in time and they will look at it at the same way we look at the civil rights movement: an inflection point where we had to ask ourselves whether we had the moral courage to do the right thing, not just for the people who are alive today, but also the right thing for all the generations which are to come after us.

The question of the magnitude of our response to the challenge of climate change is all about us turning inward and asking ourselves whether we have the courage to stand up and fight for our future. Every single day that I wake up at home, Madam Speaker, I wake my two older boys up and get them ready for school, and I make my coffee and prepare for work cradling a now six-month-old baby in my arms.

And it is in these moments of contemplation where I recognize that the question of whether or not those kids will be able to enjoy the same standard of life and the same opportunities that I have enjoyed in my life are the true test of any climate plan, whether it's at the provincial level or whether it's at the federal level.

Now we know that climate change is real and that it is man-made. There is a scientific consensus on that and it is unimpeachable. There is also an economic consensus, Madam Speaker, that putting a price on pollution should be a part of the response to climate change for jurisdictions all around the world.

The most recent Nobel Prize winner, one of the co-Nobel Prize laureates, received that award because they had done work proving the efficacy of putting a price on pollution. And this is a market-based solution that is not merely one adopted by progressives; it is one that fiscal conservatives the world over have adopted as an important means of fighting against global warming. It is accurate to say that there is also an economic consensus that putting a price on pollution is a very important part of fighting climate change.

Now, Madam Speaker, in North America the debate has become increasingly polarized and has driven us away from the actual substance of this debate, which is that we ought to be asking when we vote on an issue like putting a price on pollution: are we willing to stand up for future generations in our province?

Specifically, what is the price that we are willing to place on the well-being of our kids and on our grandkids in this province? What is the price that we

are willing to attach to the hope and optimism that we invest in the next generation?

If we fail to act and respond to the challenge of our time, if we fail to put a price on pollution, Madam Speaker, we will, by default, be giving a subsidy to the biggest polluters in our planet, and that is a subsidy that future generations of Manitobans will be having to pay for many decades to come.

Now, I am pleased to hear the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) language soften on hydroelectricity. He now recognizes that it is an investment. And again, past generations of premiers in Manitoba recognized the importance of generating electricity here in Manitoba in a way that respects the environment.

Now, we know that there has been a cost to hydro. There has been a tremendous human cost to hydro development, particularly in the north of Manitoba, and while we are committed to reconciling that past with the investment that hydro represents in our present, we must remain committed to a future in which we can continue to have clean power here in Manitoba.

I have grown increasingly frustrated with the federal government over the past number of weeks, Madam Speaker, as they continue to make carve-outs for coal power right across the country, not just in New Brunswick, but today they also announced that they're launching a carve-out for coal power in Saskatchewan. At the same time that they are going to make it more expensive for natural gas electricity, they are going to make coal power cheaper—the dirtiest form of electricity.

So, certainly, the federal government has a long way to go before they can claim to be leaders on the climate front and, certainly, future generations of Manitobans deserve better leadership than what they are getting at the provincial level and what they are getting at the federal level, Madam Speaker.

Future generations of Manitobans will look back at this moment and ask why nobody had—in the Premier's office or in the PMO had the courage to make the difficult decisions when push came to shove that were required of us at this time.

We know that there is a small window, approximately 11 years, in which we can make the drastic but important and necessary changes for us to make in order to ensure that they will have a bright future.

Now, the cynical—or, perhaps, I guess, other interpretation that we might take out of the federal government's carve-outs is that there is still apparently room to negotiate a new arrangement with the federal government.

Now, we, unfortunately, in Manitoba have not seen any progress on the negotiating table because the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has abandoned that opportunity, choosing instead to pick fights with the Premier—with the Prime Minister rather than working out differences and perhaps being able to—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —arrive at a unique deal for Manitoba. Again, that's on the table. Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Quebec, Newfoundland, other jurisdictions are securing made-in-Newfoundland, made-in-Quebec, made-in-Nova Scotia, made-in-Saskatchewan plans. But we have been unable to secure a made-in-Manitoba deal, because the Premier has walked away and instead chosen to throw stones from afar.

So a pox on both their houses, Madam Speaker.

Again, we heard the Premier say today, and—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —I quote, we will oppose. And, again, to further use another quote, he said, they will take all necessary steps, end quote. The question which lingers, of course, is: does the Premier intend to take the federal government to court? He has mused in the past about launching a court challenge, but he has yet to answer that question specifically.

At the end of the day, Madam Speaker, today we are being asked to vote on whether or not we should put a price on pollution. I'm proud to say that, on this side of the House, we will stand up for kids in Manitoba, for future generations in Manitoba and against big polluters. And, yes, we will be in favour of putting a price on pollution so that we can have clean air, water, earth and—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired. *[interjection]* Order.

I have been informed that the member of Assiniboia has withdrawn his request for a matter of privilege.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): Madam Speaker, the Premier's

Made-in-Manitoba Climate and Green Plan was released over a year ago. On the surface, the plan has its appeal, but the details tell another story. It was not made in Manitoba; it was outsourced to Ottawa. And the bill for the commute alone was over \$60,000.

And it is not a plan; plans have actions attached. The digital file name on the website still has the title discussion paper. It's filled with ideas and suggestions, many perfectly fine, but there is no commitment to do any of them.

The report uses the term could 49 times. It uses the word considering 10 times. It lists pillars, and then it asks readers whether they're suitable or not. It has no goals and no targets. It has no results. These are supposed to be picked through input from online polls.

In an era of click fraud and bots, when the Province has routinely failed the most basic security to rule against multiple submissions or ensure only Manitobans are being consulted, this undermines consultation.

But one of the most serious problems with this plan is that it only measured reductions in emissions while ignoring increases. There was no question of what the net was. The green plan talked about the things the province might do to reduce emissions, but—and, again, there are all sorts of plans they have announced, which would increase emissions, which they left out.

So, in this way, their approach through environment emissions is much like their approach to government's finances. Imagine a government that only talks about revenues and not expenditures, or only looks at the bottom line of the government while ignoring the impact on the public.

That's what we'd have, Madam Speaker. The PCs talk about what they're cutting, but they ignore all the ways they're making life more expensive for everyone but themselves. A green plan that ignores increases in emissions is worthless.

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

* (13:50)

But it's also clear, when it comes to the Auditor General's report on climate change, that this government had not yet released a plan either. It said the Department of Sustainable Development was aware, by the fall of 2009, greenhouse gas emissions would not be 're-released'—released. Following the April 2016 'provincial' election the government announced it was developing a new plan, but it has not yet been released.

And a further criticism of the NDP's December 2015 plan, cancelled by the PCs, was that most of the initiatives proposed in the plan were high-level strategies lacking details and estimates of their expected emissions reductions and costs.

That also describes the government's current green plan. It has no timelines, it lacks goals and the high-level strategies in the PC green plan are virtually identical to the ND—plea plan that didn't work before: Efficiency Manitoba, electric buses, organics diversion, biodiesel, sustainable agricultural practices and a coal phase-out—nothing new.

I do believe that governments should help people reduce their energy consumption, but Efficiency Manitoba makes no sense. As a business model, it can only spend and doesn't appear to have any revenue sources, so why make it a Crown corporation?

And there's another reason why Hydro's debt and rates are going up so high and that they don't have to be. For years, the NDP and PCs alike have taken hundreds of millions of dollars a year from Hydro to make their books look better. They charged Hydro a capital tax, so the bigger they build, the more Hydro pays. They charge Hydro a debt fee, so the deeper into debt Hydro goes, the more Hydro pays. They charge a water rental fee, though it isn't spent on lakes and rivers. All told, it adds up to \$360 million a year this year alone, and Hydro is borrowing \$2 billion. That is the real reason Hydro's rates are going up. They don't have to be, and they don't—and they shouldn't be, especially if we want to encourage people to switch to hydro.

Excuses are wearing thin, and there are plenty of positive things that can be done to make Manitoba a climate leader. It requires action now, not another two years of talk.

Manitoba should be poised to take advantage of this, but this government seems incapable of acting, other than to throw obstacles in the way of those who are trying to get things done, Madam Speaker.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to proceeding with the responses to the ministerial statement, we have some guests in the gallery that are going to be leaving us in a few minutes and I would like to introduce them to you.

Seated in the public gallery, from Alhijra Islamic School, we have 40 grade 8 and 9 students under the direction of Karlyne Thiessen, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

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

* * *

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): I ask for leave to respond to the ministerial statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to respond to the ministerial statement? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Fletcher: Again, I always want to extend a thank you to the Premier (Mr. Pallister) for allowing me the opportunity to represent my constituents in the way that they wish to be represented.

And it was obvious a very long time ago that a carbon tax was not in the interests of any Manitoban. It was also apparent that the federal government was going to do what federal governments often do, and it was that simple. Provincial government just should've stepped aside, let the federal government do what they do and let the federal government explain their actions. But, no, that wasn't good enough. The—and, by the way, Madam Speaker, against my advice and suggestions—the entire government bench supported the Premier in introducing a carbon tax that was 250 times what Ottawa wanted, and immediately. So that is bad public policy. And I'm glad now that we agree that a carbon tax is bad public policy.

And a lesson in this is: the members of the government side, if you want to be listened to, come and join me over here. Join the freedom caucus. And when the Manitoba Party forms government, perhaps you will have a seat as well. Who knows?

But the point is, the Premier has undermined all the Conservative governments and the national Conservative Party by taking the bizarre carbon pricing scheme that he brought forward. He agreed with the federal government on principle and the only thing they couldn't agree on was price. The

Premier (Mr. Pallister) wanted to tax faster, federals a little bit slower, but the fact is it was bad public policy.

Now we have a bill coming up, Bill 16, which is underfunded—unfunded. We have a huge hole in the budget. The Premier somehow—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fletcher: —kind of trying to say, oh, we're going to blame Ottawa, no? Look in the mirror; that's who to blame. It's a public policy fiasco. To shoot the guns at Ottawa is not the appropriate target.

That is why, Madam Speaker, given the fact that Manitoba Hydro board has resigned; that Metis Federation is up in arms; Manitobans, in general, are up in arms; the Premier flip-flops—has been caught on a variety of missteps.

Madam Speaker, the Premier of Manitoba should resign.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Members' statements?

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Point of Order

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, on a point of order.

Mr. Ewasko: We on the government side of the House, Madam Speaker, are working very hard to change the culture within the government, within the civil servants—Civil Service, sorry—in regards to a respectful workplace.

I stand today in my place to bring forward this point of order at the most opportune time, and basically it is asking the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) to apologize not only to the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher), but to all of us in the House, because right after his speech, his response to the ministerial statement, he stood up in his spot, walked to the back of the Chamber and told the member from Assiniboia that he better shut his mouth—to keep his mouth shut.

