

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

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

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 14, 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

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Minister of Crown Services): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table the Manitoba Public Insurance's 2017 Annual Report and the 2017-18 audited financial statements.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Integrity

Hon. Cathy Cox (Minister of Sport, Culture and Heritage): Today I want to talk about integrity, and after 17 years of NDP mismanagement, Manitobans chose to vote for change, for transparency, for responsibility and for a government of integrity.

I learned the value of integrity at a very early age, Madam Speaker, from my baba and gigi who immigrated here from the Ukraine with—
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Cox: —a hope and a dream for a better future.

And back in the 1950s when my mother and father established a hardware store in the North End of Winnipeg, the only reason that a small business like that remained successful was by ensuring that they treated their customers with honesty and integrity. They ensured that their staff were always respected, and that's what integrity is, Madam Speaker, and I am so fortunate they—that they instilled these important family values in our family.

Members opposite have done little to live up to this standard, and I have seen it first-hand in the arts and culture sector. A former music director for the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra made it very clear to me the difficulties that they experienced when playing in our Centennial Concert Hall, which is in dire need of repair, Madam Speaker. I've personally seen the duct tape that holds the carpet together at the Manitoba Centennial Concert Hall, and they also

ignored the fire alarm system, which was a huge safety concern for everybody who was attending at the concert hall.

After many, many years of neglect, Madam Speaker, it was our government's responsibility to invest \$5 million in that fire alarm system—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

I would indicate to member that when members' statements are being read, they are to relate not to a minister's portfolio, but to a constituency situation, person, event. Ministers are not able to do members' statements and make references to their portfolios. So I would ask the minister to bring her comments into relevance to her community.

Mrs. Cox: I would like to elaborate on my mom and dad and my baba and gigi and the hard-working individuals that they were. You know, my mom—my baba and gigi, when they immigrated, they came here with absolutely nothing. They worked hard and they reached success because of the values that they have and that they stood beside each and every day whether at work, whether in their community, whether at church or whether in—just in family events that we had.

So I am so proud to have been raised by hard-working Manitobans who instilled in me the value of integrity each and every day, Madam Speaker.

Motorcycle Safety

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): Madam Speaker, last month marked the end of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month, but the message of motorcycle safety must be an initiative that all motorists, as well as anyone driving on the road, remember throughout the riding season.

Last year seven motorists were killed here in Manitoba, and this year the number of motorcycle fatalities has already risen to three—and, Madam Speaker, we're still in June.

I want to use this as an opportunity to extend my condolences to all the families and friends who have lost loved ones as a result of a motorcycle accident.

Motorcycle safety is everyone's responsibility and it starts with a culture of mutual respect on our streets.

I love riding my motorcycle and so does the member from Lakeside, and, you see, motorcyclists are passionate about riding. But with this passion riders face a problematic issue of traffic safety. Yes, motorcyclists are more prone to dangerous situations; however, with strong awareness of each other's presence while driving and mutual respect of the roads, no matter how many wheels, size of engine or even lack thereof engine, we can all get from point A to point B safely.

You know, Madam Speaker, when I was younger and working at getting my motorcycle licence, I learned some useful tips that I'd like to share. For motorcyclists: ride defensively; watch the drivers' bodies in the cars, and buy expensive, quality gear. It can save your life, and you'll be more inclined to wear it because of how much you spent on it. And for parents who ride with children in the car, play spot the motorcycle. This will heighten awareness for when they start driving themselves.

Madam Speaker, at the end of the day all Manitobans who use our roads want to get home safely to their families. Let's drive safe, be aware of our surroundings and enjoy the riding season.

Thank you.

Honesty and Integrity

Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River): We've been shown time and time again the dishonesty and lack of integrity of the NDP, a party who, when in government, promised to end hallway medicine and instead turned it into highway medicine, with Manitobans travelling elsewhere for the treatment they need and deserve; a party that refuses to acknowledge the important and selfless work that Manitoba conservation officers do for our province, protecting the beauty and resources of Manitoba while facing growing risks on the job; a party that raised the PST after lying and stating that the idea was nonsense; a party who doesn't seem to consider the public awareness of Lyme disease as an important issue, despite the over tenfold difference in Manitoba cases from five to 52 between 2009 and 2016; a party that dismissed and silenced allegations of sexual harassment from its female staff; a party that left this province with masses—massive debt that continues to impact the future of Manitobans; a party that let our province

decay, repeatedly applying quick fixes to long-term problems, then stood back and patted themselves on the back for a job not-so-well done; a party that Manitobans realized they couldn't rely on.

The NDP continue to show the same lack of respect and disregard for the well-being of Manitobans that they did when they were in government.

This government, Madam Speaker, is focused on getting this province back on track and acting with integrity and transparency. We are implementing actual solutions, improving our financial situation, our economy and our services.

The honesty and respect the NDP failed to show Manitobans time and time again is the respect that Pallister government is committed to showing, and we'll continue to be a government that Manitobans can trust.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Plaid for Dad

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Plaid for Dad was launched in 2015 to help raise awareness and vital research funds for prostate cancer. It has quickly become a fun and easy way for Canadians to celebrate dads and help the one in seven men who will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes.

This year, for the fourth year in a row, thousands of workplaces and individuals from across Canada will go plaid through donations, fundraising and events. The Friday before Father's Day is the perfect time to wear Plaid for Dad and spread the word about a cancer that affects so many men in our society.

I also take this opportunity to stand with those individuals and families who show resilience every day in their fight against prostate cancer. Prostate cancer affects men of all ages; however, early detection can save lives.

When detected early, the survival rate for prostate cancer is over 90 per cent. Prostate Cancer Canada and prostate cancer experts advocate for a smart screening approach to early detection which takes a man's personal risk into account, such as age, family history and ethnicity. This means getting a simple blood test taken from your arm which measures the amount of prostate antigen in your

blood. This establishes a baseline number which is then incorporated into the man's risk profile to determine when the next test needs to occur. For those who believe they are at a higher risk for prostate cancer, they should talk to their doctors before the age of 40.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the front-line health-care workers who work every day with individuals and families affected by prostate cancer.

A special thanks to CancerCare Manitoba, which is the provincial centre for prostate disease in Manitoba, and Prostate Cancer Canada for the invaluable work they do to support those affected.

I urge all members to participate in Plaid for Dad and I hope that everyone has a great Father's Day weekend.

* (13:40)

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Happy with Health Care

Mr. Jon Reyes (St. Norbert): Time and time again, we hear from the NDP rhetoric and statements of doom and gloom of Manitoba's health care.

Well, Madam Speaker, wait times are down. We are investing more in health care and the truth—the truth—is that services are improving, as evidenced in a recent letter to the editor by one of my St. Norbert constituents, Mr. Eric Grehan, seated with us today in the gallery.

The letter is titled Happy with health care, and outlines a positive experience that Mr. Grehan and his wife had when moving his parents, both who are in their mid-80s, from Ontario to Manitoba. One of the first concerns, finding a doctor, was quickly overcome as they were able to find a doctor within less than one week of his parents arriving in Winnipeg.

Earlier this year, Eric's family noted a couple of irregularities with his father's health. The elder Mr. Grehan's doctor recommended a visit to the Victoria urgent-care centre. Eric stated that the entire staff was outstanding in both their professionalism and their compassionate care given. Upon assessment, Eric's father was transferred by ambulance to St. Boniface Hospital emergency centre. Eric spoke of the excellent care his father received when undergoing surgery the next day.

In Eric's own words, the medical process takes a team effort from the government on down, and his views deserve—his view deserves a grade of one hundred per cent. Mr. Grehan stated, and I quote: I experienced first-hand the efficiencies instituted by our government with regards to patient care, and I, for one, approve. Many of those I hear complaining are receiving their information second-hand or have been misled by less-than-truthful advertisements.

These positive comments illustrate that our government is earning the trust of Manitobans and we will continue to improve the services that were broken, fix the finances and rebuild our economy, and, Madam Speaker, we will do this as we always have, with integrity.

ORAL QUESTIONS

New Manitoba Hydro Board Qualifications of Appointments

Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition): Happy World Cup kickoff day, Madam Speaker, and happy Bombers home opener day as well.

I want to take a hop in the way-back machine to go back to a recent unprecedented event on March 30—or 21st of this year when the entire board of Manitoba Hydro resigned, citing as a reason for their resignation, their mass walkout, the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) unwillingness to meet with them to discuss critical issues of finance and governance.

Then, on March 23rd the minister responsible appointed a board that he said could lead Manitoba Hydro. But through a freedom of information request that I will table for the minister or for the Premier, we hear that the Manitoba Hydro board themselves say that they lack some critical skills that are necessary to exercise proper oversight of this Crown jewel in our province. Specifically, they say they need somebody with accounting expertise to be named to the board; they say they need somebody with human resources expertise to be named to the board; and they need somebody with an engineering background to be named to the board because there currently is none of those expert skill sets on the board today.

The minister failed to appoint anyone with engineering, HR or finance certifications to the board of Manitoba Hydro. *[interjection]*

Why?

Madam Speaker: Order.

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Minister of Crown Services): It's certainly nice to finally get a question on Crown Services and Crown departments.

I can rest assured and tell Manitobans that we may—not seeking advice from the NDP in terms of human resources, accounting expertise or any of the other expertise the Manitoba Hydro board do require.

We will deliver, though, and do what Manitoba Hydro board have asked.

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

Mr. Kinew: Well, I'll tell you why they didn't appoint anyone with accounting, HR or engineering expertise: it's because the appointments were made in a rush because of the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) mismanagement. Again, it all comes back to the Premier's mismanagement of Manitoba Hydro.

Now, the board members themselves, as we have clearly established, have outlined that they're missing some critical skills that are necessary to exercise proper oversight over Manitoba Hydro in HR, finance, engineering. That was two months ago. Now, the minister has done nothing since to help Manitoba's Crown jewel. This, even though he said in an April letter, that I will table for the Premier today—he said in this April letter—the minister, that is—that he would act in the coming weeks. Well, that was months ago at this point.

Their own board has said that they are missing critical skills necessary to exercise oversight over our Crown jewel.

Why did the Premier and the minister ignore the recommendations from their second Manitoba Hydro board?

Mr. Cullen: Well, Madam Speaker, let's talk about mismanagement.

Seventeen years of NDP government got us in the mess in—this government has—now is facing, and also in the Crown corporations, the mess the NDP left us in. Manitoba Hydro will be facing a \$25-billion debt in the next few years, which will amount to over \$1.3 billion in interest payments each and every year.

The NDP left us in a mess. This government is going to fix the mess the NDP left us in. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

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

Mr. Kinew: You know, it was stalwart Conservative Sandy Riley who, upon resigning from the Manitoba Hydro board, said that the mismanagement of this Premier is worse than anything that he had seen before.

He cited the Premier's—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —mismanagement of Manitoba Hydro as the reason for his leaving the board of Manitoba Hydro. That was in March.

Now we learn that the mismanagement of this Premier continues even to this day, because in their rushed appointment of a new Hydro board they have left out some of the most critical skills to exercising oversight on Manitoba Hydro: accounting, human resources and engineering. It's a company that builds dams, that employs a massive amount of Manitobans and that is responsible for large capital expenditures.

The minister has been aware, the Premier has been aware of these lack of skills on the board and they have done nothing to address the issue.

Why is the Premier putting Manitoba Hydro and the rates—the low, affordable rates that Manitobans pay at risk with his continued mismanagement of our public Crown jewel? *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cullen: Well, we—let's talk about mismanagement, Madam Speaker.

We had a proposal for \$70 million before us, a proposal that the Leader of the Opposition would have signed without even reading it. That is not prudent management. That would have been on the backs of Manitoba ratepayers. We will stand up for Manitoba ratepayers each and every time.

Madam Speaker, that also would have impacted Metis rights into the future. We will also stand up for the rights of Manitoba Metis well into the future.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

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

Post-Secondary Education Funding and Affordability

Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition): I want to thank the members opposite

for delivering their first standing ovation to me. I'll keep standing up for Manitoba Hydro ratepayers.

Now, not only is this government mismanaging—
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —the largest public corporation in our province, but under their watch—[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kinew: —they are also watching unemployment rise to the highest level that it's been in recent memory. It's now higher than it is in other jurisdictions like Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. That speaks to the need for a strong jobs plan here in the province, the jobs so that Manitoba families can be sure that their kids will be able to find meaningful careers here and put down roots.

Now, we know that this government is slashing the budget for post-secondaries in our province. The result is that Red River College has had to close programs, that they are now hiking tuition.

* (13:50)

It's making post-secondary education less affordable and it's making it more difficult for Manitoba families to ensure that their kids will stay here in the province.

When will the Premier (Mr. Pallister) reverse his cuts to post-secondary and instead make education affordable for everybody in Manitoba?

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): Once again, more myths from the NDP opposition.

Madam Speaker, in fact, what the member does not recognize is what Manitobans do see, and that is that jobs and economic growth are at the centre of our plan for rebuilding the Manitoba economy. We have the most stable and diversified economy in Manitoba and things are looking up. Regardless of the fact whether the opposition leader is depressed today, the provincial economy has gained momentum over the past three years progressively, so things are going in the right direction.

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

Mr. Kinew: You know, families in this province want affordable tuition so that their kids can find good jobs after graduation and stay here in Manitoba to put down roots.

What has this Premier's response been? Well, he decided to raise taxes on recent graduates by \$2,500 per person. He did that when he ended the tuition rebate, and now we know that they're also raising tuition, not just the rebates but tuition itself, at all the universities in the province. Also, for Red River College, we know that students there will be paying \$250 more each year as a result of this Premier's misguided policies.

When will the Premier reverse his cuts and instead listen to Manitoba families and what they want, which is affordable kids and programs that will help their kids find good jobs and put down roots right here in the beautiful province of Manitoba?

Mr. Friesen: Well, Madam Speaker, we've found a point of agreement, the opposition leader and I. Affordability does matter. It's what we've said to all Manitobans. It's why we could not continue on the path of the former NDP government where they raised taxes and borrowed more and hiked costs for all Manitobans.

We've said that government must do a better job of budgeting and getting better results, and we're doing that. But in addition to that, we're making it more affordable for Manitoba families, like increasing the basic personal amount by \$2,020 by the year 2020, keeping almost \$500 more in the pockets of every two-household income in Manitoba.

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

Mr. Kinew: You know, this weekend it's going to be Father's Day. So I want to take a second just to wish a happy Father's Day to all the dads out there across Manitoba, and I hope that everyone in their families gets to spend some wonderful time together. I know that, often, dads are the butt of jokes and crack some pretty bad dad jokes themselves, but maybe this is a day where we can set that stuff aside and just enjoy our time together.

Now, many of the fathers, many of the parents I speak to want their kids to be able to stay in Manitoba, get a good job, and they know that an affordable education is key to that. Instead of being able to provide that, this government is raising taxes on recent graduates and they're hiking tuition. We know that the average recent grad will pay \$2,500 more in taxes and that they will have to pay tuition if they decide to go back to school, hundreds of dollars more each and every year.

When will the Premier (Mr. Pallister) stop these cuts to our post-secondary system and instead bring forward a real plan to create good jobs in Manitoba, but to help young people get those good jobs by providing an affordable, accessible post-secondary education?

Mr. Friesen: Madam Speaker, in the prebudget conversation that we had with over 35,000 Manitobans, I heard from student after student who said, you're doing this the wrong way. You're providing benefits for people like dentists who have been in their profession for 15 years and professionals who are 45 or 55 years old. But they said, instead, we'd like the government to profile more supports to those entering the education system, and that is exactly what we've done by quintupling the amount of money going for scholarships and bursaries.

Why doesn't the opposition leader get on board and recognize the important ways we're making it more affordable for all students in Manitoba?
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: We have some students in the gallery that I would like to introduce to you. They are going to be leaving the gallery shortly, so I am going to introduce them to you now.

Seated in the public gallery from Faith Academy middle school we have 46 grade 6 students under the direction of Joanna Esselink, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Curry).

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

Family Law Reform in Manitoba Inclusion of Non-Traditional Families

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): The Minister of Justice's strategy for Manitoba's family law fails to include a plan to modernize the way Manitoban-Manitoba deals with same-sex parents, surrogacy or even sperm donors, Madam Speaker.

We know the makeup of Manitoba families has changed. The modern Manitoba family has same-sex parents, single parents, surrogate parents and even tri-generational parents. Our laws must keep up with this reality.

Does the minister agree that her family law strategy should address and acknowledge the different ways that families express themselves today in Manitoba?

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I thank the member for the question.

And what we do know is that the family law system in Manitoba needs significant reforms to it, and we are committed to ensuring that we do make those reforms. We've heard from Manitobans that it's a very adversarial system the way it is right now.

So we're going to listen to Manitobans. We're going to take the time to get this right.

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

Ms. Fontaine: Family law experts have been calling for changes, and this minister's strategy fails to address their concerns. Families spend years in courts, paying thousands of dollars in legal fees because Manitoba's laws are currently out of date, Madam Speaker.

This minister has a responsibility to address the gaps in our legislation that let modern families fall through the gaps. They need a strong body of law that better addresses same-sex parents, single parents, surrogacy, sperm donors and even the rights of grandparents.

Madam Speaker, will the minister admit that her strategy does not go far enough to fix Manitoba's family law?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, Madam Speaker, the NDP government had 17 years to make these kinds of changes when they were in government, and they refused to do that. So where they failed, we will deliver to Manitobans.

But I should caution the member opposite that she's being disrespectful to Allan Fineblit, who helped chair this committee, along with many other professionals and lay people in—who care about family law reform. So when she starts to say—this is a report that has been produced by them, that has been consulted on by many, many Manitobans. And so when she is talking disrespectfully about that, I think that that is not called for, Madam Speaker. And I'd ask her to apologize to those who spent the time, day in, day out, to ensure that we have this kind of report that's before us today. And we will make the legislative changes needed to implement the report.

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

Ms. Fontaine: There has been much work done to modernize Manitoba's family law that actually hasn't been included in the minister's strategy, and I would suggest to you we know why, because the minister's own report says on page 3, and I quote: In the fiscal—in the current fiscal climate, proposing a model that requires any investment of resources, even with the promise of long-term savings, is a hard sell. End quote.

Clearly, meaningful change doesn't fit with the minister or her government's plan to cut services. But families need investments and they need supports, Madam Speaker.

Will the minister admit that her strategy does not address some of the biggest issues in family law?

Mrs. Stefanson: I will remind the member opposite that this is not my report. This is a 'repart'—a report by Manitoba's Family Law Reform Committee, chaired by Allan Fineblit, very well-respected attorney in our province, and I want to thank he and all the members of this committee for all the incredible hard work that they did to establish this report.

So, Madam Speaker, I will cast aside the litany of false assertions from the member opposite. We inherited a mess in our justice system in Manitoba. Where they failed, we will deliver.

* (14:00)

Women's Reproductive Health Minister's Attendance at Life Hike Rally

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Madam Speaker, we've got a strange situation with the Minister of Health, who either cannot or will not stand up and answer a single question in this House about women's reproductive health.

So can this minister please tell the House what he said at the anti-choice Life Hike rally in Steinbach on May 26th?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Yes, Madam Speaker, I was invited to attend to share the experience that my wife and I had and the difficulty in having children. We had a number of miscarriages when we were trying to have a child: four. They asked us to come and share that experience of having miscarriages. My wife, in fact, has now written an article, a blog

about that to help other women who are struggling. I'm very proud of her each and every day, but particularly because she's speaking out about that important issue.

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

Mr. Swan: I know the minister's wife and of course I know his son, and certainly we're happy that things worked out for them.

But I'm not sure what standing up at an anti-choice Life Hike rally, along with Conservative MP Ted Falk, has to do with what the minister's put on the record.

We know about Ted Falk's recent comments about reproductive rights. Last week, of course, he out—or last month he had outbursts in the House of Commons. He was called out not just by Liberal and New Democrat members, but also by Conservative members and his own leader for turning aside women's right to reproductive health.

This Minister of Health has refused every time to stand in this House.

Did he stand up and say that Ted Falk was wrong and that women's reproductive rights are a priority in Manitoba?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, at that particular event there was a number of people speaking about the challenges that they've had with miscarriages. In fact, they are raising funds for an organization that helps women who are dealing with miscarriage. They asked me to share our family's personal experience. We've been doing that more recently as a family because we think that we can help other people.

As I mentioned, my wife, just a couple of days ago, published an article about the miscarriages that we endured in the challenge to have our son, who we believe is a miracle child, Madam Speaker. There's been a lot of talk about decorum in this House in the last few days. I would hope that all members would extend a heart for certain issues. We've—all have gone through challenges in our life and I think we've supported each other in some of those challenges.

If the member opposite is taking a different tack, that's not the member that I thought I knew, Madam Speaker.

An Honourable Member: Apologize.

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

Health Minister's Position

Mr. Swan: Well, I'm sorry if members opposite have problems with me asking questions about the minister's health view on reproductive rights, but I'm going to ask these questions on behalf of women in Manitoba.

The minister spoke alongside Mike Schouten, the director of We Need a Law. This organization campaigns to limit women's reproductive health care. Two days before the rally they celebrated a new law in Iowa which bans abortion after just six weeks, and they criticized the abortion pill for encouraging women's natural desire to hide their choice of abortion.

This Minister of Health has refused to take responsibility for the reproductive health of Manitoba women and he hasn't answered our questions in this House about that important issue.

Does the minister support full access to reproductive health in Manitoba?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, I think I've answered for the member what my participation was at the event. There were others who spoke very eloquently and very courageously about the miscarriages that they've had within their families and they are raising funds for an organization that helps women who deal with that.

I'm happy—in fact, I'll gladly provide a full copy of my comments at that event for every member of this House, along with a copy of the article that my wife has written, Madam Speaker, because I know that there are many families who struggle with having a child. That is their greatest desire, and they all haven't been able to achieve that desire. And if there's anything that I can do to help them or my wife can do, we're willing to do that.

If the member wants to stay in the gutter, he can enjoy his time there, Madam Speaker.

City of Thompson Jobs Training Plan

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): The people of Thompson are facing hundreds of job losses. The industry that's powered that city for generations is going through challenging times.

But when the City of Thompson asks for help from this Province, they receive excuses and delays.

They made a request for help from the community mining reserve fund nearly a year ago, but the Premier (Mr. Pallister) and his minister refused to meet, and now they're refusing to help.

When the Tembec plant at Pine Falls closed, the federal and provincial government stepped up. We created a Community Adjustment Fund to make sure workers had the training and jobs needed to move forward.

This Province has put forward no plans to help the community of Thompson.