Madam Speaker, I've had the pleasure of and the privilege of being elected in 2011 and I pride myself on treating others like I would like to be treated, and I find that this is absolutely an embarrassment to this Chamber, and I ask the member for Fort Rouge to apply today—or to apologize today to the—not only

the member from Assiniboia, but also to everybody here in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on the same point of order.

Mr. Kinew: That's right. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

The member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko) missed the first part of my statement, which was that I said to the member for Assiniboia that I heard him—it did not escape my notice that he was speaking the entire time that I was delivering the response to the ministerial statement.

So you will know that, in fact, the point of order should probably be that there shouldn't be any distractions or heckling taking place while somebody is addressing the Chair in the House—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: So I was merely conveying to my colleague my desire to have no disruptions or any interruptions while a statement or questions are being asked in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Burrows, on the same point of order?

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): On the same point of order, Madam Speaker.

I, too, I did not hear the very beginning of what the member for Fort Rouge said to the member of Assiniboia, but it was very clear at the very ending, and I wrote it down the moment I heard it. It said: You better keep your mouth shut. He said it while he was standing just to the right-hand side of the member from Assiniboia, facing the Speaker, just looking forward but speaking down to the member, telling him he had better keep his mouth shut.

* (14:00)

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Assiniboia, on the same point of order.

Mr. Fletcher: Ah, yes. Madam Speaker, during the first ministerial statement I was discussing the issue of notice with, among other people, the Deputy Clerk and my colleagues.

I make it a point of not heckling ever. I'm sorry to the member if my—if somehow that was bothersome to him. Though it wasn't—it was dealing with a procedural issue, and I certainly empathize when people are talking around you when you're

trying to make a statement. And it was an important statement.

As for the other statements, I appreciate everyone in their comments, but in the big picture—and all the comments are true, but people have gone through far worse and I hold no ill will towards the leader who has also gone through a lot. These can be stressful times and—but I do appreciate the support from the other colleagues. So no harm done.

Just a statement.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Normally, points of order are raised in order to point out a breach of a rule of the House.

Certainly, this is an interesting situation where some comments have been made that many have found offensive, and I think the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) has also indicated that he is taking no offense to that at the moment.

So based on that, with everybody's agreement then, we could indicate that there is no point of order.

However, I do have to add that in situations like this, this is what we have been trying so hard—not only in Manitoba but across Canada—as Speakers to try to address is respectful work environments.

And this is maybe a good teaching moment and a good example for all of us to be very careful with our words because words can hurt and words can be offensive.

And I know sometimes everybody gets carried away with a great deal of passion, and everybody should have passion or you wouldn't be here doing this job. But it's a matter of how the passion is put forward, and passion without offending other members or hurting other members is certainly what we would be, you know, wanting to see in this House.

So, a good caution, a good moment of learning for all of us—appreciate the member for Assiniboia indicating his comments on this.

So I just urge all members to please heed this and as we go forward today that there is respect shown and we have a civil working environment here in this Chamber in Manitoba.

So, I appreciate everybody's comments.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Mark Rogocki

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, the month of October was Disability Employment Awareness Month in Manitoba, and since 2015 our province has designated one day every October as Take Your MLA to Work Day.

I have had the distinct pleasure of taking part in the campaign for all four years to not only raise awareness about the barriers that people with disabilities face when trying to gain employment, but the benefits that their successful employment can bring to our communities.

On October 26th, I had the privilege of spending Take Your MLA to Work Day with Mark Rogocki, who is a former student of mine and is employed at Sobetski Enterprises in Beausejour which is owned and operated by Jeff, Lori and Karen Sobetski.

When asked his employers about Mark, they stated, quote: Mark has a fantastic work ethic. He always shows up early and always has a story to tell. Mark always does his tasks with pride and loves to do a great job. Mark is a great team player at Sobetski Enterprises and we enjoy having him here. End quote.

Mark has been part of the Association for Community Living, Supported Employment Options program since 2005. Mark has been employed at Sobetski Enterprises for over one year and also works at the Howland Hotel in Beausejour since 2009.

Mark has asked—was asked a small list of questions by his supportive employment options support workers that I would like to share with you here today.

Question: How would you describe yourself?

Mark responds: Friendly, happy-go-lucky person. I'm a hard worker. I like to joke around and I like to work with other people.

Another question: Who have the—who have been the biggest supporters throughout your life and why?

Mark said: My parents and my sister, because they show me love, respect and are there when I need them.

What's your favourite part about working at Sobetski Enterprises?

Mark: We all work together to get things done. All the employees are great. We joke a little and work a lot. They make me feel part of the group. It's like one happy family there.

Question: What is your proudest moment in life and goals?

Mark: When I graduated from high school, getting my beginner's and being able to drive.

Future goal is to get his licence.

Madam Speaker, Take Your MLA to Work Day is a celebration of why supporting—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

The member's time has expired.

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to allow the member to complete his statement? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Ewasko: So, Take Your MLA to Work Day is a celebration of why supporting those with disabilities gain meaningful employment is a great—is great for all of us, and I thoroughly enjoyed spending it working alongside Mark Rogotski *[phonetic]*.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask leave—to ask—to read out the names of my guests here in the gallery to—so that they could be entered into Hansard.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to include those names in Hansard? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Ewasko: Mark Rogotski *[phonetic]*; Karen and Jeff Sobetski, owners of Sobetski Enterprises; Jordan Beer, an employment specialist; and Robyn Furnish, supportive employment co-ordinator.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Remembrance Day Exhibits by Letty Lawrence

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Logan): As Remembrance Day approaches, I would like to acknowledge the work of Winnipeg artist Letty Lawrence who has done—and what she has done to commemorate the Canadian soldiers who lost lives in World War I.

Letty, a fibre artist, created a two-part project inspired by an exhibit she saw in Australia that commemorated the 100th anniversary of a World War I battle. For the first part, she made banners written with details of a soldier's life before they entered the service and hang them from their former communities in Winnipeg.

Remembrance Day ceremonies often focus on the number of people who died in battle, but Letty's project is meant to commemorate the individuals. The banners act as reminders that before they became soldiers—most of whom were very young—these soldiers were friends and family members who loved and were loved.

It took Letty 1,000 hours of research to gather all the information to make the 900 banners.

For the second part of the project, Letty and her friends crafted handmade poppies attached to pieces of cotton flannel—the same material as the soldiers' undershirts—written with the names and ages of the soldiers when they died. The poppies will be on display at the Blankstein gallery at the Millennium Library for the public to view.

I encourage all members to visit the gallery, and if you were one—and—see one of the banners around Winnipeg, take a moment to read it and remember the sacrifices those men and women have made for our country and world democracy.

I request my colleagues to thank Letty Lawrence and her friend Rebecca Cramer *[phonetic]*, for using their talents and creativity in meaningful projects such as these. Letty and Rebecca *[phonetic]*, you have done a thoughtful, beautiful tribute to the fallen Canadian soldiers.

Thank you very much.

* (14:10)

ANAVET Unit No. 10 Anniversary

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): The Empire Hotel opened in 1904, the Great War ended in 1918, the Avenue Grocery Store closed in 1950, and the old LaSalle Grill closed in 1954.

These buildings, events and dates are very significant in the city of Brandon, Madam Speaker. You see, after the Great War of 1914-1918, a few of the veterans got together in the old Empire Hotel for a few drinks and to talk about the old times. This was the beginning of Unit #10 of the army, navy veterans association of Canada, and they received their charter on December 16th, 1918.

They continued to meet in the Empire Hotel until they established their own club room after the Second World War. This was also the time when the air force veterans were welcomed and the 'assoshisation's' name was officially changed to the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada.

When the Avenue Grocery Store closed in 1950, the ANAF purchased the building and completed some extensive remodelling to create a new club room.

When the LaSalle Grill closed, ANF-ANAF purchased the building, resulting in further expansion and remodelling. On August 16th, 1953, it was business as usual at the new clubhouse, with the ladies auxiliary being founded and receiving their charter.

By 1983, their membership had grown so large that a new home was necessary, so three lots were purchased on 14th Street, with the new club room and banquet hall officially opening in October 1984.

The history is important, Madam Speaker, as ANAVET—[*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Isleifson: –Unit #10 President Peter Reiss, their members and the community celebrated their 100th anniversary on Saturday, September 22nd.

As we gather here today to serve Manitobans, I ask that all members of this House join me in congratulating the army, navy and air force veterans association No. 10 on their centennial anniversary.

Thank you.

Harvey Friesen

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House to honour the life of Harvey Peter Friesen, who passed away peacefully on Saturday, October 20th, at the age of 92.

Winkler resident Harvey Friesen enlisted in the Canadian Army active services in 1943. He was one of the 3,500 volunteers for the infamous chemical warfare testing program conducted by the Canadian military. And he was part of the lobbying effort years after to have the federal government acknowledge Canada's role and raised awareness for those veterans who had been exposed to mustard gas during the conflict.

The government eventually announced compensation for survivors of mustard gas experiments in 2004, and a memorial plaque was erected where the testing took place in Suffield, Alberta.

Harvey was a proud Legion member, branch 14, who loved to ride in the Corn and Apple Parade. He was instrumental in starting Remembrance Day

observances in Morden and Winkler. He was an advocate for the establishment of the memorial cenotaph in Winkler. He received the Minister of Veterans Affairs Commendation for his advocacy for veterans. In 1994, he was Winkler's Citizen of the Year.

He led a full and active life. He was owner of Pembina printers limited. He was involved in organizations including the chamber of commerce, the Lake Minnewasta and Manitoba water ski associations, the Canadian Community Newspaper Association and the Royal Canadian Legion. For years, his licence plate read: fish, fly, hunt and ski.

Harvey was a warm and generous man, a character, loving, caring and proud.

Harvey, may you rest in peace. For your many gifts and contributions, you have the love and the admiration of a grateful nation and community.

Madam Speaker: Any further members' statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

CancerCare Manitoba Government Review

Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Speaker, cancer is a—it's a terrible scourge. It's one that affects so many families in our province. I'm sure that everybody in this Chamber and most people across the province have their own stories to share about the impact that cancer has had on them.

Here in Manitoba we are lucky to have an organization like CancerCare which CIHI, Canadian Institute for Health Information, has told us is the best in the country. Within four weeks, 100 per cent of cancer patients get the radiation services they need.

Now, unfortunately, the Premier is now demanding that a high-priced consultant conduct an external review of CancerCare. His minister said, yesterday, it's been a long time. Guess the minister forgot about the KPMG report which did examine CancerCare and returned recommendations.

Why is this Premier doing another review of CancerCare, and will KPMG's past recommendations form part of this new review on CancerCare?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Yes, cancer has touched the lives of all of us in this House and of many Manitoba families, and, of course, Madam Speaker, we want to make sure that services of

CancerCare Manitoba and all health services in our government are reviewed and that they are improved wherever that is possible.

We do not think that the fact that CancerCare Manitoba has done a good job should stand in the way of improvements happening there through this review.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Kinew: The concern that we have is that in the RFP that this government put out in their ask for this review of CancerCare, it's only focused about the money. There's strictly parameters put into place about reviewing CancerCare's financial performance, but where is the emphasis on the care that CancerCare delivers to Manitobans?