What plans for training and jobs does the Premier have for the city of Thompson?
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

An Honourable Member: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Points of order are not allowed during oral questions. If the member wishes to raise one, it has to be at the end of oral questions.

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): The assertions the member makes are just completely false.

But what is true, though, is that we know many things. Vale gave notice in 2010 about closing the smelter, and the NDP party did absolutely nothing for it.

We know, also, that there's lots of nickel still in the ground in the Thompson area, and yet the Leader of the Opposition has signed the Leap Manifesto which says all 'resources' should stay in the ground.

The member needs to get his story straight rather than putting false information on the record.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Minto—sorry, the honourable member for Flin Flon, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Lindsey: The Premier has claimed that he can't help the City of Thompson because the mining reserve fund is below \$10 million. But that claim doesn't stand up to scrutiny. The act is clear: the fund was set up to help communities in need. The \$10-million-amount limit applies to payments for exploration projects, not for communities that are losing jobs.

We know the City of Thompson has lost hundreds of jobs due to the closure of the mine and the smelter. We know the City has requested funds

for nearly a year. We now know that there were millions of dollars available to help the City, but the government has refused to act.

Why is the government denying support to the City of Thompson in their time of need?

Mr. Pedersen: Just a few more facts for the member, Madam Speaker.

The mining reserve fund hit an all-time high of about \$16 million in 1996-97. And ever since 1999, it has continued to diminish. And this is a reflection of how the former NDP government chased away all mining activity, discouraged mining activity from coming to Manitoba.

We will do much better, Madam Speaker. We're in talks all the time with mining companies.

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

US Steel and Aluminum Tariffs Government Position

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): The Premier (Mr. Pallister) is ignoring other communities in need in this province, as well.

When economic forces hurt communities across our province, communities like Selkirk, the Province needs to step up. It needs to be at the table as a partner to make sure unfair tariffs don't hurt Manitoba workers. It needs to engage with companies and workers to hear their concerns and make sure their voices are represented.

*(14:10)

We've talked to representatives of the steel workers and Gerdau. They are concerned about the Province's lack of action in the face of unfair US tariffs. There are hundreds of jobs at the Gerdau plant in Selkirk, and they are at risk because of the US tariffs. Losses could be as great as \$500,000 every week.

Will the Premier take some action? Will he stand up? Will he meet with people from Gerdau and the steelworkers' plant? What will—

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

Order.

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): Madam Speaker, we also know that with the NDP signing the Leap Manifesto,

it also expresses all desired that no trade deal be entered into, no trade deal be signed.

Going back to the city of Thompson, we have met a number of times with Mayor Fenske. We will be meeting again with Mayor Fenske, and the really good news is that finally—finally—the city of Thompson and the surrounding area has a great MLA in the MLA from Thompson.

Mental Health Strategy Request for Government Plan

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): When a person is continually bullied and harassed time and again, year over year, the stress begins to take a toll on that person. That person needs tools and resources to be able to combat that stress to continue.

The person who is a bully typically is a person who is in power and uses this power to bully.

In 2016 the Manitoba Liberals released a mental health strategy that addressed that issue and we produced 98 recommendations to help this new government along.

What movement has the member from Fort Whyte made in implementing a mental health plan?

I'll also remind the members across to respect the rules of this House and answer through the Speaker.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Madam Speaker, I am proud of a government and particularly a Premier who made mental health and addictions one of the key priorities during the last election campaign. In fact, the Premier, running for election, indicated that we would develop, if we were fortunate enough to form government, a cohesive plan for mental health and addictions. That promise has been fulfilled in the VIRGO report.

There is great work that is being done in terms of co-ordinating the system when it comes to mental health and addictions, and I am proud to stand with a Premier and with a government who has made that a priority, Madam Speaker.

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

Education System Bullying Prevention

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): Bullies use various forms of harassment tactics, some extremely

juvenile, such as staring down at their targets, of hair pulling or name-calling, all of which happens in municipal councils or right here in the Legislature.

In today's age, we now have a very serious threat in cyberbullying. Bullying is a big problem in our schools right across Manitoba. I know at my own kids' schools, students are encouraged to bring these concerns forward. It was not always the case, as my older kids were bullied, but we parents spoke up and things changed.

Would the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Wishart) tell us what the department is doing to combat all forms of bullying in schools?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Acting Minister of Education and Training): Madam Speaker, as the fortunate father of an 11-year-old boy who has been in the school system now for about six years, I can tell you that as a parent you often worry. I mean, you worry about your child being bullied at school, and parents worry about whether or not their children are acting appropriately in school. I know we've had many discussions in this Legislature when it comes to bullying and how to address the issues.

I certainly know the member for Portage, the Minister of Education, has taken this very seriously, and in discussions with local school divisions, I know that he's made this a priority.

And, certainly, I think we need to look to local school divisions to see what actions they are taking and what works in their particular circumstances and encourage more action to be done at the local level, Madam Speaker.

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

Bullying and Harassment Prevention Support for Bill 231

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): I brought forward Bill 231 because all elected officials have no recourse, no one to turn to under any current legislation. We tried to express our concerns here, and as typical fashion, we victims are not believed, our concerns dismissed.

My ancestors led me to here to ensure life is better for victims—nay, for survivors.

I'm here to say to the First Minister, he will never have power over me. I have my coping tools. But I need for others to be assured they hold their

own power. I need to ensure they have these types of tools and, as equally, to have recourse.

Will this government support Bill 231, or when will they introduce their version?

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): Well, Madam Speaker, rejecting much of the premise of the member, we would remind that member and all members of the legislation of our no-wrong-door policy. This government has taken a strong stance. We need to make sure that everyone feels welcome, secure in coming to work for the Manitoba government. It's why we're disclosing now on an annual basis instances of harassment. We are tracking them.

We are ejecting what was done before and we are transforming our system through being—just—clear with Manitobans and transparent about the process. We are taking steps; we are improving the processes, and we are going to do more.

Northern Manitoba Development Government Initiatives

Mr. Kelly Bindle (Thompson): Madam Speaker, our PC government understands the unique opportunities and the importance of northern Manitoba's untapped potential. Unlike the NDP, who shunned the North for 17 years, our PC government has been hard at work to help shape the future of the region by meeting with natural resource companies and officials while also continuously consulting with local and indigenous communities.

Can the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade please update the House on how our PC government is standing shoulder to shoulder with Thompson and all of northern Manitoba?

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): Since 2010, the NDP knew that the smelter was closing in Thompson, and yet they did absolutely nothing.

Our government continues to work with the City of Thompson in turning a corner in that community and all across the North. There is renewed interest in tourism, forestry, fishing, and the rail line looks like it's finally going to be fixed. Very soon, we'll—we will be announcing our mineral development protocol. This builds on the initiatives that we already started in the North. We will continue to work with the City of Thompson and build on the true potential of the North together with our great MLA from Thompson. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

**Recreation Programs for Inner-City Youth
Application Approval Inquiry**

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Logan): Last December the City of Winnipeg applied for a \$500,000 grant to fund recreation programs for children and youth in Point Douglas. This program has been funded every year since 2009. This program provides hope and opportunity in one of our most vulnerable communities, so it must continue.

Will the minister confirm for the House today that the \$500,000 enhanced recreation program for children and youth in the inner city has been approved?

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): This—our government is very proud of the commitments we've made in the two years we've been in government, Madam Speaker, and how we've—how we'd make these decisions, we go out and consult with communities throughout Manitoba, not only here in the city of Winnipeg. We rely heavily on the input from the stakeholders and folks that are on the ground to ensure we make investments that benefit all Manitobans.

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

Ms. Marcelino: The stakeholder has already spoken, requiring the \$500,000 investment.

Madam Speaker, the value for money for inner city recreational programs is that it keeps kids active and productive during the long summer months. It provides them the place to make friends. Something as simple as a real friendship or a sincere mentor can keep a child from joining a gang, because they see a real opportunity in the world and real value in themselves.

Will the minister confirm for the House today that the \$500,000 enhanced recreation program for children and youth in the inner city has been approved?

*(14:20)

Mr. Wharton: Madam Speaker, we were very proud last week to announce a bilateral agreement with the federal government announcing a \$1.1-billion investment here in Manitoba over the next 10 years.

And I can advise the member opposite and let her know that we're looking forward to engaging our community organizations throughout Manitoba

as we go through this process to make sure we invest the \$1.1 billion over the next 10 years to community organizations and other areas and projects throughout Manitoba, Madam Speaker.

**Highway Infrastructure
Budget for 2018**

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): In just two short years the highways budget has been cut nearly in half. The NDP spent \$628 million—

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maloway: —in the last year in power. It was then cut to \$502 million, then cut again to 430, and now it's only \$350 million.

Now, last year, the Conservatives promised a \$500-million budget. They said it to the media. They said it to the public. They even put out a press release promising \$500 million every year.

Like to ask the Premier (Mr. Pallister): Why did he break his commitment to people all across the province who want their roads fixed?

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Infrastructure): Well, Madam Speaker, Manitobans for 17 years were promised by a failing NDP government, of which that member was a member of, that they would get the Freedom Road. Every year it was promised, lot of press releases, lot of work done on it other than building the road.

Our government in the first two years of being in office have gotten it built. The last stretch of it is being done right now. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

The honourable member for Elmwood, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Maloway: I was asking the Premier to explain why he cut his highways budget in half. The NDP spent \$628 million on highways in their last year. This year, the Conservatives are spending only \$350 million on highways.

All this comes about after they made a promise. Trust us, they said, we will stop our cuts and keep funding stable at no less than \$500 million each and every year for the next four years. They've said it in a press release. They said it to the media last fall and they told the industry just four days before the budget, but now betrayal: a \$150-million cut in one fell swoop.

Why has the Premier (Mr. Pallister) broken his word?

Mr. Schuler: Well, Madam Speaker, I'd like to point out to the member opposite, while he was in government, that they overspent in every budget, every year except for one, and that was Infrastructure. So first year after being elected, they would raid the budget; second year, raid; third year, raid—oh, force year before—fourth year, before an election, parade.

I would like to point out to the member that in 17 years, on the Freedom Road not a mile, not a yard, not a foot, not an inch was built. We got it done. What they couldn't get done in 17 years, we got accomplished.

Madam Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

PETITIONS

Affordable Housing

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) All Manitobans deserve safe, quality and affordable housing, but this Premier is making it harder for low-income families and seniors to get the housing they need.

(2) Higher housing costs mean families and seniors living below the poverty line will have less money to pay for food, education, transportation and basic necessities.

(3) Advocacy groups like Campaign 2000 and Make Poverty History have recommended increasing the number of affordable housing units as a way to fight poverty in Manitoba.

(4) Instead of making housing more affordable and Manitoba public housing more accessible this provincial government has cut the Rent Assist benefit and increased rates for Manitoba Housing residents.

(5) The Premier cut funding to Rent Assist by almost \$2 million for the second year in a row and the Right to Housing Coalition estimates this will cost a single minimum-wage worker an extra \$1,300 per year.

(6) The provincial government increased 'Manitosa'—Manitoba Housing rents yet again, forcing tenants to pay an extra \$720 a year.

(7) The provincial government cut 510,000 community housing improvement projects, which provided more than 200 grants to homeowners and landlords to renovate homes.

(8) The Premier has also introduced Bill 12, the red tape reduction act, which would restrict tenants' ability to object to rent increases below the guideline.

(9) Bill 12 would also remove the right to protest under fair—to protest unfair rent hikes and limit tenants' ability to advocate for affordable housing.