Now, we know that this Premier just spent \$750,000 on that previous report, on that KPMG report, and there were a number of recommendations to change CancerCare that I'm sure would concern many people in the province.

Now, one thing that we ought to know, if we are to have a true value-for-money examination of CancerCare, is how much is this new review going to cost. And that's one thing that this Premier has yet to tell the House.

Will the Premier be open with Manitobans about his plans? Will he tell us today how much he plans to spend on this review of CancerCare Manitoba?

Mr. Pallister: Well, Madam Speaker, our budget this year for health care is \$6.6 billion, which is fully \$700 million higher than the NDP ever invested in health care in their entire time in government.

But the issue surely goes beyond how much we spend and goes to what we get from the spending we do. And every Manitoban understands the pressures that are on them to get the maximum value from the money that they earn and work for and save, and so too must governments take that responsibility seriously.

It wasn't taken seriously by the previous administration, Madam Speaker. They ran deficits approaching \$1 billion and they were rising, and, of course, that's resulted in debt-service costs now, with interest only, of \$1 billion this year, for the first time in the history of Manitoba, that can't go to health care because of the overspending of the past.

Madam Speaker, we're not going to repeat those mistakes, we're going to learn from them. And what they broke, we will be fixing.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Kinew: The overall concern with this Premier and this Minister of Health is that they simply don't talk about the quality of care that patients ought to receive, and that was very clear yesterday, when the Premier was asked several times in a row if he would commit that there would be no cuts to services at CancerCare as a result of this review. And, of course, he dodged, he skated by, he evaded questions, but not once did he commit that there wouldn't be any reductions to the level of service delivered to the patients of CancerCare Manitoba.

Now, we know that this is crucial because right now CancerCare is the best in the country. CIHI tells us again, Madam Speaker, 100 per cent of CancerCare patients are getting their radiation treatment within the target timeline.

So the Premier can stick to his scripted lines, but we want to know whether he plans to reduce the level of service.

Can the Premier commit to the House today that there will be no cuts to CancerCare services as a result of this review that he's commissioned from these high-priced consultants?

Mr. Pallister: Well, Madam Speaker, not listening to consultants would make sure that the money was wasted and, therefore, would define quite accurately what a high price is. But getting value for money is actually how one defines the return on investment for a spending project.

The previous government had us in health care 10th of 10 on emergency room waits in Canada. There's a human price to that. They had us near the bottom of the list on waiting for hip surgeries, for knee surgeries. There's a human price for that too. They had us with an ever lengthening wait time for getting seniors the right housing they needed in personal-care facilities. They had us with the highest ambulance fees in Canada.

* (14:20)

On the record of getting value for money, the previous administration was dead last, 10th of 10 of all provinces. Spending more and getting less is what they were good at.

Spending to get value for money is what we're good at.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a new question.

**Lifelight Air Ambulance
Privatization Concerns**

Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Speaker, let the record show that CancerCare is the best in the country, and let the record show that for two days straight the Premier has refused to commit that there will be no cuts to CancerCare in Manitoba.

Now, of course, fear mongering is only fear mongering if those claims are unfounded, but this government has already cut two and a half million dollars from CancerCare, so we know that there is cause for concern here.

Similarly, on the issue of Lifelight privatization, 16 highly trained, expert physicians who deliver the air ambulance service right across Manitoba have written to this government and outlined their real concerns about the privatization of light-Lifelight services in Manitoba.

The Premier does not appear to be listening to them. We know who he is listening to: WPS Global Incorporated. Those are another group of outside high-priced consultants that he's asked to look and provide advice on the privatization of Lifelight.

Why is the Premier putting our health-care system at risk and why is he listening to all these high-priced consultants?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Well, I guess the question would be why did the NDP not listen to those very same experts, many of them and most of them, in fact, from Manitoba? Why did they not have the courage to act to improve our health-care system that was worsening and getting further behind, ninth in Canada? That's a question they'll have to answer.

Also, they'll have to answer this question: why is it that they so quickly drop to the bottom and start fear mongering with cancer and with cancer patients? They did it in the election campaign when they falsely spread the story that families facing cancer would have to pay for their own cancer drugs.

Playing political football with cancer patients, Madam Speaker—the member should apologize to families affected by cancer. His fear mongering has no place in this Chamber, no place in Manitoba. We

should be standing up with the families that face this horrible disease. We should not be trying to use them for political purposes, as the member is clearly doing today.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Kinew: Madam Speaker, a hundred per cent of the statements I've made on the CancerCare issue are grounded in fact. We know that CancerCare is rated No. 1 in the country. We know that this Premier has cut other services as a result of the advice of consultants like KPMG. We know that the Premier is now asking for a review of CancerCare. We know that the Premier cut the CancerCare headquarters. We know that the Premier cut \$2.5 million from the budget of CancerCare. The Premier may not like it, but those are all facts.

Returning to the issue of Lifelight, the minister said yesterday, quote: Perhaps the doctors don't yet understand the nature of this exercise, what we are entertaining into. End quote.

However, I would beg to differ. The physicians clearly understand what is at stake here. They understand that this government is going to make health care worse for everyone who lives more than 200 kilometres from the city of Winnipeg.

Will the Premier back off these plans to privatize Lifelight and instead listen to the physicians?

Mr. Pallister: The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) and now me. Everybody's got to back off today, according to the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew).

The fact remains, Madam Speaker, and the fact is this: that the previous administration stood back and didn't have the courage to address the problems in the health-care system, and we were languishing at last place in most of the major categories.

This government doesn't lack that courage. We'll tackle these challenges. And I'll use the facts, Madam Speaker, continuously. The member uses them sporadically at best. I will tell him this: in terms of his ideological battle about transferring people by private mechanisms, the NDP doubled, each of their last three years consecutively, year after year, the use of private Lifelight services. It wasn't an ideological battle then, Madam Speaker, but it is a battle about getting maximum value for money. While they were using these private services, they didn't bother shopping or getting a price.

Madam Speaker, that's incompetence of the worst kind. First, the bottom-dwelling of trying to scare families with cancer, and now the bottom-dwelling of going after ideology when he knows that the NDP government used private flight services more than they ever had before in their last three years.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Kinew: Unfortunately, the facts just don't support the Premier's position, Madam Speaker.

This government is spending \$90,000 a week on basic air carriers with Lifelight. The physicians tell us that this is simply something that has sprung up over the last two years. This is a new practice since this government took office.

The crisis at Lifelight is solely a creation of this Premier and his past two ministers of Health. They are the ones ideologically bent on privatization. They are the ones who do not want to see—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —government air services continue to care for people right around the province.

We know that these physicians are highly trained and they are doing a great service to people right across the province. So when they raise the alarm, when they tell this government that their decisions are harming the quality of health care in Manitoba, we say this government ought to listen.

So who will the Premier listen to? Will he listen to his high-priced consultants, WPS, or will he listen to the physicians who are caring for Manitobans right across—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Pallister: The member's loss of logic is supported by the fact that he's going to an ideology even the previous NDP government rejected, Madam Speaker, but he clings to it.

The previous government increased its reliance on privatized air service annually without tender, without telling Manitobans it was doing so. The Manitoba government has, for years now, depended on private operators for virtually all its air ambulance services, and the member's trying to create a phony war and scare people in the North and elsewhere when there's no justification for it.

None of these private services the previous government purchased were ever tendered. There was no guarantee of available aircraft; there were no service standards; there were insufficient safety requirements; and we're addressing each of those things to make sure that Manitobans get better value for money and a safer service is available to all who need it.

Lifelight Air Ambulance Physician Consultations

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): The Premier (Mr. Pallister) should be worried that it was 16 doctors that wrote to the Minister of Health setting out their concerns about this government's plan to privatize Lifelight Air Ambulance services, and they're frustrated with a government that talks about dollars and cents and not about the quality of patient care. They're frustrated with a government that failed to consult with them on the basis of medical evidence

And these doctors went public only after they tried unsuccessfully to get a meeting with the minister to have him hear their concerns.

Why did Manitoba's air ambulance doctors have to go to the media and have questions raised in this Legislature just to try to get a meeting with the Minister of Health?

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): So, Madam Speaker, the assertions of the member for Minto are patently false.

I received a request to meet with the Lifelight doctors last week on Thursday. We had already turned that into a solicitation back to them to meet shortly thereafter, and I can remind that member that even the director of those services said that she was very pleased to see this government put such an important emphasis on the request for that meeting.

So, that meeting will take place and, in the meantime, we've had six prior meetings. If a seventh one is the thing that will do the trick for that doctor group, we are happy to sit down. We're happy to continue the conversation.

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

Mr. Swan: If this Minister of Health—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —wants to say—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: If this Minister of Health wants to say the Lifeflight doctors aren't telling the truth, let him go out in the hallway and say that.

This minister thinks—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —he knows better than doctors that've been providing the Lifeflight service for years. And yesterday, the minister went out in the hall and told media the doctors don't yet understand the nature of this exercise, but, in fact, it's the exact opposite. These doctors do understand the nature of this exercise and they are worried about patient care.

When will the minister see the foolishness and the danger of his approach, withdraw the plan and commit to continuing Lifeflight service in Manitoba which has been providing quality service for 33 years?

Mr. Friesen: That member is having an internal conflict. He is failing to remember that it was his government that expanded the use and reliance on private carriers for the provision of this service, and that was actually curtailed and stabilized under our government.

*(14:30)

But Madam Speaker, let's understand that while he tries to make an issue of this private carrier owned and operated, in other jurisdictions—in fact, in all other jurisdictions in Canada save one—critical air ambulance is provided by the private sector.

We are asking the private sector to show us if there's a value that we can additionally harness for Manitobans. The market will tell us. If there isn't one, we won't proceed. If there is, we'll get that savings on behalf of all Manitobans.

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

Mr. Swan: Well, the minister needs to understand I didn't make it an issue. The 16 medical doctors who provide Lifeflight services to Manitobans are the ones who raised this—*[interjection]*—

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —because they have grave—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Swan: —concerns about this government's plan to go ahead and privatize Lifeflight. And these

doctors understand what it takes to provide quality service, a service that's been going on for more than 30 years in Manitoba without an incident. The Lifeflight doctors are clear: the minister's opening the door to poor health care for Manitobans who need an air ambulance.

When he meets with them, will he thank them instead of criticizing them, and will he tell them that he'll listen to them and stop this government's plans to privatize Lifeflight?

Mr. Friesen: Let me help out the member for Minto.

Meetings with the Lifeflight doctors took place on May the 11th, May the 17th, June the 6th, June the 19th, June the 23rd, July the 26th and August 24th, as well as September the 26th. But also, we supported the suggestion by Lifeflight doctors that there would be three representative physicians to review and provide input into the specifications for the RFP. We did that, and I'm looking forward to my meeting later this week with Lifeflight doctors to continue the conversation.