(10) The Premier's cuts will trap many working people, especially women, seniors and vulnerable individuals living in poverty.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to provide safe, high-quality, affordable housing that helps working families and to amend Bill 12 so that it no longer infringes on the rights of tenants.

Madam Speaker, this petition is signed by Philip—Phyllis Tolsma, Mike Brit [*phonetic*] and Phil Sigurdson and 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 wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

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

(2) The Vimy Arena site is in the middle of a residential area near 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 locations such as the St. Boniface industrial park, the 200,000—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. This exemption bypasses community input and due diligence and ignores better uses of 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.

(5) The Manitoba Housing project initiated by the provincial government changes the fundamental nature of the community. Including park and recreational uses, concerns of the residents of St. James and others regarding the 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 obvious other locations in wealthier neighbourhoods, such as Tuxedo, River Heights, have not been considered for this Manitoba Housing project, even though they are—there are hundreds of acres of land available for development at Kapyong or parks like Heubach Park that share the same zoning as the Vimy Arena site.

* (14:30)

(7) The Manitoba Housing project and 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 as land is being transferred for a 50-bed facility even though the project is clearly outside Manitoba Housing's 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 preservation of public land along Sturgeon Creek for the purposes of park land and recreational activities for use, including being an important component of the Sturgeon Creek Greenway Trail and 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 continue to be designated for parks and recreation activity and neighbourhood and community.

This petition has been signed by Art Proutt, Lynn Proutt and William Bertron [*phonetic*].

Thank you, Madam Speaker—and many other Manitobans. Thank you.

Gender Neutrality

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition 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 or who are identified by others as intersex, third gender, transgender, genderqueer or non-binary.

Identification in 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: (a) interactions with health-care professionals; (b) interactions with persons of authority; (c) accessing government services; (d) 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 another.

Many newcomers to Canada have already—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 persons who fall 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 form 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 Tracy Campbell, Sheila McKay, Katie Kilgour and many others.

Madam Speaker: The—grievances?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

House Business

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader): On House business, I'd like to announce that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts meeting on Monday, June 18th, 2018, at 6 p.m., will consider the following in addition to the reports previously referred: The Auditor General's report, Follow-up of Recommendations dated March 2018, Accounts and Financial Statements.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts meeting on Monday, June 18th, 2018, at 6 p.m., will consider the following in addition to the reports previously referred: Auditor General's report, follow-up recommendations, dated March 2018, accounts and financial statements.

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

Madam Speaker: On House business.

Ms. Fontaine: Pursuant to rule 33(8), I am announcing that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Thursday of private members' business will be one previously put forward by the honourable member for St. Johns. The title of the resolution is protecting and promoting French languages.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Thursday of private members' business will be one previously put forward by the honourable

member for St. Johns. The title of the resolution is Protecting and Promoting French Language Services.

* * *

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, would you call Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)?

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the House will resume debate on second reading of Bill 29 and the amendment thereto proposed by the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Kinew).

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

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

Madam Speaker: So, second reading, Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management), standing in the name of the honourable member for Flin Flon, who has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It's unfortunate that we ran out of time yesterday and now I need to pick up where I left off, but first I need to figure out where I left off. So I'm sure we'll get back where we were at some point in time.

Let me just say that what is before us, the reasoned amendment that the member from Fort Rouge, the Official Opposition Leader, put forward, really is the right way to go. It's very reasonable. It makes sense.

We talked yesterday a lot about Charter rights and things that this Premier (Mr. Pallister) and this government should have done. It's hard to wind the clock back and have them do what they should have done in the first place and didn't, but by following through with the resolution that was—or the amendment that was put forward, it would give this government a chance to actually live up to some of the things that should be done as part of the whole act of—the word escapes me at the moment.

*(14:40)

But, Madam Speaker, they've—the amendment suggests that, really, the government look at a true shared management process, a shared management concept. It ties into the whole concept of reconciliation, that rather than the Premier running

around saying things that incite people, that create problems, really having the shared co-management system with the groups that really have the most at stake.

Certainly, some of our First Nations groups should have been consulted properly. They clearly weren't. I mean, this government stands up and says, well, they consulted, but when we see things in the press where various First Nations groups are saying that, well, we really weren't consulted, and if the government proceeds with this act the way it is, it'll land up in court and—which, really, at the end of the day, Madam Speaker, doesn't do anybody any good. But sometimes, I guess, it seems that's where this Premier likes to land up. He's—claims to be a good negotiator, but seems that judges and juries are going to do the negotiating for him in a lot of cases, which is very unfortunate because that doesn't always lead to the best outcome. It may lead to the legally binding outcome, but, really, the whole part about consultation is to come to the best resolution, a resolution that everybody can believe in, everybody can be a part of.

And the whole concept of the shared co-management with some of the First Nations groups that are directly impacted would really be the way to go. If the government would have done this right from the start, perhaps we wouldn't be here where we are today talking about this Bill 29; we'd actually be here today talking about some financial emergency measures that this government called the House back for.

As I pointed out yesterday, this—clearly, this bill clearly wasn't an emergency for this government, because they talked about it in their election campaign in 2015. Certainly, they've had any number of sessions since then that they could have introduced the bill and didn't, so it's not an emergency at this point in time. Maybe it's an emergency for the Government House Leader, that he's committed something to his Premier that he can't really live up to that didn't really happen. I don't know. I'd hate to speculate that far down that road, so I won't go much further than that, but—

So, really, we want to make sure that the Manitoba government—the government that supposedly represents us all—we want to make sure that they're successful in efforts in a shared management system with our big-game population. But in 'orner' to do that, they need to actually involve the various groups that should have been involved.

But it's never too late to do the right thing, and I strongly encourage the Government House Leader (Mr. Cullen) to go back to his Premier (Mr. Pallister) and say, listen, let's just rethink this a little bit. Let's really take this Bill 29; let's go out and talk to the people we should have talked about. Let's sit down with them and invite them to be a part of the actual co-management process so that everybody feels that they been listened to, that their concerns are met.

So I really encourage the Government House Leader to do that very thing. I guess I don't have a lot of faith that he'll do that, but I remain optimistic that common sense will prevail, and he will do that very thing. He'll look at this reasoned amendment that has been put forward, and he'll go to his Premier and say, you know, this really does make sense. This really is the right way to go. If we're serious about reconciliation, that—let's do the right thing, Madam Speaker. Let's really sit down and consult with people. Let's put people that need to be on the management board—let's put all of those people that need to be there so that we can actually have true co-management of that resource and make sure that the best interests of everyone are represented.

And, certainly, I think that we need to do that. I think that the basics of this Bill 29 are good, but it's the nuts and bolts, if you will, Madam Speaker, that are really missing from this that need to be in place to make sure that we have the best legislation possible to make sure that we have the legislation that won't tie us up in court for years and years and years, at which point this government may not be in power anymore—in fact, I'm sure they won't be, but that's a different story.

You know, there's things that talk about, in the bill, that, well, maybe we'll do this and maybe we'll do that, so I understand why some groups are very concerned because they weren't involved in those consultations. They're not involved in what maybe will happen and maybe won't.

Back in the days when I was involved in negotiating collective agreements, we were always on the lookout for things that were, in the lexicon of the business I was in, called weasel words, and those types of things were that a party may do something as opposed to a party shall do something or a party must do something. So we see some of that, that really a regulation may say something, a regulation may address something, but then again maybe it won't or maybe it'll address something different.

So, without the co-management piece there to helping craft what the regulations are, this government is doing two things, really. One is it's missing the opportunity to really craft the best legislation possible, but perhaps maybe it's more sinister than that—I would hope not—that really, on the surface, that the act looks good but the regulations come out and say things that maybe won't have the best interests of all parties involved in it. So I'm really very concerned that without the government listening to some of those concerns—and some of those concerns are around the adoption of the regulations and what may be in there. So, without the co-management system, without the actual true consultation process taking place to craft regulations, to craft an act, to craft a way forward, Madam Speaker, to craft a better future for all parties that really speaks to reconciliation, that really speaks to the rights of all parties, that really speaks to a better society, without the government actually doing that, perhaps they're building a system, an act, that's doomed to failure. And that's not in any of our best interests.

So, really, I, again, must encourage not just the Government House Leader, but all members of the government caucus, to really look at what this reasoned amendment says, to really look at what should be done as the right thing, Madam Speaker, to make sure that groups that need to be a part of that whole co-management system are, in fact, a part of it.

Thank you.

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Logan): Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to say a few words in support of the motion amending the motion of the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Kinew), amending by deleting all the words after the word, quote, unquote, that, and substituting the following: This House declines to give second reading to Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management).

Madam Speaker, my—lately, my next-seat neighbour, the honourable member from River Heights and I have been having serious political conversations. I'm finding my colleague, who is a learned and diligent member of this House and a dedicated advocate for his constituents and the greater Manitoba community, to be thoughtful and wise. He has given us insights regarding Bill 29 that is worthy of reflection and further discussion. Likewise, hearing the experiences from my dear

colleague, the honourable member from The Pas, brought back sad memories of children who, against their will, were separated from their families.

* (14:50)

With regards to the ongoing debate on Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act, on night hunting, and in particular the amendment to this bill, the member from River Heights made several profound statements along with the rest of my colleagues on this side of the House that I wholly agree with.

Incidentally, I have no complaints that we are still holding legislative sessions past the agreed-upon time. I believe it is good for the people of Manitoba to see their elected members at work and vigorously debating serious issues in this House.

The more days we're sitting in this Chamber, the more Manitobans will find out what is happening here, what questions are being asked by opposition members, who Manitobans elected to bring this majority government to account, and how opposition members fully scrutinize the bills this government has introduced and, more importantly, Manitobans will know the kind of bills they have introduced and are planning to introduce.

Thankfully, all the proceedings of this House, including committee meetings, are recorded for posterity. Anyone with Internet connection and a computer, laptop, tablet or smartphone can access these Hansard records to see how Manitoba's elected representatives have conducted themselves in this House.

Having said this, I, too, Madam Speaker, am perplexed why we are debating this ill-prepared, ill-conceived bill which patently lacked serious and intentional consultations with First Nations' leaders and communities.

I thought we were called to this extension of legislative session to deal with a very important matter—emergency matters on finances like the BITSA bill. But we are not debating BITSA. Where is the BITSA?

Madam Speaker, Bill 29 is nowhere remotely close to a BITSA bill. Instead, it is a bill that seriously undermines the relationship of this government with First Nations and Aboriginal people.

Madam Speaker, history is replete with accounts and instances that we all should learn from. When government policies are enforced without care and

consideration for those who will be affected by these policies, tragedy will always occur. The first and most obvious that comes to mind is the policy of killing the Indian in the child. Of course it was not introduced in those words exactly, but that was the intent of the residential school policy.

A First Nations elder shared with me that, to this day, the decades after her stint from a residential school here in Manitoba, she still sleeps on her back because if they were caught sleeping on their sides, they will be hit or whipped, as sleeping on their sides mean they are communicating with their bedmates in their own First Nations' language, which was strictly prohibited.

Likewise, she never experienced being in a powwow ceremony while in residential school. What else can you take from that but an intentional way of exterminating a very strong First Nations cultural practice?

Several years ago I attended a powwow in a place outside of Winnipeg. I was so delighted and surprised to see a toddler who was in his diapers ran to the field where youngsters and adults were dancing in their powwow regalia. This toddler had no such outfits and was, as I said, in diapers even. And, in the middle of the field, this toddler was dancing to the beat of the drums, just like the rest of the powwow participants. I even considered him a way better dancer than some of the dancers there.

It's too bad I did not own a smart phone then, so I was not able to videotape this toddler. That experience of seeing this toddler running in the middle of the field from the stands where spectators were seated was an emotional experience for me. That sight clearly reminded me that a nation's culture should not and cannot be taken away from children, just like what the residential school policy tried to do. Never should cultural genocide be ever tried again.

Now, Madam Speaker, here we are in this Chamber debating night hunting. I have heard how my colleague, the member from The Pas, felt so hurt and disturbed by what this bill will bring to her people. It will not only limit their ability to provide subsistence for their families but, more insidiously, transgress their rights as First Nations Aboriginal people.

Madam Speaker, on this side of the House, we agree with the idea of working to improve safe hunting in consultation and with collaboration of

indigenous nations—with indigenous nations and government. Has this been done by this government? From statements from several indigenous leaders, this was not so. The operative words here are consultation and collaboration. How can consultation and collaboration happen when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has said that night hunting is turning into a race war? Rubbing salt to the wound, the Premier also said, quote, young indigenous guys going out and shooting a bunch of moose because they can, because they say it is their right, it doesn't make any sense to me, unquote. That was from a news item from CBC on January 20, 2017.

The Premier went further when talking to a reporter at his resort in Costa Rica. Quote: Young indigenous men—a preponderance of them are offenders, with criminal records—are going off shooting guns in the middle of the night. Unquote. That came from a Maclean's magazine article.

Madam Speaker, I know of several indigenous moose hunters who are respectful, hard-working indigenous persons. One I know quite well, he works full time at Tolko, now Canadian Kraft Paper, and from known information, this person has had no encounters with the law or police officers. There you go; we just can't generalize or stereotype indigenous men and women as offenders or with criminal records.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

On this side of the House, we believe the Manitoba government to be successful in its efforts in shared management of our big game population. We will support this government in this goal, but our laws need to be effective and enforceable and actually meet the Province's legal obligations, including constitutional obligations. The Province's own legal obligations are spelled out in the minister's own transition binder. It says that (a) major changes that have a major effect on Aboriginal hunting require significant consultation with all Manitoba First Nations; (b) the scale of this consultation would exceed that of Bipole III, which was Manitoba's largest consultation effort to date—quoted from the Sustainable Development transition binder.

* (15:00)

Madam Speaker, we are not convinced that the—Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not convinced that the Pallister government has met its legal requirements as set out by their own department. Indigenous

government, both First Nation and Metis, have said that the government has not properly consulted them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the law must also live up to its billing. It must be a real system of shared management of hunting in this province. This bill, Bill 29, pays lip service to the idea of shared management but leaves all the power in the hands of government. When the principles of shared management are ignored, it only makes it more likely that there will be problems implementing the bill. One of the principles of shared management is consultation, and it's clear the Premier has failed to properly engage the Province's partners.

On this side of the House, we have practical concerns with this bill. The bill calls for a new hunting permit process that would require significant resources to ensure timely access to the application as well as processing of the applications. The Water Stewardship and Biodiversity Division, the division responsible for these policies, currently has a 25 per cent vacancy rate, and the government has eliminated dozens of positions in its regional offices. This division is already starved for resources. Implementing this major change without appropriate staffing would overburden existing staff and lead to problems when issuing permits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe many or all of my colleagues on both sides of this House are familiar with the tragedy of E. coli-contaminated water that struck Walkerton, Ontario, in May 2000. The population of Walkerton then was less than 5,000, and 2,300 people fell ill and seven people died as a result of the E. coli outbreak. Thorough investigation and a formal inquiry on the situation was called. The Walkerton Public Utilities Commission water plant operators were found to have engaged in a host of improper operating practices. The austerity measures and cutbacks under Ontario Conservative government of Mike Harris led to the privatization of water testing in October 1996.

We all know cutbacks often lead to privatization of public services, and when services are privatized, there will be staff positions eliminated. A key witness to the Walkerton Inquiry, Dr. Murray McQuigge, the regional medical officer of health, testified that this catastrophe could have been avoided. He suggested that cutbacks and the privatization of water-testing labs by the Ontario Conservative government were partly to be blamed for the water contamination in Walkerton.

Just last month, on May 1st of this year, Robbie Schnurr, one of the people who fell ill in Walkerton water contamination but survived, finally found a doctor who will administer the drugs for a doctor-assisted suicide.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order.

Point of Order

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just—the honourable member for Rossmere, on a point of order.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Rossmere): I'd like to suggest the member has wandered quite drastically off course. Some fascinating issues—medically assisted suicide, unclean water. I'm not sure—I may be wrong—I don't know if the words night hunting have come up yet. But that is what we're debating, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I have been listening, and I think earlier that the member was able to perhaps tie it back. I'm not really sure. But it's been a little while since such a connection was made, and I would implore you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to encourage the member, if you would be so kind, and if she would be willing to indulge that she could return to the topic about which we are discussing this afternoon. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Concordia, on the same point of order.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Deputy Official Opposition House Leader): On the same point of order, and it is my pleasure to rise and put a few words on the record with regards to this particular point of order raised by the member opposite, because I think it does speak very closely to some of the discussions that we've been having in this House of late with regards to how members listen to one another, how they pay attention to some of the words that are being spoken and also about how those words are interpreted and then disseminated afterwards.

I was, as well, listening very closely to the member and, you know, I wasn't having a conversation with another member during most of the speech. I was sitting closely listening and intently here in my place, and what I think I may have heard was the member building quite an expansive case for her very reasonable argument with regards to this important issue, and, Mr. Speaker, you've been very clear with members of this House that we are to remain relevant to speak to those topics that are—have come forward for debate here in this House.

And in this case, in fact, the Speaker has been very clear that we are not debating the bill—Bill 29 which has been called by this government, but in fact what we are debating is the reasoned amendment which has been brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition and I think the Leader of the Opposition has set a very clear tone in terms of how that debate would carry forward. It was very clear that he was speaking very specifically to that issue, and I think it's very important that all members recognize that fact, recognize how important it is for all of us to stay on that topic, to put as many good arguments as we can towards that specific topic, but not to veer off whether it be to other issues or whether it be to bring us back to the bill, which I did hear other members of the government—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I just want to just interrupt the member from Concordia. Like, I heard what you had to say on the point of order. I just don't want to make sure that we're debating that—the point of order and stall tactics. But I just wanted to—also it's not a point of order from the member from Rossmere, it's just that, you know, again, I said it like this morning in a resolution, I'm going to say it again now, if you could actually—if the member from Logan, if they could, you know, stay on the topic and talk about what's at hand. You're sort of veering off but not totally.

I was listening and—but at the same time it's about the Bill 29 and the amendment—reasoned amendment that was put forward by the member—the Leader of the Opposition—Opposition Leader, and if we can still talk about, you know, why this shouldn't go to second reading. I think we need to talk about that topic.

So I just want to thank the member from Concordia.

Point of Order

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, the honourable member for Concordia, on another point of order.

Mr. Wiebe: I will not be reflecting on your ruling and judgment with regards to the previous point of order. I'm in full agreement with your ruling.

What this point of order pertains to is my concern that members opposite are using points of order specifically on the issue of relevance to disrupt the ability of members on this side to present arguments that, in my judgment, are sometimes very complex, sometimes quite far-ranging and reaching in terms of bringing issues that are important to

Manitobans together and to present them in a way that is then—has the ability to be understood by the public.

* (15:10)

So, while I think it's very clear that members on this side of the House have been, you know, as concise and to the point as they possibly can be, you know, listening to your very reasonable suggestion that everybody stay on topic. You have given that advice, not just today, but multiple times in this House. The Speaker has given that advice. And while members on our side of the House are trying to adhere to that, what we find is members opposite continue to bring forward these points of order which simply serve to disrupt and distract our members from presenting those ideas in a way that adheres with your ruling.

So I'm concerned about that. I think that a simple caution or judgment on your point—on your part may help clarify that for members. But I think there's a long-standing tradition in this House of giving members some latitude to create these sometimes complex arguments that can help understand these sometimes complex issues and bring them to a very specific conclusion here in this House.

So I look forward to your ruling on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Again, on the point of order—and both points of order, there's no—really no point of order here.

Like I said, I said—I remember—I—what I said point—when I said to relevance, I actually—even this morning, a member from the—the member from Lac du Bonnet, I also told him to stay relevant to what the topic was, so it's on both sides. I've given you warnings on both sides of the House to stay relevant. I know we're extended here. Everybody's in certain moods that we have here right now. So we just want to make sure that we can continue with the duties of this Chamber, and to respect each other and to stay on topic is very important.

So I'll have the member for Logan (Ms. Marcelino) continue her speech.

* * *

Ms. Marcelino: I wish my honourable friend from Rossmere had heard that, prior to my briefly citing the Walkerton tragedy, I had just referred to the 25 per cent vacancy rate at the water diversity and—Water Stewardship and Biodiversity division and

that this division's already starved for resources, and with that vacancy, there will certainly be problems happening. And then I segued to the Walkerton incident. So I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm being relevant here.

Anyway, let me continue. As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, last month, Robbie Schnurr, one of the people who fell ill in Walkerton water contamination, but survived, finally found a doctor who will administer the drugs for a doctor-assisted suicide. He said he lives with severe neurological damage as a result of being poisoned by the Walkerton water in 2000.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want the Manitoba government to be successful in its efforts for shared management of our big-game population, but legislation—[interjection]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Ms. Marcelino: —needs to withstand scrutiny that meets the Province's legal responsibilities. Legislation needs to be practical in that it can be reasonably used, and it needs to meet a public policy objective like shared management, not simply used for divisive politics.

Unfortunately, on all three counts, this bill fails. But we agree with the principle of working with indigenous governments to promote hunting safely. That's why this amendment to this bill is being introduced and being debated as we speak. We propose improving the bill with an enhanced and real co-management regime. I believe that's a very relevant issue to be discussed here today.

We also believe, on this side of the House, consultation and consensus first before such an ill-conceived legislation. Indigenous and non-indigenous people can and should live alongside with one another respectfully and engage in meaningful consultations to identify resolutions to these issues—identified issues.

We also believe First Nations and Metis hunters, like any other, stand to benefit from having a healthy game population in Manitoba and safe measures of hunting that game. Indigenous peoples also want safe and sustainable hunting practices and meaningful consultations are essential to the success of changing hunting culture in our province.

Going back to that Aboriginal person, who, I believe, is respectful and upright individual, every year in the fall, he hunts for moose, and one moose is

enough to feed his family for a year, since there are only three of them in the family.

Actually, I have never tasted a moose, and one time I was at their place, his wife, I think, cooked roasted moose, and I bet you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it tasted better than the other roasted beef I've tasted in my life. And I—they were saying game meat, such kinds of meat are gamey in taste but I wouldn't even recognize it—that it's a moose, because it tastes so good.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, indigenous peoples want safe, sustainable hunting practices and meaningful consultations are essential to the success of changing hunting culture in the province. If safety, ethics and animal welfare are the real concern, then the government should be working co-operatively with First Nations to ensure they reach the end goal without impeding on treaty rights.

First Nations Canadians have a right to hunt for food and it's a right protected by the Constitution Act of 1982, provided it is done safely and under certain conditions. This legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 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 this is clearly something that this government hasn't done.