Social Housing Units Maintenance Budget

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): Yesterday we demonstrated that the minister's so-called housing construction list included hundreds of housing units that were under construction before they took government. We also showed that spending on maintenance has been cut by \$78 million.

The minister bizarrely suggested that she's cutting the maintenance budget—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Smith: —to address a backlog by a—of deferred maintenance. To paraphrase the minister: She would like to destroy a village in order to save it.

But I'll give the minister another chance in her own words to explain, as my constituents genuinely want to know: How is she going to accomplish much needed upgrades to housing units when she has cut the funding by \$78 million, 68 per cent?

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Families): Again, a litany of false assertions by the member opposite. It seems to continue on a day-to-day basis, Madam Speaker.

But the facts of the matter are that members opposite had 17 years to get it right. They had 17 years to deliver more affordable housing to Manitobans, and they failed.

And where they failed, we are delivering for Manitobans. In fact, we have over 550 new affordable housing units that have been built and are lived in today, Madam Speaker, and we have almost 100–200 more that have been committed to.

So where members opposite failed, we will deliver for Manitobans.

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

Mrs. Smith: They can thank us for those 550 units that Manitobans are living in today.

In this House and in committee, the minister and former minister repeatedly made references to deferred maintenance. Well, the minister will know that we rose to that challenge. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Smith: Our NDP government spent over \$500 million on maintenance upgrades, and what did this government do as soon as they had the chance? *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Smith: They actually cut the maintenance by \$78 million. That's over 62 per cent.

So I'll ask the minister again: Will she stop making things up and, more importantly, will she stop cutting the maintenance budget and commit to building even one more—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, speaking of making things up, Madam Speaker, the member opposite never ceases to amaze me. She makes things up in this House every day when it comes to housing.

But this is a very serious issue. We recognize that for Manitobans, and that's why we are delivering for Manitobans. More than 700 new affordable housing units have been committed to by our government in the last two and a half years. Where members opposite failed, we will succeed for those Manitobans who need affordable housing, when they need it.

Madam Speaker: Just a caution to members to be careful with the language that is being used in the House. We are now moving into some territory that is becoming a little bit close to being unparliamentary, so I would ask for everybody's co-operation, please, to choose your words wisely.

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

Mrs. Smith: I can tell this government that we're listening to Manitobans. Manitobans want housing now—today. Not in two years. Not in five years. Not in 10 years. Today.

Ten years ago, actually, Manitoba Housing did a one-time assessment of needed upgrades. But since that time, \$500 million was spent on upgrades, and thousands of new, affordable and social housing were built by our NDP government.

But now, since this Pallister government took office, this maintenance budget has been cut by \$78 million. Manitoba is falling behind.

I will continue to ask this minister: will she stop making things up and, most importantly, will she cut the maintenance budget and commit to building even one more social—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, the fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that Manitobans wanted affordable housing five years ago. They wanted it 10 years ago. And, in fact, they wanted it 15 and 17 years ago.

Members opposite had the opportunity to do that, to create more affordable housing for Manitobans. Where they failed, we will succeed for Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Just a caution to members, once again, and I shouldn't have to repeat it, but when I urge caution on language, I expect members to be following my caution.

So I would urge members to be very, very careful about the language that they're using in this House, and I'm hoping everybody's going to respect this ruling.

Contaminated Site Cleanup Timeline and Budget

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): Madam Speaker, the Premier has been saying that his green plan includes cleaning up contaminated sites. It's not clear what this is in reference to.

The Climate and Green Plan doesn't seem to make any reference to contaminated sites. The Minister of Sustainable Development's (Ms. Squires) mandate letter makes no mention of it, and there doesn't seem to be any money budgeted to it.

There was a major fire in St. Boniface Industrial Park yesterday, and I want to thank the fire personnel who put out that blaze, which, fortunately, was fuelled by oilseeds, not by anything hazardous. We are all thankful it was not a contaminated site involving hazardous materials, of which there are many in the St. Boniface Industrial Park.

But, again, the only references we've heard of cleaning up these contaminated sites appear to be in the Premier's speeches and in PC marketing materials.

Can the Premier explain what contaminated sites he's talking about, how much money is budgeted to do the job and when they'll be cleaned up?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): I appreciate a question from the member on a Manitoba topic for a change, Madam Speaker, I do.

And I thank him for noticing that we are actually going beyond the initial proposals of a year ago, in terms of making provision to do what the previous government failed to do adequately, which is to take into account the growing costs of cleaning up the messes left by previous operations in respect of contaminated sites. This year we are actually budgeting an additional \$20 million for such cleanup, and Manitoba is proud of its green record.

We're proud to stand for Manitobans, not for Ottawa, in respect of these things.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Second Opposition, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Lamont: I ask the question again.

There are serious concerns about lead and other metal contamination in Weston, in Point Douglas and in St. Boniface. I know that Manitoba Hydro has had a long-standing practice of budgeting to clean up contaminated sites, especially diesel sites up North.

But, frankly, this government does have a credibility problem when it comes to cleaning up contaminated sites. This government did nothing with a lead report it sat on for nearly a year and then acted only when they realized they could attack the NDP.

* (14:40)

And that same report that was released a year ago showed a pattern of not publishing reports into lead contamination going back to the 1980s, which includes the Filmon PC government, of which the Premier was a member. No one was alerted and no

one—nothing was cleaned up. So it would be great to know if these neighbourhoods are eligible for the cleanup.

I will—again, can the Premier be specific about what kind of sites are going to be cleaned up and when?

Mr. Pallister: I do appreciate the member referencing previous work that I have done, because I have actually had a job prior to this one and done some things in the past, and I know that that may leave me open to criticisms, Madam Speaker, but I gladly accept those in the interests of accountability.

I would say to the member, though, that when he tries to lump us in with the NDP, their inaction has actually been the opposite of our ministers' and our government's actions. We've undertaken to do the necessary work and research to pursue progress in cleaning up contaminated sites of various kinds. We'll continue to take such action.

The previous government's inaction has necessitated me saying, Madam Speaker, that they made the mess and we're cleaning it up.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Second Opposition, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Lamont: The problem is that both the PC and NDP governments did plenty of testing in Weston, Point Douglas, St. Boniface and elsewhere, where they found dangerous levels of toxic metals and they did nothing about it for decades.

The unpublished report written under the NDP was filled of references to other unpublished reports written under the PCs which showed neighbourhood and school yards contaminated with dangerous levels of lead, cadmium and copper. Some of that contamination is due to hazardous waste disposal, but in the red tape reduction bill this government is making it easier for existing companies to start up hazardous waste disposables—sites without a new licence, and Bill 8 means there won't be public notices about it.

If the Premier is committed to cleaning up contaminated sites, why is he making it easier for companies to create new ones?

Mr. Pallister: Well, I have to ask the member, who represents Ottawa-west in his perspectives, Madam Speaker; why he would stand behind a federal plan that proposes to exempt diesel, coal produce—production around the country, why he will today be voting for a made-in-Ottawa green plan and against

one that takes responsible action to mitigate against the effects of climate change, that invests in actual action. But that is for the member to explain.

It is for me to say that our minister has taken the concerns of the people of St. Boniface and elsewhere very seriously, acted promptly, has done the necessary air quality testing, has met with the affected people, has done additional soil testing, has shared the results with households, is doing further investigative work into this.

And we are committed, as a government, to cleaning up the mess we inherited from the previous NDP government. The member should applaud this minister for her initiatives in that respect.
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

**Infrastructure Investments
Highways and Programs Budget**

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I have a question for the Premier.

"This government is restraining immediate growth and putting our potential for growth at risk." That's a direct quote, Madam Speaker, from Chris Lorenc and Yvette Milner in today's Free Press; that "it has no multi-year plan for investment in core infrastructure." That's another direct quote.

Madam Speaker, the Pallister government has cut the highways budget every year and all but eliminated the Municipal Road and Bridge Program.

Will he listen to people in the construction industry who say that this government's cuts are hurting the economy?

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Infrastructure): Well, Madam Speaker, I'd like to point out to the member that our government is investing more than—to be very clear—more than \$1 billion in strategic infrastructure. In fact, we are building seven new schools.

The question really is, why is the NDP opposed to seven new schools?

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

**Municipal Road and Bridge Program
Request to Restore Funding**

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): The—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maloway:—Heavy Construction Association will be running with, the next couple of weeks, an advertising campaign explaining how this government has been cutting infrastructure since they've been elected.

This government has consistently refused to ask our questions—answer our questions about the Municipal Road and Bridge Program.

The Pallister government has gutted the program, cutting funding by 84 per cent. Over 80 communities have signed an AMM resolution calling on the Province to reinstate the program.

Will this Premier (Mr. Pallister) actually listen to municipalities and restore the municipal bridge program?

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Infrastructure): Well, after 17 very grim years where, when it came to Freedom Road, not one inch, not one yard and not one mile was ever completed.

Madam Speaker, in a couple more weeks Shoal Lake 40 will have their Freedom Road and it will all be because of the courage of this Premier and this government to get the job done.

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

**Infrastructure Investments
Highways and Programs Budget**

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, Thompson mayor, Colleen Smook, says the harsh impact of the northern climate on infrastructure means that the Province can't afford to cut back on investments in infrastructure.

Of course, that hasn't stopped the government from cutting investments in northern roads, cutting the northern patient transport program, cutting northern airports and seeking to privatize Lifeflight.

When is this Premier going to stop these cuts?

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Infrastructure): Well, Madam Speaker, what we are going to do is commit to Manitobans is—the practice under the NDP, where it was raid the first year, raid the second year, raid the third year, and then the fourth year, parade.

What we are going to provide to the industry and to all Manitobans is sustainable funding, Madam Speaker, and that's what industry is calling for.

St. James Civic Centre Funding for Expansion

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): The St. James Civic Centre is an important hub for Winnipeg's western neighbourhoods. It has been a care—it has been a centre for community gatherings for more than 50 years.

The former NDP administration made over \$600 million worth of project promises but never budgeted for them, including for the St. James senior centre. Smoke and mirrors, Madam Speaker.

Can the Minister of Municipal Relations tell this House how our government is keeping promises to the saint—to St. James seniors?

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): I'd like to thank the member for St. James for that great question.

We know that all the former NDP government did, Madam Speaker, with respect to St. James Civic Centre, was issue press releases during the 2011 and the 2016 provincial elections, and never delivered.

Our PC government keeps its word and has budgeted over \$3.9 million, Madam Speaker, to expand the St. James Civic Centre to support enhanced space for community programming.

Thank you to Connie Newman, Madam Speaker, executive director of Manitoba Association of Senior Centres, and other community members for their tireless work to ensure that this project moves forward.

Madam Speaker, our government has promised to fix the finances and improve the services Manitobans depend on. We are delivering a promise to St. James Civic Centre, to the residents of St. James. We will deliver where they failed—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Lifelight Air Ambulance Privatization Concerns

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, from the very beginning of the government's attempt to privatize the air ambulance, it has been misguided and misfired.