Many First Nations appear to be unsupportive of the current bill. During this government's announcement of Bill 20, there was no First Nations representation. The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs' Grand Chief Arlen Dumas told reporters consultation with indigenous people is far from finished. It's barely started. Quote: There has to be meaningful conversation. Unquote. Dumas said, quote: I wouldn't call it a bill yet. It's just a recommendation. End quote.

Well, reasonable forces get crowded out by the government's inflammatory comments like race war. Comments like this are not only racist, but they hinder the development of respectful relationships with First Nations and reconciliation efforts. There needs to be meaningful dialogue between government and First Nations to come up with a reasonable solution that are safe and sustainable.

* (15:20)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on—in September of 2017, Manitoba Metis Federation members voted to ban spotlighting for their members. That's according to CBC, September 21, 2017. Their new resolution

places further restrictions and limitations on night hunting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see this self-governing approach that MMF took as a step in the right direction. It actually goes further than what the Province has proposed. Indigenous leaders have said they are willing to work with the Premier (Mr. Pallister), but this requires working together and meaningfully consulting, something the Premier has not been willing to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, like any form of hunting, monitoring and enforcement are needed, whether that is self-regulation or provincial regulation. The division responsible for implementing this legislation has a 25 per cent vacancy rate; we're deeply concerned that this government has not put forward the necessary resources to set up this system. The government needs to work more closely with indigenous peoples when they are dealing with indigenous hunting rights. A failure to work with First Nations will not improve this ongoing situation we're facing now with regard to night hunting.

We know that a strong duty-to-consult framework must be the basis for good governance in Manitoba. Engagement in meaningful collaboration with Manitoba's indigenous nations, the urban Aboriginal community and the indigenous organizations must be a priority. However, the Premier and this government have repeatedly failed to present a comprehensive duty-to-consult framework with Manitoba's indigenous peoples. The Premier has ignored the pathway to reconciliation laid out by The Path to Reconciliation Act, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. He has also ignored the continuous requests for consultations by the First Nations, Metis and Inuit people of our province and has continued full steam ahead with his ideologically driven legislation.

Without the duty-to-consult framework, this government has opened up Pemmican Island to mining speculation. Without the duty-to-consult framework, this government cut ties with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and thrown hundreds of First Nation fishers out of a job, shut down on—the East Side Road Authority and ended community benefit agreements with First Nations. This government threatened to shut down the Grace Lake Airport, broadsiding the people of Mathias Colomb Cree Nation and threatening the viability of Manitoba's only First Nation-owned airline.

We believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these actions are regressive and hurt the government's relationship with our First Nations, Metis and Inuit peoples. The leaders of this current government continually fail to recognize how the long colonial history of abuse has impacted the indigenous people of our province. They refuse to try and understand the needs and hopes of our First Nations, Metis and Inuit communities. Instead, they focus on ideological attacks against indigenous peoples.

The Premier (Mr. Pallister) has also—the Premier continues to show lack of respect to meet and consult indigenous leaders on issues that have direct impacts on their people.

Despite continuous requests, the Premier didn't meet with MKO Chief Sheila North Wilson regarding indigenous health issues.

The Premier is also hiding his lack of consideration for indigenous peoples. In January 2017, he claimed that his ministers have visited every First Nations in Manitoba, yet a freedom of information request revealed that, at the time, they had only visited one-third of Manitoba's First Nations communities.

We have a government that is not committed to working with Manitoba's First Nations in a respectful manner, and because of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): I will start by thanking the constituency of Tyndall Park for re-electing me in 2016 with a majority over my opponent of about 490, which is not really that bad or good, but to stay on topic before the member from Rossmere gets up, I will say the following: (1) Bill 29, which prohibits night hunting, is a good bill, a very good bill because it seeks to promote public safety, but—there's a big but. However, the problem that I have with the bill as it is written is that it seems to be amateurish in the sense that there are some laws and decisions and case law that were supposed to be taken into account when you propose anything that proposes a prohibition. A prohibition on the part of government is an admission that there are rights; there are rights that are generally considered either traditional, commonsensical or legal, and I am speaking from my experience as a trial lawyer before, that the member from—

An Honourable Member: Bedrock.

Mr. Marcelino: Bedrock—I mean from—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Marcelino: —Emerson, is piping in and you'll get your chance to speak, Mr. Speaker. The problem that I have with this proposed law is that it impinges on treaty rights. There's no simple way of saying it. Treaty rights that have been recognized for the indigenous people of Canada, and I would quote something from the CBC which published the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada sometime in December of 2006. That decision acquitted two men who had been convicted of night hunting with a flashlight. And the Supreme Court said that the men's treaty rights prevailed, as in: should be given priority over provincial law. And the court overturned the convictions. That's in 2006.

* (15:30)

Now, when I read further, there was that statement from the court in its summary that says that those who hold those treaty rights—and I'm paraphrasing—originally would have used torch light, bows and arrows, but their equipment must be allowed to evolve, and the use of guns, spotlights and motor vehicles reflects the current state of the evolution of the Tsartlip's historic hunting practices. And these are the judges who wrote the decision.

I must also, in fairness say, that it was a very narrow decision. It was 4-3. But then I took a look at other cases wherein treaty rights that were discussed in some of the cases shows that there is that respect for the traditional hunting rights of the indigenous peoples.

Now, my problem with this current bill is that it needs to strike a very careful balance between public safety and a healthy respect for those treaty rights. Now, if this bill—and I say with two letters that are capitalized: if—this bill is meant to degrade, demean or diminish those treaty rights, it should be struck down because those treaty rights, although not as absolute as we might think they are, also evolve. Meaning, those treaty rights have to be taken into consideration every time that we pass any law in this province. Those treaty rights include consultation in accordance with the Supreme Court, that it's part of our obligation as legislators to respect those treaty rights by consulting with those affected.

There's a beautiful word that's being used every time that somebody from the Conservative side speaks. They call them stakeholders. Stakeholders. Those are treaty stakeholders. And for us to demean

it by saying that we could pass the law because it is inhumane to shoot at a deer using a spotlight, is to start—or, is it an attempt to trigger or inflame hatred towards those who are exercising their treaty rights to hunt or to fish or to cultivate in their reserves or go to Crown land and hunt. It is as simple as what is commonsensical. Common sense dictates that consultation should be done with those who are most affected by it.

And I am being told to direct my statement towards the Deputy Speaker, and I'll do that. But I have to look around because I'm looking at the amount of attention that some of the members from the other side are paying to what I'm saying. And I understand that they're good. Maybe they're just waiting for a point of order to raise. And I'm trying my best to drown out any of your concerns.

Our legal obligation, especially when we craft any law, is to consult, and consultation is part of the legislative process. It's a process, and it's not available only for those who have Internet. It is supposed to involve people who are affected directly by the rules and regulations that we intend to impose, those penalties that we intend to propose. And by telling them that they cannot use a spotlight is to tell them that they should buy those thermal imaging equipment which is \$627 on the Internet. And they cannot use their traditional ways of hunting for food, and it will not be fair.

The law has always been designed by reasonable people to be fair and just and kind. And, when the law becomes a little bit overbearing or when the law becomes a burden to those who will be affected by it, then the law will not usually be obeyed, and we will see civil disobedience, or we will see law enforcement scrambling to take violators and put them in jail or stop them from hunting for food.

And from my point of view as an immigrant in this country and as an avid hunter myself—I still own my 30-30, and I still have my own carbine—my concern is not really about the animals themselves but also for people who will get hurt if public safety is not taken into account. But then I was of the belief that maybe we could strike a balance between those who are most affected by the law and those who are concerned about their own public safety or personal safety.

*(15:40)

And there are some attempts on the part of the proponent of this bill to strike that balance. But, for

me, it was still an imbalance. The balance has to be to accept that those treaty rights of the indigenous peoples of Canada should be respected absolutely. It is part of our tradition to respect the rights of those who were here first. We have to respect the treaty rights of those who have allowed us to stay on their land.

And we have to recognize that even if you were here for 38 and a half years, like me, and for those who have been here maybe 100 years, the indigenous rights should always be considered, respected and given its proper place in how we craft our law.

We agree with the idea of working to improve safe hunting with the collaboration of indigenous nations and governments, and we want the Manitoba government to be successful in its efforts in shared management of our big game population. But our laws need to be effective and enforceable and actually meet the Province's legal obligations, including constitutional obligations.

The Province's own legal obligations are spelled out in the minister's own transition binder. It says: major changes that have a major effect on Aboriginal hunting require significant consultation with all Manitoba First Nations, and the scale of this consultation would exceed that of Bipole III, which was Manitoba's largest consultation effort to date.

And I daresay, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this obligation to consult has not been obeyed. This duty was not performed. This obligation was not done in accordance with the common sense approach that we have, that we should always consult with the stakeholders who are indigenous and who will be affected by what we propose in this Chamber.

We are not convinced that the Pallister government has met its legal requirements as set out in their own department. Indigenous government, both First Nation and Metis, have said that the government has not properly consulted, and I'm hoping that the law will live up to its billing as a real system of shared management of hunting in the province.

This bill pays lip service to the idea of shared management. It's just talk but—and leaves all the power in the hands of government. And there's something that has to be said about that. Lip service, as I would usefully indicate—words are cheap, action should speak louder.

And when those people who were distinctly and separately and specifically affected by the

proposed bill were not consulted—and they said so—it's a violation of our legal obligations under the constitution to consult.

Shared management only makes it more likely that there will be problems in implementing the bill if the principles of shared management are ignored.

Shared management usually indicates that everybody was on the same page. And I believe that the minister responsible for this bill did not do her duty in good faith. And we have practical problems. There's 25 per cent vacancy rate in those who deal with the licensing process. *[interjection]* The member from Morris will have his turn, and I just hope that he hears what I'm trying to say because it is important for us to listen to one another.

I'm deeply concerned that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has used a very insensitive word. Or, there are two words: race war. What he said, according to the CBC, was that young indigenous guys going out and shooting a bunch of moose because they can, because they say it's their right. It does not make sense—any sense to me. This is in January 2017. And I believe that it did not help. It did not help our cause of reconciliation.

Reconciliation takes more than just words. There has to be personal acts of kindness to one another. Reconciliation requires that we should be honest with each other by at least doing our duty in good faith. And well-intentioned individuals sometimes make mistakes. And when we do, what do we usually say? We're sorry, but it was never intended to hurt.

It is a very contentious issue, especially when you provide reasons for the indigenous members of our society to doubt the sincerity of this government. It is a very serious issue when we inflame the sense of hatred or anger. It is very divisive and it is very disuniting.

Our province is facing a test. It is a test of how good we are as Manitobans. And indigenous and non-indigenous people can and should live alongside with one another with respect and engaged in meaningful conversations to identify solutions to issues. First Nations and Metis hunters, like any others, stand to benefit from having a healthy game population in our province. And safe measures of hunting that game will also benefit those who are themselves hunting.

* (15:50)

Indigenous peoples also want safe and sustainable hunting practices, and meaningful consultations are essential to the success of changing the hunting culture in the province. If safety, ethics and animal welfare are the real concern, then the government should be working co-operatively with First Nations to ensure they reach the end goal without trampling on or impeding treaty rights. First Nations Canadians have a right to hunt for food at night, and it is protected by the Constitution Act of 1982, provided it is done safely and under certain conditions.