When the government indicated it wanted to privatize this service, it signalled to pilots that there was uncertainty about their future. We now learn that four pilots have left, with the latest being one in September and one in October, and this has

happened because of the uncertainty that this government has created.

Will the government come to its senses and immediately withdraw its misguided attempt to privatize the air ambulance service?

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Well, Madam Speaker, the member seems to be advocating for a moratorium on retirements, but we can't do that, of course, as a government. People will serve the Province and eventually they will leave, for a variety of reasons, one of which is retirement. And so the one point I would acknowledge with the member is that people do eventually leave the employment of the Province.

In this case, of course, what the government is really doing is asking the questions that should always have been asked about whether this is the best preservation of the service in this form. The market will tell us. If it is, we will be confirmed. If it's not, we will examine and take up those opportunities to do better for Manitobans.

Better care sooner for Manitobans—that is our goal.

*(14:50)

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for River Heights, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Gerrard: The service operated well, and so the government wants to break it.

Service is a critical issue for doctors. In 33 years of public service, Manitoba's air ambulance has had no incidents. Since privatizing the air ambulance in Ontario, there have been crashes, including one in which two pilots and two paramedics died. No one wants this to happen here.

Air transport regulations stipulate that a private company cannot land a jet airplane on the short gravel runways which are present in 23 of the communities where air ambulance service is critical and operates. This can mean up to two additional hours in emergency response time.

Will the government come to its senses and immediately withdraw its misguided attempt to privatize the air ambulance service?

Mr. Friesen: Well, the member seems to be saying that government should in no circumstances ever ask questions about value, and we reject that thinking. Madam Speaker, those were the approaches of the former NDP government.

We understand that asking those questions is essential in a system that is becoming more expensive. The member knows that. Aging is becoming an issue, price of drugs, the price of medical remuneration, these are all pressures on our system.

It is exactly by asking questions about that value that we will be able to harness savings and reinvest them in the health-care system to make the investments we want for shorter wait times, and those were the kinds of improvements that the NDP government failed to get and that the attitudes of the member will fail to get as well.

We will take up those opportunities and get that value for all Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for River Heights, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, one of the fundamental principles of good government is that you look at what is working really well and then you leave it and improve it, but don't go in there, as this government is, and mess it up.

We now have all the doctors working with the air ambulance service saying they will quit if the government privatizes the air ambulance. These are doctors with great dedication and great experience. It will not be easy or cheap to replace them with the doctors of similar quality and experience. This is not a sexy job. Getting up in the middle of the night, responding to an emergency, flying to St. Theresa Point or Garden Hill, having to take a boat in the summer or across the ice in the winter in cold blowing weather is not fun.

Will the government come to its senses and immediately withdraw—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Friesen: Well, Madam Speaker, the member for River Heights talks about slower response times, and that might've been an issue in the past, but he understands that new turbo prop technologies are much more approximate to the speeds of current jets. But more than that, had he been paying attention, he would've understood that, in addition, consultation with physicians from the Northern Medical Unit have indicated that delays in triaging and activating the current Lifelight system are much more significant than anything else. And those things could actually be collapsed and be more approximate to what they are in other jurisdictions.

If that member really wanted to stand up and talk about what's important, he could talk about asking Ottawa to be a more full partner for health-care provision in the province of Manitoba. Where they used to give 25 per cent, they'll now give 18 per cent.

We're standing up to get more value for Manitobans, not less.

Northern Manitoba The Pas Health Clinic

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): When this government came into office, they had an opportunity—

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for The Pas?

Ms. Lathlin: Madam Speaker, when this government came into office, they had an opportunity to invest in a new clinic for The Pas that would have saved money for the Northern Patient Transportation Program. Their Premier (Mr. Pallister) just doesn't see the connection between investment and savings, and so he cancelled that clinic.

The new clinic would have expanded northern health care and provided treatment for people in their own communities. It would've meant that fewer people would've had to travel to Winnipeg, producing savings for this government. The former Health minister even acknowledged this fact in Estimates on April 26th—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): While I did not hear a question, I did hear the member reference the issue of investments in the North.

Let me tell you about some of those investments under our government in just two and a half years: investments in Flin Flon for the hospital; investments for a new replacement of air conditioning systems, new defibrillators; direct digital controls upgrades; surgical table upgrades; and, of course, let's not forget the new emergency development—or department development for the Flin Flon General Hospital.

Madam Speaker, in just two and a half years more than \$28 million of new investments to the northern regional health authority. Better care sooner is our plan for all Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

PETITIONS

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 closures 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 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 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 north Winnipeg who visit the emergency room frequently, especially 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 closing of their emergency room or to consult with health-care officials and health-care workers at Seven Oaks general—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 the 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.

And this is signed by Josh Brandon, Reyburt Cabayan [*phonetic*], Yira Claywork [*phonetic*] and many, many other Manitobans.

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

Vimy Arena

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): I'd like to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to the 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 site as a Manitoba Housing project.

(2) The Vimy Arena site is in the middle of a residential area near many schools, churches, community clubs and senior homes, and neither the provincial government nor the City of Winnipeg 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 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 has no role to play in the land acquisition for this Manitoba Housing project for use as a drug addiction facility.

* (15:00)

(5) The Manitoba Housing project initiated by the provincial government has changed—or 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 are not being properly addressed.

(6) The concerns of the residents of St. James are being ignored while other obvious 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 site.

(7) The Manitoba Housing project and the operation of a drug treatment centre 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. The land is being transferred for a 50-bed facility even though the project clearly falls outside of Manitoba Housing responsibility.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure that the Vimy Arena site is not used for an addiction treatment facility.

(2) To urge the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure the preservation of public 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 the Sturgeon Creek ecosystem under the current designation of PR2 for the 255 Hamilton Ave. location at the Vimy Arena site, and to maintain the land to be continued to be designated for parks and recreation active neighbourhoods and community.

Madam Speaker, this has been signed by Ray Plett, Marilyn [*phonetic*] Friesen and Bill—or Kristyn Witherspoon and many other Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Further petitions?

Gender Neutrality

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Manitoba—to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

Gender, sexuality and gender identity are protected characteristics of human rights, both federally and provincially, in Manitoba, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia, and soon will be in Saskatchewan, Yukon and other places in Canada. These governments have realized the need for this

option on identification for the benefit of people who identify—who are identified by others as intersex, third gender, transgender, genderqueer or non-binary.

Identification and government documents should reflect gender neutrality to prevent issues that may arise from intentional bias on gender and misgendering.

The people described above face anxiety and discrimination in many aspects of day-to-day life, such as interactions with health-care professionals, interactions with persons of authority, accessing government services, applying for employment.

Gender neutrality describes the idea that policies, language and the other social institutions should avoid distinguishing roles according to people's sex or gender in order to avoid discrimination arising from impressions that there are social roles for which one gender is more suited than the other.

Many newcomers to Canada may already have gender-neutral ID. Many indigenous persons are coming to identify as two-spirit as the effects of colonization are lessening, and this needs to be addressed in the process of reconciliation.

Being forced to accept an assigned gender affects children and newborns as they grow and become part of society. There are many psychological benefits for transgender and non-binary people to be allowed to develop without the constraints put upon them by having their gender assigned based on purely physical attributes.

The consideration to have a third option like X or Other on documents was on the previous provincial government's radar for several years, but the current provincial government has not taken steps to implement it.

The City of Winnipeg is actively making its forms reflective of gender neutrality in respect to all persons who work for or come into contact with that government.

The federal government now issues passports and is educating personnel about the correct language and references for non-binary persons. An Other option existed on enumeration forms for Elections Manitoba in 2016, was easily accepted and provided a framework to provide accurate statistics of those who do not identify under the current binary system.

The foresight, along with training and making changes on required forms, acknowledges and accepts person who falls outside the binary gender so that governments and people can more effectively interact with one another and reduce the anxieties of everyone involved.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the provincial government to immediately begin implementation of plans to convert systems and forms to be more inclusive of two-spirit and other non-binary individuals, whether it be to include a third gender option or no requirement for gender on forms unless medically or statistically necessary, including health cards and birth certificates.

(2) To urge the provincial government to immediately instruct the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation to offer a third gender option or no gender requirement for licences or any other forms of provincial identification.

(3) To urge the provincial government to instruct Manitoba Health, Seniors and Active Living to offer the option of Manitoba Health cards with no gender in order to reduce the anxieties of transgender and non-binary persons accessing the health-care system as a first step.

(4) To consider revisiting legislation that may need updating to meet the needs of its citizens in this regard.

Signed by Erica Pastetnik, Carrie Mastrangelo, Fleur Mann and many others.

Madam Speaker: Grievances?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): Madam Speaker, on House business.

Madam Speaker: On House business.

Mr. Pedersen: First, I am informing the House that I do not wish to proceed with my sixth report stage amendment on Bill 16, and I would ask that it be removed from the list of amendments to be considered later today.

And, secondly, in accordance with rule 139(11), I am requesting that, where possible, you combine the debate and the questions on the report stage amendments on Bill 16 listed on the Order Paper in my name.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the honourable Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade will not be proceeding with his sixth report stage amendment on Bill 16, and I will remove it from the list of amendments to be considered later today.

Regarding the minister's request to combine the debates and questions on his proposed amendments to Bill 16, his second, third and fourth report stage amendments meet the criteria of similar content and position in the bill, and I will be grouping them for debate and for putting the questions.

I will note that there will only be debate on these report stage amendments if they are called prior to 4 p.m. today, after which point I would be putting the questions without debate.

For the information of the House, on these amendments we will proceed as follows: (1) the member will move his first amendment individually, which will then be debated and resolved; (2) the member will then move his second, third and fourth amendment separately and consecutively; (3) I will put each one back to the House in turn; (4) there will then be one debate covering the combined amendments; (5) when that debate concludes, I will put one question to the House covering all three of those amendments; and (6) the member will then move his fifth amendment individually, and they will be debated and resolved separately.

House Business

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): On House business, I'd like to announce a change to the items under consideration for the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs meeting on Wednesday, November 28th, 2018, at 6 p.m.

It was previously announced that the committee would consider the report on activities of the commission of elections. However, this report is not included in the annual report of Elections Manitoba, and The Elections Act does not mandate for its referral to committee. Accordingly, the committee is not able to consider that report and it will be removed from the notice.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced by the honourable Government House Leader, a change to the items under consideration for the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs meeting on Wednesday, November 28th, 2018, at 6 p.m.

It was previously announced that the committee would consider the report on the activities of the Commissioner of Elections. However, this report is not included in the annual report of Elections Manitoba, and The Elections Act does not mandate for its referral to committees. Accordingly, the committee is not able to consider that report and it will be removed from the notice.

* * *

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, would you please call for concurrence and third readings this afternoon of Bill 29, Bill 223, Bill 35 and Bill 36.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the House will consider the following this afternoon: concurrence and third reading of bills 29, 223, 35 and 36.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

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

Madam Speaker: Moving, then, to the first one: Bill 29, concurrence and third reading of Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management).

*(15:10)

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Eichler), that Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management); Loi modifiant la loi sur la conservation de la faune (pratiques de chasse sécuritaires et gestion intégrée de la faune), reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Squires: Our government's No. 1 concern always will be the safety of Manitobans. That is why we introduced this bill, which carefully balances indigenous hunting rights with the public safety of all Manitobans. And I look forward to the passage of this bill in this Chamber this week.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on this bill?

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): It is a privilege to put a few words on record as we debate Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management).

This bill declaring a ban on night hunting should be looked at in a much, much bigger picture. This bill proposed is an infringement upon treaty rights, including mine. Once again, I am here as a First Nations woman, Treaty No. 2697, from Opaskwayak Cree Nation, formerly known as The Pas Indian Band.

My late mother is also a treaty, from James Smith Cree Nation, near Melfort, Saskatchewan. My treaty roots, my ancestors are extended in two provinces across Canada, our traditional lands.

In regards to consultation and consensus, instead of legislation, indigenous and non-indigenous people can and should be—should live alongside with one another respectfully and engage in meaningful conversations to identify resolutions to identified issues. First Nations and Metis hunters, like any other, stand to benefit from a healthy game population in Manitoba and safe measures of hunting that game. 'Indigenous' people also want safe and sustainable hunting practices, and meaningful consultations are essential to the success of changing hunting culture in this province.

If safety, ethics and animal welfare are the real concern, then the government should be working 'co-operally' with First Nations to ensure they reach the end goal without impending on treaty rights. First Nation Canadians have the right to hunt for food at night, a right protected by the Constitution Act of 1982 which—provided it is done safely and under certain conditions.

Legislation is heavy handed. Instead of antagonizing people with it, it would help to consult in a collaborative and meaningful way to establish an agreement that favours all parties. But, Madam Speaker, this is clearly something that the govern has not done.

Many First Nations appear to be unsupportive of this current bill. The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs' Grand Chief Arlen Dumas told reporters consultation with indigenous people is far from finished. It's barely started. There's—has to be meaningful conversation, Dumas said. I wouldn't call it a bill yet; it's just a recommendation.

Reasonable voices get crowded out by this government's inflammatory comments like the race war. Comments like these hinder the development of disrespectful—development of respectful relationships with First Nations and reconciliation efforts. There needs to be a meaningful dialogue between the government and First Nations to come up with reasonable solutions that are safe and sustainable.

In addition to this, indigenous hunters—indigenous people have a right protected by the Constitution Act of 1982 to hunt animals for food at night, provided it's done safely and meets certain conditions, including that the hunting is done on reserves, unoccupied Crown land or private land with permission. However, this legislation would come without proper consultation with indigenous people. Well, in fact, you may as well say no consultation about this issue, which is a constitutional obligation.

It is very difficult to practically separate the duty to consult and accommodate, because consultation may lead to the fulfillment of the duty to accommodate. The broad purpose of this duty to consult and accommodate is the objective of reconciliation of pre-existing Aboriginal societies and the assertion of Crown sovereignty. In other words, it's a fiduciary duty to consult indigenous people.

SCO Grand Chief stated, I quote: the use of the phrase shared management in the bill is misleading. In substance, the bill merely proposes to create recommendation committees. This is a complete failure to accommodate calls for negotiations with First Nations on a true shared-management regime on wildlife hunting.

His statement truly exemplifies that treaties are made between nations to nations, and should be honoured that way.

Once again, just recently, the SCO Grand Chief Jerry Daniels expressed his concerns again on behalf of the Anishinabe and the Dakota, that this government needs to learn that there is a difference between hunting activities. There's hunting for sport, and hunting for food.

I can tell you I come from a large community of OCN where we have families that go hunting. And whatever they bring home, it is absolutely shared with families, especially when there's wakes and funerals going on. The meat is donated with their families and with the community, which is always an

honour that—when they're hunters, and you can just see the pride on their faces when they're able to do so with their community.

The minister stated that, I quote: we understand our constitutional responsibility and we take that responsibility very serious. End quote. I have to disagree. As a critic for Indigenous and Northern Relations, and as a treaty First Nation woman, I have witnessed the complete opposite. This was truly demonstrated in committees, where many, many First Nations came forward with their concerns and stating facts that there was no consultations whatsoever.

I just wanted to go on with—to quote, once again, an actual constitutional that clearly states what consultation with Aboriginal people is. I need to clearly put on quote what section 35 is. It is the existing Aboriginal and treaty rights of Aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed, and (2) in this act, Aboriginal peoples of Canada includes the Inuit, Indian and Metis peoples of Canada. (3) For greater certainty in subsection 1, treaty rights includes rights that now exist by way of land claim agreements or may be so required. Finally, (4) notwithstanding from any other provision of this act, the Aboriginal treaty rights referred to in subsection 1 are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

I just wanted to go on with what I truly think. What overshadows this Bill 29, as an Aboriginal woman, is the comments that were made by the Premier (Mr. Pallister). Whenever Bill 29 is mentioned, all I can think about were the comments that he made regarding Aboriginal people.

Comments such as—oh, I lost my space, just give me a moment please—that Aboriginal people who practice this night hunting, it was truly disturbing when the Premier said that most likely, these indigenous men have criminal records.

* (15:20)

And I just want to let you know that during my journey here to MLA for the Pas, I had to overcome many, many acts of racism, discrimination, and also live within that stereotype which I believe the Premier enforced with those comments. It is my—I feel like it's my duty here as MLA to sit and inform this whole House as we still deserve an apology from the Premier regarding these remarks.

In fact, I was interviewed regarding these remarks while I was setting up my apartment here in Winnipeg with my daughters, and it was just absolutely sad that I had to be interviewed by these comments by the leader of our province. Here I am sitting with my daughters who I am trying to raise to be proud, proud First Nations women, not to be ashamed as to who they are.

And also, like I said, I felt sorry for my daughters. I went through a lifetime as a First Nation woman facing barriers, discrimination and accepting defeat as those stereotypes of how our society has labelled us as just Indians.

However, today in 2018, Deputy Speaker, I am, along with our Aboriginal communities—are still living with those stereotypes casted upon us as Indians. Like I said before, the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) comments about our indigenous hunters fed those 'vario' stereotypes that I as a mother, an aunt—I'm trying to protect all my four daughters from. And I'm sure you can understand with your two beautiful children as well.

We are in the era of reconciliation of our country. This action from our Premier took us a few huge steps backwards in honouring and recognition of what reconciliation means for everyone in our province, in our country.

In fact, with the truth and reconciliation 94 recommendations, I hear as a—I was a Native Studies student at U of M, graduating 2003. It was not until I went to university that I started hearing about our huge steps forward in our political movement as an Aboriginal person, because like I said, my esteem as an Aboriginal person before that education, it was pretty low, you know, being called a dirty Indian, a squaw, was pretty demeaning. But until the power and the tool of education empowered me to know that I'm not like that, and to understand and learn what residential schools were all about. Where I come from, three generations of women who attended. And also to learn about, again, our political movement which installed pride within myself. My dad was chief of Opaskwayak Cree Nation by then.

And I just wanted to tell you that being in this House, I believe it was in 2015 when the recommendations were brought forward. It was something to be very honoured to witness especially being within the House with these recommendations coming forward. I never thought as my days of a university student that we would ever come to this

day and actually hear what the 94 recommendations were. I actually had the opportunity to sit and listen twice to the honourable Murray Sinclair regarding TRC and the journey to these recommendations.

So, like I said, cultural awareness was one the recommendations under the TRC, and I truly believe that one of the recommendations was cultural awareness for government employees should be mandatory. Well, I would like to see that perhaps that this cultural awareness should be applied also to elected—all elected officials as well.

And I just want to end with my comments on Bill 29. Like I said, the Premier's comments to me overshadows what this debate is about. And I just want to add a PS to my debate that—to the Premier, that it's the beauty about apologies that it's never too late to apologize.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there any other further speakers?

Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Liberal Party and the Liberal caucus have opposed this bill. There are too many assumptions that are in this bill without enough evidence. And there are many aspects of this bill that we believe are actually dangerously wrong, because one of the premises is that animals are being hunted to death and that that is the reason why we're seeing a drop-off in the number of moose and other species, but also that it's a specific group of people who are responsible for this, when there are actually far greater issues at play.

We all want people to be safe. And, instead of building bridges and recognizing what indigenous communities and First Nations and other communities across rural and northern Manitoba have in common, this bill drives a wedge between communities. I've travelled rural Manitoba, I've travelled northern Manitoba, and one of the things that strikes me about both First Nations and small towns—and no matter—almost no matter where you go—is they all feel abandoned to some degree. They all feel that they've been left behind. In the case of First Nations, very much, it's neglect on the part of the—of a federal responsibility for many—sometimes for years, sometimes for decades.

But there's also been that sense of a retreat on the part of government and sometimes even of the law from other communities. And it's really unfortunate, because I think we have an opportunity

to reconcile, and we have an opportunity to recognize that First Nations and other communities nearby have an opportunity to work together and that there's a huge amount that they have in common in terms of common interests, in 'sterms' of stewardship of the land.

Now, it's extremely difficult is that—because a lot of the justifications for this bill basically are wrong, that when you talk about the realities that indigenous people face and the issues that many northern residents face, is that they're actually hunting not for sport, but they're hunting for—they're hunting to feed their families.

And one of the things that people have found is that they'll sometimes find a moose carcass with its head cut off, and that's not—that's somebody—that's a trophy hunter who's at work. That's somebody who's coming in and shooting a moose, taking the head and leaving without—leaving the rest of the carcass to rot. That is not something that's been happening—that's not to blame anyone, but whoever did it is a trophy hunter.

But there is a real problem in a whole bunch of numbers that there were issues that we need to deal with. For example, I mean, one of the ideas is that they've presented the idea that this night hunting, or bullet holes are through people's barns—look, it's incredibly dangerous; it's something to be worried about, but the question of whether there's actually any evidence that, say, night hunting on the part—there seems to be this connection or conflation of First Nations and night hunting and bullets through barns, which are—where it's—or there's an assumption there without evidence.

Only 17 per cent of Manitoba's entire population is indigenous, 40 per cent of which live here in Winnipeg, making about 3.5 per cent of Manitoba's indigenous population who live in our more rural areas.

And there was—I understood there was a quote—the Premier (Mr. Pallister) was quoted in the media saying young indigenous men—a preponderance of them are offenders with criminal records—are going off shooting guns in the middle of the night. That is a really terrible thing to say. I know that the Premier has walked back those comments, but if you contrast that with conservation officer, Sean Bouvier [*phonetic*], who told CBC News who's—and said that when it came to hunting or people shooting off guns in the middle of the night, quote: It's everybody, all different segments. Whether you have a record, don't

have a record, go to church on Sunday, it doesn't matter.