Failure to work with First Nations in a—is unfortunate. The Premier's comments towards indigenous peoples in Manitoba are damaging to reconciliation efforts, and they perpetuate a negative stereotype. The Premier is the father and leader of our province, no matter what the political stripe, and he should be leading us by example. Time and again he has failed, but he might be doing better if he heard our word. This is a plea from an immigrant that we should stand by our people and rule with kindness. Telling them that they are, well, bad hunters or bad people does not really help us, never did.

The pathway to reconciliation is never easy. It is never easy, but there are ways. There are ways that we could actually help in promoting reconciliation among ourselves. There are pathways sprinkled with kindness to each other and honesty. We cannot keep on doing what we're doing by insulting the indigenous nations of our province or ignoring them or insulting them by calling them names. We cannot be a united province, serving our common mutual interests if we ignored a portion, a huge portion, of our province.

My friends, thank you for allowing me to speak. I am an immigrant, and as an immigrant, I have a lot of gratitude to all the indigenous First Nations for allowing my people to settle here on Treaty 1 territory. This is Indian land, let us not forget about it. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there any other speakers?

Is the House—oh, the government—the honourable Government House Leader.

House Business

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader): On House business, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm seeking leave of the House that—to announce the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs will meet Tuesday, June 19th, 2018, at 6 p.m., to consider

the report entitled *Modernizing Manitoba's Conflict of Interest Legislation, Recommendations of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner*, by Jeffrey Schnoor, Queen's court, dated April 2018.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I was going to ask leave for the House if there's to announce—for the Government House Leader (Mr. Cullen) to announce the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs that will meet on Tuesday, June 19th, 2018, at 6 p.m., to consider the report entitled *Modernizing Manitoba's Conflict of Interest Legislation, Recommendations of Conflict of Interest Commissioner* by Jeffrey Schooner [*phonetic*], QC, dated April 2018.

Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Leave has been denied.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there any other speakers on the debate on the reasoned amendment?

The House is ready for the question—oh, sorry.

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): The issue of hunting in Manitoba and who can and who cannot hunt and the method of hunting goes to the very origin of our province. There's a famous camp song about the land of the silver birch, home of the beaver, where still the mighty moose wanders at will, and that's Manitoba.

We have seen almost the extinction of moose and beaver in Canada—almost, and that is—almost happened because of irresponsible hunting practices. We've seen an almost extinction of the buffalo, so when it comes to hunting in the present context and the amendment and the bill that we are talking about today, it's important to realize and understand where we have been.

Hunting methods have changed over time. The demographics of Manitoba have changed over time. As the member from Tyndall Park eloquently said that he is very grateful, as I am, to have the opportunity—and I think everyone is very grateful to have the opportunity to live here on land that famously was dealt with between—well, Chief Peguis and Lord Selkirk and later on with the federal government or the Crown. And I'll just make this observation: The Crown acted honourably. The federal government has a lot to answer for—a lot to answer for over the century and a half that Manitoba's been in existence.

And it's important to recognize this because there's a significant issue surrounding who can hunt, where, how, what time of day. And dealt with without proper forethought or consultation—can lead to misunderstanding. And if you go back to when the railways came into what settlers—or, Europeans, mostly—considered new land, virgin territory, they also wiped out the wild animals. And that's—you know, we know about that with the bison and almost with the beaver and the moose.

* (16:00)

Now, I'm not a big fan of moose at all. And I think the House will understand that I don't mind if moose were wiped out. And I would certainly support that kind of legislation. And I have made that suggestion in Newfoundland, actually. I—and this is paramount to hunting because they—moose are an invasive species on the island of Newfoundland. And I wrote an article a few years ago about the collisions—the untold collisions that have caused people to die or be injured due to moose collisions on the island of Newfoundland, including, famously, one of my colleagues, Fabian—Senator Fabian Manning. I think he was in an accident while we served together in Parliament.

And I raise this because there's another aspect to the hunting, and I don't know if it's been explored. And that is population control of wildlife—and of humans. Population of—we'll get—we'll come back to the moose in a second, but where humans are now able to go with modern transportation—everything from roads to railways to float planes and helicopters, snowmobiles—that changes the game. Most of Manitoba is north of Selkirk.

Now I know that the member from Wilkes or from—someone suggested Fort Whyte—we'll just use that. It is—and I—that's not my suggestion. I want to be clear. But we'll just say people within the Perimeter as a whole—some people find it shocking that some—the largest portion of Manitoba is not south or within the Perimeter, but north of Selkirk. In fact, over time, the infrastructure does improve and the reach for people extends further and further where before wildlife could be wild without human encroachment.

In regard to the moose, as an invasive species, I think it would be quite advantageous to the people of the island of Newfoundland to exterminate all those invasive animals and let the ecosystem go back to its natural state and allow for safe passage, because it is a beautiful place.

Now I—the-Newfoundland is unbelievably beautiful. When I was minister of Marine Atlantic, which is the constitutional ferry service between Cape Breton and the island of Newfoundland, I was able to do the Argentia-Port aux Basques loop there. It's a drive which I encourage everyone to do. If they got rid of the moose, it'd be a much safer drive.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

So that would be an example of hunting with a purpose. Now, when I wrote this in the St. John's journal or herald, I was shocked that the island of Newfoundland was up in arms with my suggestion. I did radio shows from Bonavista to Gander to, I think, Port aux—[interjection] yes. It was unbelievable. People are passionate about the moose. But the fact remains, population control can have a benefit.

So how do we do that? How do we balance the natural environment with the need to allow for sustainable development? And when it comes to hunting, what is appropriate? Is it—you know, thank goodness that I—you know, in the United States, it seems that they use bazookas to shoot mosquitoes.

That's what it seems. It's not the reality, but they take guns to a level that is probably not—that is not consistent with the values of Canadians, and part of the argument from the American side of the border is, well, people need them for hunting. I have no idea why someone would need a semi-automatic gun to hunt, and I don't think anyone in Canada would accept that.

So where do you draw that line? There are recent Supreme Court rulings dealing with Aboriginal and Metis citizens that are controversial and maybe not defined as much as they should be, and that's where the federal and provincial legislation takes hold.

There was a time when muskrat and beaver and other types of wildlife that—you know, there was the snare traps, which had been used for a very, very long time, but society has decided that that may not be the way to go.

There's a lot more empathy, I think, today for wildlife and for our natural environment than there used to be back in the day, with the exception, of course, of First Nations, you know, pre-contact and post-contact, but I'm talking about us newcomers, at least metaphorically.

So, when it comes to the issue of where to draw the line—so, we've agreed that guns—certain kinds of guns are not acceptable. We've agreed that certain

kinds of trapping are not available. Let's explore the Supreme Court rulings.

No matter who you are in Canada, you have a right to freedom of speech, but what you don't have the right to do is break the law. And rightly or wrongly, in Canada, the law—there—we do not have what we used to think of as the supremacy of Parliament.

* (16:10)

The fact is, Parliament is super duper powerful, but so is the Supreme Court. And, if the Supreme Court makes a ruling within the constitution, well, that's the law of the land. And I think we all agree, in this place of lawmakers, that we shouldn't break the law.

So, when we move over to hunting practices, it brings us to this legislation, the legislation that refers to the rights and responsibilities of citizens, of lawmakers and citizens of—and our First Nations communities and Metis. So let's go to the next step. There are, apparently, and I am okay to be corrected on a point of order on the facts, but, apparently, there have been instances of night hunting and at least one instance of spotlight hunting at night.

So where does that—and then there's the issue of—[inaudible] the traditional values and traditions of First Nation, Metis people—and where do you draw the line? Like, I—with respect to many people—well, everyone—I would suggest that there's a large consensus, though we don't actually know because the government didn't reach out to the Aboriginal communities, but I will make this assumption to the Aboriginal and Metis communities, and I'm happy to be corrected—but that spotlight hunting is probably not—there would be agreement that there are other ways to hunt.

So, if there is agreement there, what about night hunting? I used to canoe a lot in Manitoba, and when there's no moon, it is dark. When it is cloudy and there is a moon, it is pitch black. However, when there's a full moon and it's clear, it's amazing what you can see. It's kind of like one of those old VHS black-and-white tapes back in the day; you can see, but you can't quite see everything.

So where does that take us? We have to wonder what the traditions were, and are, of our First Nations people and what the values are as a society and what the law says. I think we all agree that if you're going to be hunting, to do it in an—in humane manner. Are you—prolonging unnecessary suffering is not a—that's

just not acceptable in this day and age. There's no reason that animals have to suffer, domestic or in the wild. However, this does go to methods of hunting.

There's a spot in Headingley where—and it's actually at FortWhyte Alive. There's a replica of the very clever tactic of—that First Nations people used before contact, and that was putting up barriers in—sort of a V-shape configuration to encourage the herding animal, which is, in the example I'm using, buffalo, to point them in one direction and off a cliff or—and then the—instead of having to go after a animal that is healthy, you can get the animals that are wounded or killed. And that was common. There are places all along the Assiniboia. In Headingley, there's a famous spot just not even a few kilometres from the Trans-Canada, along the river that was used for exactly that.

But we don't do that anymore. Large—and maybe it's because there are no—there aren't enough bison in and around to attempt that, but I think even if there were, that's not the way it would be handled, for population control or otherwise. So we've identified another method that society has decided that is not on for a variety of reasons.

So let's think about the population distribution of Manitoba. North of the 53rd parallel, it's certainly much different than south of the 53rd parallel as Manitoba is different from the 51st parallel south, which is about approximately Gimli south. And the demographic is different. And the population density is different. So does that mean that we need to have different regulation in different parts of the province?

I think we agree that hunting within the city limits is off-line, not acceptable. There are a lot of deer in Charleswood, a lot of deer, and I—forgive me for—I remember I was first elected and shared a portion with a MLA from Charleswood, there—like, that was a big issue, population control of wild animals. Half the community fed the deer, and the other half wanted to kill the deer. And then there was another half that—*[interjection]*—I know, I know, I know; I'm using Efficiency Manitoba math here—would, you know, just not care. But we agreed on another principle as a society that in highly density—in high density areas, you can't go hunting with firearms, and we may have to check the law on this, but I don't believe you can use crossbows or slingshots or any kind of other trapping method within the city limit. Okay, so that is something. And, in fact, if you go to other communities throughout Manitoba, they will have similar regulations.

* (16:20)

And, you know, Madam Speaker, people are saying it's crazy that I would object to hunting within the city limits with semi-automatic or crossbow weapons. I would say that people who make that suggestion, they are probably the crazy ones. So I—sorry that the people across the way would make such a ridiculous suggestion in their heckles.

But it does not negate the point that the population density does matter. So let's go—so let's say below the 53rd parallel, we agree that the population is too dense for hunting with firearms or other methods. So what does that mean between the 53rd parallel and the 60th parallel? Now, again, for our friends within—or, maybe before the government mentions, in the city of Winnipeg, the southern boundary of Manitoba's at the 49th parallel. And I'm talking about the 54—the 53rd parallel. That's four degrees of latitude. From the 53rd parallel to the 60th parallel, that's seven degrees latitude. Like, that is the portions that we're talking about. There's four degrees latitude difference in the north-south composition of the province. If you go east-west, it's even less dense because of the kink at the Manitoba border as you go north, to the east.

So we have a different population density. So what does that mean? Does that mean we should have different laws for north or south? Or is there a way to regulate issues north of the 53rd parallel, south of the 60th parallel, in a way that can accommodate both the rights enshrined in law by the Supreme Court and safety?