And this is—it's a—it's really terrible to sort of reinforce these divisions, because when it comes to, you know, anecdotes and pictures of dead livestock and bullet holes in—holes in houses, there's zero data to report the claim that these incidents were necessarily caused by indigenous people.

The government has also used 44 charges in 2016, but the fact is that, if those people were already charged, it means that what they were doing is already illegal. So, in a sense that—we're making something that's already illegal yet more illegal.

And—but the other is that, when it comes to things like declining moose populations, we have a serious issue where it's not simply a question of overhunting or people taking too much and not letting the population revive.

One of the major issues is that Manitoba hasn't had a new management—land management policy in over 50 years. This is something we spoke with KAP—we spoke with the Keystone Agricultural Producers about, because one of the fundamental problems with wildlife and habitat management in Manitoba for farmers is that we are, as KAP put it, still in pioneer days where we bulldoze forests and clear the land in order to make it—to use as much of it as possible without leaving wilderness behind.

* (15:30)

So this is a worldwide problem in terms of the expansion of agriculture, and we have to recognize there needs to be a balance between our agricultural communities and making a profit, and also having wilderness where wild populations can actually eat. Because that—we've seen that expansion everywhere, huge expansions in terms of farming and livestock and, ultimately, what it means is that if we are—if we're seeding the ground to feed ourselves and feed our livestock, it means that's space and that's food that is not going to food—to feed wild populations.

And there still is the challenge in terms of consultations. This is a bill—and we're also opposing this bill because First Nations have made it very clear to us that they don't support this bill. He'd—it's—part of it is just that the provincial government is trying to regulate an area which is outside of their jurisdiction—that these are constitutional rights.

There is a way to achieve these—to achieve or regulate this, but it starts with discussing it with the

leadership of the communities and letting them self regulate, which would be the appropriate path to take.

Instead, I think we have an intrusion of provincial jurisdiction into an area where it doesn't belong, and it's been quite clear both Grand Chief Arlen Dumas of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and Grand Chief Jerry Daniels both stated they were not properly consulted in regards to this bill.

And, again, one of the most important issues to First Nations is the simplest and easiest to grant, which is the ability to have their voices heard.

Hunting could be safer. We could—we would support education and partnerships with First Nations and making hunting safer for everyone. And even in the consultations, I spoke with my colleague, the member from Kewatinook, who said, you know, people know that hunting at night can be dangerous, but so is being a metal worker which has the highest death rate of any profession in Manitoba, but people don't stop metal workers from supporting their families.

And one of the things about night hunting is that, again, it's not hunting for sport; it's hunting so that people can feed their families.

At the bill's briefing, colleagues that were present talked about some great ideas that were in the 'pross' of being implemented. They had great ideas for safety light hunting—sorry, daylight hunting.

But the problem is is that when employees don't stray from what the Premier (Mr. Pallister) is trying to achieve, those employees shortly afterwards tend to be conveniently out of a job.

It—this is a—it's an—this is—it's clear that this is a very serious issue, but it also—it crosses over into a whole series of other important issues related to the environment, related to the need for more wilderness and to preserve spaces so that we have wild populations for everyone to share, so that we're—and that we're working together with First Nations in a way that's productive and that we're working and trying to find ways in which we have commonalities.

And that's—I'll just briefly read, if I could, from the submission of Pine Creek First Nation, and they said they wanted to address some of the very specific issues.

One was the idea that First Nation hunters are routinely shooting bullets through the night into farmhouses damaging property and causing lives to

be lost, when in truth the evidence of this is uncertain, to say the least. First Nation hunters—the idea that First Nation hunters are the main reason for species loss, when in truth there is zero evidence of this. In contrast, the evidence suggests the animals are being starved due to inadequate wilderness habitat.

The idea that Bill 29 creates a shared management process, when in truth the bill pays lip service to the idea of shared management and leaves all the powers in the hand of the federal—I'm sorry, the provincial government.

And the idea in this case specifically from Pine Creek First Nation, that they were duly consulted, when in truth the engagement with Pine Creek First Nation was inadequate. And that's from councillor Cindy McKay and Jeremy [phonetic] McKay, councillor and member of Pine Creek First Nation.

So I do think that there are a whole series of very profound problems with this bill. Fundamentally, I—it's flawed both in its application. I think that the Province is existentially out of line in trying to apply a jurisdiction in the jurisdiction that does not—and that, unfortunately, I think this is a bill which serves to divide and reinforce some very dangerous ideas that really need to be challenged about relationships between the many diverse peoples in our province.

I think it's unfortunate and I could ask with the great hope that the members of the government side would all vote against it, but, failing that, the Manitoba Liberals certainly will.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there any other speakers?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is the concurrence and third reading of Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management).

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear no.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Andrew Swan (Acting Official Opposition House Leader): Recorded vote, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Order.

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management).

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Allum, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 35, Nays 12.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now we'll continue on to concurrence and third reading on Bill 35, The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of

Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands). Oh [*interjection*] 223. Okay, sorry. Okay.

**CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS—
PUBLIC BILLS****Bill 223—The Child and Family Services
Amendment Act**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now we'll go on to concurrence and third reading on Bill 223, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act.

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): Miigwech, Deputy Speaker.

I move, seconded by the member from The Pas, that Bill 223, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act, be reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (15:50)

Mrs. Smith: Gives me great honour to rise in this House today to speak to Bill 223. This is something that's been a long time coming. Our families, our children deserve this. We have over 11,000 kids in care.

This is going to be a game changer for our families, for our kids. It's going to mean strong investments to help keep our families together. And I want to acknowledge some of our families in the gallery today.

I want to acknowledge Matthew Shorting. Matthew grew up his whole life pretty much in care and had the opportunity to come back to Winnipeg to find his birth mother and spend some time with her before she passed away. But, had this bill been in place, you know, when he was apprehended, perhaps his life would have been different. Perhaps he would have had more time with his mom.

You know, and I just send my love to you, and Matthew's here supporting today because he knows that this is going to make a difference for families. He works with families on the front lines, and he sees—and he knows the impact that this is going to have.

I want to acknowledge Vanessa Roulette who's also here with us today who's—who just—she just had a visit with her daughter last week and she's been struggling to get her daughter back. And, had this bill

been in place, again, she would have had her daughter living with her. So I cry with you today. And I cry with all my families that won't have to go through this because of this bill.

I want to acknowledge Marlene as well, Marlene DeLaronde, who's here with us, who also is working to get her children back from being in care. And, you know, it's been a struggle for our families that don't see that our way of life is our norm, that it isn't maybe their norm.

You know, I grew up in two bedrooms. I had two other siblings. We shared a bedroom. Often we had our mattress in the living room on the floor and we had friends over, and there were, you know, five, six of us sleeping on that mattress.

You know, and if someone would've come into our house and saw that, they would've probably apprehended us. But that's our norm. That's how we live. We're comfortable with that. That's our choice, to live like that.

And it shouldn't be someone coming into our house deciding that our kids need their own bed, that our kids need their own bedroom, that they don't have enough in the—food in the house, that their kids are going to school without boots on their feet or warm jackets.

I also want to acknowledge Laverne Contois who just retired this year from being a social worker, and, you know, she's also spoken about the impact that this is going to have for our families here in Manitoba and that, you know, she's shared some stories about some of the work that they've done in Little Black River that they were working towards not apprehending kids due to poverty. And this is going to ensure that this happens right across Manitoba, not just in communities that are choosing to do it.

I was just at a meeting and I was speaking with some of our child protection workers from Peguis, and, you know, they're doing the best they can to support our families.

And this bill is going to ensure that our families are kept together, that supports are put into place so that our families don't have to be torn apart.

We know that kids that are in care often end up being homeless. I spent some time in care as a youth, and, you know, I wasn't taken from my family, but my mom had signed for me to go into care because I was making some bad choices. And, you know, they

didn't try to keep me. What they did was they put in supports into my home. They brought in a support worker that worked with my mom. They worked with me. And a lot of the things that happened to me as a child could have been prevented had there been supports sooner, you know.

And this is going to ensure that our families get those supports that they need and that, you know, families aren't having to go do things that they wouldn't normally do to feed their kids, to ensure that they're getting the best that they can.

And parents are just doing the best they can. They're, you know, working, often, one or two jobs, their kids—trying to provide for their families.

And, you know, I just—I want to uplift our speakers that also came and spoke to committee: Manoj Nowrang, who also was a kid in care that grew up and, you know, lived a horrific life in care and spoke to this bill and said how, if that had been in place, he wouldn't have had to experience the physical and the sexual abuse that he experienced while living in foster care.

I also want to uplift the work that Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata is doing around family unification and, you know, making sure that families are a part of conferencing, and that it's just not foster parents, but it's about bringing everyone together.

So I want to also thank my colleagues here today for supporting this bill, and, you know, this is going to mean a lot to our Manitoba families, so I thank you. Miigwech.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) for bringing this forward. It is an important bill. When I was first elected in 1999, I was told that about a third of the families didn't need to be in care because it was just an issue of social circumstances and poverty that could've been helped.

By over 19 years it was very frustrating that this was never adequately addressed and so that we ended up with about 11,000 kids in care, and probably about 85 per cent of them on the basis of neglect, and many of those due to social and economic circumstances.

There needs to be, clearly, from the government's side, a plan to support families who are in difficult economic and social circumstances, so that when you have a child not coming into care, there

needs to be an alternative that needs to be 'vigorative'—vigorous and strong.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

I thank the member for Point Douglas and hope that we can pass this through.

An Honourable Member: Question.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 223, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act.

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

I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Acting Official Opposition House Leader): Is there leave to agree that this was passed unanimously this afternoon?

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to agree that this was passed unanimously? [*Agreed*]

It has been passed unanimously.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

(Continued)

Bill 35—The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands)

Madam Speaker: We will now move to the next bill, Bill 35, The Crown Lands Amendment Act.

Hon. Ralph Eichler (Minister of Agriculture): I move, seconded by the member of Sustainable Development, that Crown Lands Amendment Act, and reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred and be now read for a third time and passed.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Eichler), seconded by the honourable Minister for Sustainable Development, that Bill 35, The Crown Lands Amendment Act (Improved Management of Community Pastures and Agricultural Crown Lands), reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Eichler: Question, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I want to put a few words on the

record. This is a significant bill. There was quite a bit of discussion at the committee stage. There is support, clearly, from organizations like the Keystone Agricultural Producers and the beef producers. There is clearly some concern about how the situation will address and help young people.

And I was disturbed in reading through the notes of what happened at committee that although that question was raised, the Minister of Agriculture didn't have an answer in terms of how he was going to make sure that young farmers were supported. So I'm hopeful that the minister will come forward—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The time being—when the matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 29 minutes remaining.

* (16:00)

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Madam Speaker: The time being 4 p.m., I am now interrupting debate to put the question on the remaining report stage amendments without further debate or amendment on the following designated bills: Bill 8, the two remaining amendments from the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Lamont); and Bill 16, the amendments from the honourable Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade (Mr. Pedersen) and for the honourable member for River Heights, in that order.

The House will not adjourn until all applicable questions have been put. If there are any applicable report stage amendments that have yet to be moved, the member bringing the report stage amendment forward will move the motion but with no debate.

I will now call on the honourable minister—oh.

Bill 8—The Government Notices Modernization Act (Various Acts Amended)

Madam Speaker: I will now call on the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition to bring forward his amendment on clause 12 and Bill 8.

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

THAT Bill 8 be amended by striking out Clause 12.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

* (17:00)

Order, please.

The question before the House is the sixth report stage amendment of Bill 8 related to clause 12, brought forward by the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Lamont).

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 15, Nays 34.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will now move and call report stage amendment on Bill 8, clause 13, brought

forward by the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition.

Mr. Lamont: I move, seconded by the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard),

THAT Bill 8 be amended by striking out Clause 13.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Gerrard: Yes, a recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

* (17:50)

The question before the House is the seventh report stage amendment to Bill 8 related to clause 13, brought forward by the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Friesen, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere,

Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley Lecomte, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith (Southdale), Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Deputy Clerk: Yeas 15, Nays 34.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* (18:00)

Bill 16—The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act

Madam Speaker: We will now move to report stage amendments, to Bill 16, The Climate and Green Plan Implementation Act.

I will now call on the honourable Minister for Growth, Enterprise and Trade to move the report stage amendment to clause 3 of Bill 16.

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): I move, second by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Eichler),

THAT Bill 16 be amended by striking out Clause 3 of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act).

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The amendment—the report stage amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

I declare the—the honourable member for Concordia.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Deputy Official Opposition House Leader): Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

* (19:00)

Order, please.

The question before the House is the first report stage amendment to Bill 16, brought forward by the honourable Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 34, Nays 15.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to moving on with further amendments, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the Speaker's gallery where we have with us today Malachi and Kim Goertzen, the son and wife of the honourable Minister of Education, and Lorne Korol, Chris Randle and Matthias Goossen with the Winnipeg Blue Bombers Football Club.

We'd like to welcome you to the Manitoba Legislature and thank you for giving us a little bit of a fun break at the moment by welcoming you here, and the next time the bells ring for an hour maybe everybody can go throw a football around in the rotunda or something, have a lesson from the Bombers. So welcome to the Manitoba Legislative Assembly.

Madam Speaker: And, as previously announced, we will now consider the honourable Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade's (Mr. Pedersen) second, third, and fourth report stage amendments.

I will first recognize the minister to move his next three amendments.

Mr. Pedersen: I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Eichler),

THAT Bill 16 be amended by striking out Schedule B (The Industrial Greenhouse Gas Emissions Control and Reporting Act).

I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture,

THAT Bill 16 be amended by striking out Schedule D (The Income Tax Amendment Act).

And I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture,

THAT Bill 16 be amended by striking out Schedule E (The Fuel Tax Act).

Motions presented.

* (19:10)

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendments are in order.

The question before the House is the honourable Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade's second, third and fourth report stage amendments to Bill 16, striking out schedules B, D and E respectfully.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendments, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

* (20:10)

Order, please.

The question before the House is the second, third and fourth report stage amendments to Bill 16, striking out schedules B, D and E, respectively.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Lamont, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 32, Nays 11.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendments carried.

Madam Speaker: I will now call on the honourable Minister for Growth, Enterprise and Trade to move the report stage amendment to clauses 2, 4 and 5 of Bill 16.

Mr. Pedersen: I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture,

THAT Bill 16 be amended by striking out Clauses 2, 4 and 5 between the enacting clause of the Bill and Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act).

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Ms. Fontaine: A recorded vote please, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

* (21:00)

The question before the House is the fifth report stage amendment to Bill 16 striking out clauses 2—I'll just start that again.

The question before the House is the fifth report stage amendment to Bill 16 striking out clauses 2, 4 and 5, brought forward by the honourable Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade (Mr. Pedersen).

Order.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Clerk: Yeas 33, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will now move to the next set of amendments, and I would just indicate to you that the honourable member for River Heights had

previously requested to have his report stage amendments to Bill 16 grouped for debate where possible. Seeing as we are now past 4 p.m. and our rules no longer allow debate on these amendments, we will be considering them in chronological order.

The honourable member for River Heights, to move his first amendment.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the MLA for Burrows,

That Bill 16 be amended by adding the following clause after Clause 2(1) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act):

Required content in the climate and green plan 2(1.1) The climate and green plan must include

- (a) targets and time lines for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, removing greenhouse gas from the atmosphere and increasing the storage of greenhouse gas in Manitoba;
- (b) a research plan for improved monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions, the removal of greenhouse gas from the atmosphere, and greenhouse gas storage; and
- (c) programs, policies and measures to make electric vehicle charging stations available across Manitoba.

Motion presented.

* (21:20)

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion the Nays have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Recorded Vote

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Second Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

The question before the House is the report stage amendment on Bill 16, amending the following clause after clause 2.1 of schedule A, The Climate and Green Plan Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Nays

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

Clerk: Yeas 13, Nays 33.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: I will now call on the honourable member for River Heights to move his report stage amendment on Bill 16 related to clause 6(1).

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I move, seconded by the MLA for Burrows,

THAT Bill 16 be amended by replacing Clause 6(1) in Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) with the following:

Quarterly and annual reports on climate and green plan

6(1) The minister must prepare quarterly and annual reports on the programs, policies and measures used

to implement the climate and green plan during that quarter or year.

Greenhouse gas updates and forecast in a quarterly report

A quarterly report must include an update on greenhouse gas emissions, reduction and storage during the quarter, and a forecast for the next annual report of greenhouse gas emissions, reduction and storage.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), seconded by the honourable member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux),

THAT Bill 16 be amended by replacing Clause 6(1) in Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) with the following:

Quarterly and annual reports on climate and green plan

6(1) The minister must prepare quarterly and annual reports on the programs, policies and measures used to implement the climate and green plan during that quarter or year.

Greenhouse gas updates and forecast in a quarterly report

6(1.1) A quarterly report must include an update on greenhouse gas emissions, reduction and storage during the quarter, and a forecast for the next annual report of greenhouse gas emissions, reduction and storage.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

Order, please. Could I just ask members that when the pages are counting their votes or recording the votes, that everybody listen carefully and quietly, because it's very distracting for the pages and it's easy for them to get pulled off the mark.

So I would ask please if everybody could remain silent while they're calling out names.

The question before the House is report stage amendment on Bill 16 related to clause 6(1).

* (21:30)

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Nays

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

Clerk: Yeas 13, Nays 33.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: I will now call on the honourable member for River Heights to move the report stage amendment to clause 6(3) on Bill 16.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I move, seconded by the MLA for Burrows,

THAT Bill 16 be amended—be amended by adding the following after Clause 6(3) in Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act):

Greenhouse gas update in annual report

6(3.1) The annual report must include a report on the amount of greenhouse gas emitted during the year and the amount of greenhouse gas removed or stored in accordance with the plan during the year.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for River Heights, seconded by the honourable member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux),

THAT Bill 16 be amended by adding the following after Clause 6(3) in Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act):

Greenhouse gas update in annual report

6(3.1) The annual report must include a report on the amount of greenhouse gas emitted during the year and the amount of greenhouse gas removed or stored in accordance with the plan during the year.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Second Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

The question before the House is the report stage amendment on Bill 16 related to clause 6(3).

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Nays

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Friesen, Goertzen, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Martin,

Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith (Southdale), Smook, Squires, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Clerk: Yeas 13, Nays 33.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: I will now call on the honourable member for River Heights to move the report stage amendment on clause 6(4) of Bill 16.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the MLA for Burrows, *THAT Bill 16 be amended by adding the following after Clause 6(4) in Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act):*

Electric vehicle charging stations

6(4.1) The annual report must include a report on the current status of programs, policies and measures for electric vehicle charging stations in Manitoba.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Second Opposition House Leader): Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

The question before the House is the report stage amendment on Bill 16 related to clause 6(4).

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Nays

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

* (21:40)

Clerk: Yeas 13, Nays 33.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: I will now call on the honourable member for River Heights to move the report stage amendment on Bill 16 related to clause 6(7).

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I move, seconded by the MLA for Burrows,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 6(7) of Schedule A (The Climate and Green Plan Act) by striking out "the annual report" and substituting "a quarterly or annual report".

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Second Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

The question before the House is the report stage amendment to Bill 16 related to clause 6(7).

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Smith (Point Douglas), Swan.

Nays

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

Clerk: Yeas 13, Nays 33.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The hour being after 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 6, 2018

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Tabling of Reports		Infrastructure Investments	
Driedger	4103	Maloway	4118
		Schuler	4118
Ministerial Statements		St. James Civic Centre	
Approaches to Carbon Pricing		Johnston	4119
Pallister	4103	Wharton	4119
Kinew	4104	Lifeflight Air Ambulance	
Lamont	4106	Gerrard	4119
Fletcher	4107	Friesen	4119
Members' Statements		Northern Manitoba	
Mark Rogocki		Lathlin	4120
Ewasko	4109	Friesen	4120
Remembrance Day Exhibits by Letty Lawrence		Petitions	
F. Marcelino	4110	Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room	
ANAVET Unit No. 10 Anniversary		B. Smith	4121
Isleifson	4110	Vimy Arena	
Harvey Friesen		Fletcher	4121
Friesen	4111	Gender Neutrality	
		Gerrard	4122
Oral Questions			
CancerCare Manitoba		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Kinew	4111	<i>(Continued)</i>	
Pallister	4111	GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	
Lifeflight Air Ambulance		Concurrence and Third Readings	
Kinew	4113	Bill 29—The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe	
Pallister	4113	Hunting and Shared Management)	
Lifeflight Air Ambulance		Squires	4124
Swan	4114	Lathlin	4124
Friesen	4114	Lamont	4126
Social Housing Units		Concurrence and Third Readings—Public Bills	
B. Smith	4115	Bill 223—The Child and Family Services	
Stefanson	4115	Amendment Act	
Contaminated Site Cleanup		B. Smith	4129
Lamont	4116	Gerrard	4130
Pallister	4117	Concurrence and Third Readings	
Infrastructure Investments		<i>(Continued)</i>	
Maloway	4118	Bill 35—The Crown Lands Amendment Act	
Schuler	4118	(Improved Management of Community Pastures	
Municipal Road and Bridge Program		and Agricultural Crown Lands)	
Maloway	4118	Eichler	4131
Schuler	4118	Gerrard	4131

Report Stage Amendments

Bill 8–The Government Notices Modernization
Act (Various Acts Amended)

Lamont 4131

Bill 16–The Climate and Green Plan
Implementation Act

Pedersen 4133

Gerrard 4135

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>