Now, I was just with a bunch of people from the Manitoba rifle association and, to a person, they were opposed to hunting at night—to a person. And their logic was: Why would you shoot in the dark? In fact, that is a byword, you know, when you're—don't know what necessarily is happening, it's a shot in the dark. That's what we say. So why would anyone use a gun in the dark?

And I don't have the answer to that. I would say it's basically a bad idea. But I reserve judgment until I hear what First Nations have to say about the issue of night hunting. Spot—or, night hunting using spotlights—I just can't—with all due respect to everyone, I just can't agree with that. That's just bad.

In regard to the issue of collaboration and talking, I think there's merit in consultation. And I find it disturbing, the 'differential' facts have been gone back and forth, when some people say, oh, the

First Nations have been consulted, and some people, oh, no, only a fraction of the First Nations have been consulted before the law was introduced.

Madam Speaker, I haven't got to the middle yet. I've given some examples on the extreme of the argument, which is more not like—it's more like a dodecahedron crystal than it is a black and white issue, or binary. So it's worth having this discussion. I'm open-minded. I think most people are open-minded about these things, and I think most people want to obey the law, and what's wrong with that?

I'll just end by saying kill all the moose, please. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Assiniboia, on a matter of privilege.

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, during the supply debate, we are—the Hansard people endeavour to note when a minister takes an undertaking and they send out a notice to everyone in this place, and such an undertaking was done by the Minister of Families (Mr. Fielding) regarding certain correspondence and I could table that, if you wish.

But, the fact is that response was due on May 28th. It's three weeks past that date and we still don't have the response, and this is a critical letter. This is the letter that the minister has said is what he signed from the—what he signed from the Province of Manitoba on behalf of the Manitoba province to initiate the one dollar sketchy land deal—whatever you want to call it—land transfer for a 55-bed men-only opioid treatment centre in the middle of a residential area. It's an important letter, and Manitoba Health, by the way, Madam Speaker, has no skin, that they're not involved; they're not putting in any money for it; it's not regulated. This is a men-only opioid thing.

The letter is critical. The minister, not once, but several times, endeavoured to bring forward or volunteered to bring it—the letter. He made that commitment in writing. It's verified by independent individuals and we still don't have that document.

So, Madam Speaker, how are we to move forward when, during Estimates, a minister who says

they're going to give something at a later date does not do it?

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I think before the member goes any further I would like to indicate, as a matter of privilege that he's trying to raise, I would like to inform him and the House that a matter concerning the methods by which the House proceeds in the conduct of business is a matter of order, not privilege.

Joseph Maingot, in the second edition of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada* states on page 14 that allegations of breach of privilege by a member in the House that amount to complaints about procedures and practices in the House are by their very nature matters of order.

He also states, on page 223 of the same edition, a breach of the standing orders or a failure to follow an established practice would invoke a point of order rather than a question of privilege.

On this basis, I would therefore rule that the honourable member does not have a prima facie case of privilege and I would urge the member, perhaps, he might want to give the minister's office a call and find out where those documents are.

Mr. Fletcher: Thank you for that and I will make a motion—

Madam Speaker: What is the member raising now, a point of order?

Mr. Fletcher: No, no. I'm just making a motion on my matter of privilege.

* (16:30)

Madam Speaker: I have just dismissed your privilege. There is no matter of privilege, so there is no motion to be made, because that was not a matter of privilege, is what I have just told the member.

Mr. Fletcher: I'd like to challenge the ruling.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have support?

The member does not have support to challenge that ruling.

Point of Order

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

Mr. Fletcher: I appreciate what you've said. I wonder, because this is very valuable information and it's not the only such undertaking made by other ministers, I wonder if you could explain how a

minister can be compelled to provide a document which clearly the minister does not want to provide.

Madam Speaker: I would indicate to the member that, under our rules, 77(17), it does indicate that during the consideration of departmental Estimates and the debate on the concurrence motion in the Committee of Supply, when a minister takes a question under advisement, he or she must, within 45 days of the question being asked, respond to the question in one of a number of ways. And it does provide the list of ways.

Unfortunately, I as the Speaker do not have any authority to impose a consequence when this does not occur. So I would indicate that the member does not have a point of order, but I would encourage him to phone the minister's office and find out where his responses are to the questions he posed.

Mr. Fletcher: On a point of order, and I appreciate that comment. And I think this might be a learning moment for many of us.

When a minister makes an undertaking at supply—

Madam Speaker: I just indicated to the member the decision on that, and I don't think it would be in the member's best interest to repeat that because I have just ruled on it.

So I'm hoping that the member is listening carefully to what I've said. And that was not a point of order. But I would urge him to phone the minister's office and ask where the documents are.

I do not have an ability to bring forward consequences, so—and I have ruled on that. So, by my ruling on it, the member does not have any ability to move forward on this conversation. It's ended.

Mr. Fletcher: I agree with you. The—I guess I've obviously done what you've asked—

Madam Speaker: Is this a point of order? The member has to state what he's saying right off the top.

Mr. Fletcher: Oh, okay.

Madam Speaker, is it in your—

Madam Speaker: The member can't—cannot go down this road. He has to—if he's raising a point of order, he needs to state right off the top what a point of order is. He can't start out in making a number of other comments. If he's raising a point of order, he

has to be clear what that point of order is. And then he can maybe make a few comments after.

So I would urge the member to zero in on what the point of order is that he's trying to raise.

Mr. Fletcher: On a matter of privilege, then.

Madam Speaker: On a matter of privilege, the—

Mr. Fletcher: —or—look, I simply request that, Madam Speaker, that we—when we're reviewing the rules, that this issue be dealt with in some way. I know.

Madam Speaker: Respectfully to the member, that is not a matter of privilege, nor is it a point of order. We will, at some point, hopefully reach a point of looking at the rules, and it may be something that we could discuss further, but right now there is no ability for me to do anything further, and I would just urge the member to contact the minister's office and see if he can get the documents that he's requesting.

* * *

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Point of Order

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): On a—Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Madam Speaker: On a point of order.

Ms. Klassen: I would like to request the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher) to retract his last statement on behalf of my four-legged relations, who cannot speak for themselves. It was a moose that gave him the beautiful gift to become a spokesman for people in his very same situation, and I would appreciate if he would retract that statement. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I would just like to indicate that what the member is raising is not a point of order. It's a dispute over the facts, so there is no point of order in that.

* * *

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before—the honourable member for Assiniboia

Mr. Fletcher: Thank you.

I have—on that point of order, I have—I can't let that—

Madam Speaker: I have just ruled that that was not a point of order.

An Honourable Member: But she asked—

Point of Order

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

Mr. Fletcher: On a new point of order.

Madam Speaker: And zero in, please, to the member on what his point of order is.

Mr. Fletcher: The point of order deals with our mutual—what—the member from Kewatinook has asked me to withdraw a statement, and I feel that it is in everyone's interest that I have the opportunity to reply, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: If the member could do so briefly within, like 30 seconds, then we can move ahead with this. But I have ruled that that was not a point of order; it's a dispute over the facts. I'll give the member 30 seconds, and that's it.

Mr. Fletcher: I don't have a clock in front of me, but it comes down to this. I—and it—the member from Kewatinook has a great riding, and I appreciate the issues that she's raising, but I hope that there's an understanding that being a quadriplegic is not a gift, not a gift at all. And for someone to minimize it like that is, and I know the intention was good, but it's not a gift. It is the worst thing—the worst—by—the worst kind of accident that can happen to someone and still remain conscious. And not only that, it's not a normal case of quadriplegia. I'm really offended about this. It's not a normal case of quadriplegia, and I've never talked about this, in Parliament or here, but I'm—it's a C3-4 injury that has almost killed me half a dozen times—half a dozen times. Spent a year of my life in the hospital. I am still in battles with Manitoba Public Insurance, and to say that I'm some sort of spokesperson, I appreciate the sentiment, but it is by the skin of my teeth, and, Madam Speaker, I'm not out to have a happy life because I can't. I can't have a family. I have to have 24-hour care which is expensive and tough to get, and there's turnover, no privacy. And for someone to minimize this on behalf of four-legged friends, give me a—Madam Speaker, to minimize a disability, but to minimize any disability is bad, but it is even worse—even worse—when it's a severe disability.

* (16:40)

Am I a spokesperson? I don't know. I'm just trying to live my life. I'm not going to have a happy life, but I have a purpose-driven life, and my purpose is—the only purpose is to try and make society better for everyone through the legislative process as long as people accept that, and there's no entitlement. I have no expectation of re-election or nomination or anything. It's up to the people and they need to decide on ability from the neck up. That's the society I want. I just came back from Selkirk College in BC, talking about this very issue, and it's no laughing matter. I know, Madam Speaker, we'll get to the vote. I'm not going to go on, but the—I never—one rule in life is never to complain, to carry forward. There are systemic things and, as you have dealt with even this place that cause barriers, but barrier—but there's so much more to it, even getting up in the morning and—people in this place—how many caregivers have you—have people seen over the years?

I raise this because it's an important issue for everyone with a disability because there's a high turnover, regardless of who you are or where you are. It's just the nature of the thing, and then to have it just sort of dismissed as some sort of glorious gift. I asked the member to please reconsider her wording and perhaps an apology or rephrase it, but I just find it an absolute outrage that somebody would even make that suggestion or connect those two words in the same sentence, even though I know what the member is trying to say is probably—and is genuine, but she's a genuine person.

But—but there are limits and it was—that line was just crossed, as it was crossed the other day.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I would indicate that the member has had an opportunity to put his comments on the record, and I think he's made his point. And, as I indicated earlier that there was no point of order, that it is a dispute over the facts, but we respectfully heard the comments of the member's response to comments made and they are on the record.

Madam Speaker: So is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment put forward on Bill 29.

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

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, a recorded vote.

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

Order, please.

The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 29.

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Klassen, Lamoureux, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Swan, Wiebe.

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 13, Nays 34.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: Debate on the main motion is open.

And the hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 14, 2018

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Tabling of Reports		Education System	
Cullen	3097	Klassen	3105
		Goertzen	3106
Members' Statements		Bullying and Harassment Prevention	
Integrity		Klassen	3106
Cox	3097	Friesen	3106
Motorcycle Safety		Northern Manitoba Development	
Lamoureux	3097	Bindle	3106
		Pedersen	3106
Honesty and Integrity		Recreation Programs for Inner-City Youth	
Wowchuk	3098	F. Marcelino	3107
		Wharton	3107
Plaid for Dad		Highway Infrastructure	
Wiebe	3098	Maloway	3107
Happy with Health Care		Schuler	3107
Reyes	3099		
Oral Questions		Petitions	
New Manitoba Hydro Board		Affordable Housing	
Kinew	3099	Allum	3108
Cullen	3100	Vimy Arena	
Post-Secondary Education		Fletcher	3108
Kinew	3100	Gender Neutrality	
Friesen	3101	Gerrard	3109
Family Law Reform in Manitoba			
Fontaine	3102		
Stefanson	3102		
Women's Reproductive Health			
Swan	3103		
Goertzen	3103		
City of Thompson			
Lindsey	3104		
Pedersen	3104		
US Steel and Aluminum Tariffs			
Lindsey	3105		
Pedersen	3105		
Mental Health Strategy			
Klassen	3105		
Goertzen	3105		
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		<i>(Continued)</i>	
		GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	
		Debate on Second Readings	
		Bill 29—The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management)	
		Lindsey	3111
		F. Marcelino	3112
		T. Marcelino	3118
		Fletcher	3121
		Matter of Privilege	
		Fletcher	3124

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>