

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

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

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

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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**

**Wednesday, June 13, 2018**

*The House met at 1:30 p.m.*

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

Please be seated. Good afternoon, everybody.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for River Heights, on a matter of privilege.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. This was the earliest time because I had to consult Hansard yesterday.

I quote page 111 in which it—of O'Brien and Bosc in which it is very clear the privileges of a member are violated by any action which might impede him or her in the fulfillment of his or her duties and functions. This is a serious issue. We have a problem in this Legislature that we have a number of rules and practices which are not being followed.

Let me start with the rule that we have two rules committee meetings a year. We had one last year, and we've had none this year in spite of the fact that I've talked with a number of people about the need to have that. And there is a need to update our rules, as I think we all recognize.

Second, the use of unparliamentary language. Page 146 of Beauchesne's is very clear that use of the word, which I will spell but not say, l-i-e, and variations of this are referenced numerous times in Beauchesne's as being unparliamentary language and unacceptable. And yet this word was used twice yesterday before we even got to question period, and versions using different phraseology, which are also not acceptable, were used three times in the same period before question period.

(3) There is a process which you as Speaker have alluded to many, many times that questions and responses by the government are to be addressed to the Speaker. And yet on 'numer' occasions, we have members of the government who have been, instead of facing the Speaker and directing their comments, addressing them to the Speaker, they have been facing the MLA who has raised the question and talked directly to the MLA instead of posing the response through the Speaker.

(4) It is—for many years, it has been the practice to not refer to the absence of a member, and yet yesterday, when the Minister for Sustainable Development did this and brought this up, I brought it up. The Speaker did not confirm that this was unparliamentary. I had asked, because it is unparliamentary, that those comments be stricken from Hansard, but my request was not responded to, and today I find that the Hansard record shows the reference to the absence of a member.

So with those four points where the rules, as illustrative, are not being followed, I would move, seconded by the MLA for Burrows, that this be referred to an all-party committee.

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

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia):** I believe the member from River Heights has brought this up at his earliest opportunity, so it meets the prima facie test.

The matter that he has brought forward certainly occurred yesterday, but it has occurred for months. I've also made reference to some of the behaviour on points of order in this place, and they continue. In fact, they continue in spite of what the Speaker has continuously been telling us, you know: tone it down, focus on the issues, let's get rid of the personal attacks, let's focus on public policy, let's not heckle each other. That's all reasonable, and none of that's been followed.

Madam Speaker, on the issue of intimidation, obstruction, molestation and interference that are referenced in the House of Commons handbook, each one needs to be looked at in the context of this place. The colloquial meaning of these words and the parliamentary meaning of these words are not

synonymous, and I'd like to make that an observation.

And if there is a—perhaps an ironic oversight in the member from River Heights's motion is, I would suggest that any committee that be struck include not only the political parties but also the independents, which include the member who has raised this matter of privilege. I think we would all benefit from the member's extensive experience in Ottawa and in this place, and I know the member from The Maples, myself have many concerns about the rules and the conduct of this place. And I'm sure it is quite appropriate to include independent members, as defined by this place, in any committee that would be struck. But I agree that a committee should be struck and that, please, do not leave it to the main parties because they would tend to support the status quo, and the status quo must change.

\* (13:40)

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** I was remiss by not adding that, before recognizing any other members to speak, I would remind the House that remarks at this time by honourable members are limited to strictly relevant comments about whether the alleged matter of privilege has been raised at the earliest opportunity and whether a prima facie case has been established.

**Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader):** I certainly look forward to your review and your ruling on this particular matter of privilege. I do recognize that, already, in this first three days of this emergency session, we've had seven matters of privilege raised by—one by—all by the opposition members of various parties. So, clearly, there's some work to do for you and certainly your staff.

I will say, in terms of the harassment issue, I certainly welcome the work that you're doing through LAMC in terms of bringing forward a harassment policy. I think we certainly all look forward to input from every member of the Assembly to address this harassment policy and make it something that's—we can all work within.

I will agree with the member when he raises the issue around rules. I think we all recognize the rules of the House need clarification, need some work. And I look forward to, certainly, co-operation on that front from all members and from all parties. In a recent letter I did receive from the opposition party, there seems to be a reluctance to address rules unless there's a more fulsome debate on BITSA. So, clearly,

the view that we can co-operatively discuss rules of the House seem to be somewhat in peril.

So with just saying those few words, Madam Speaker, I do look forward to your ruling on this issue.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader):** Just a couple of words in respect of the member for River Heights's (Mr. Gerrard) matter of privilege.

I would suggest that the member has attempted to bring this forward in a timely manner.

I do just want to put on the record and disabuse the Government House Leader in respect of all seven matters of privilege being from the opposition. In fact, we know just a couple of days ago that the Minister for Finance raised a matter of privilege in this House. So, certainly, that's not true.

And finally, Madam Speaker, I think that those of us on this side of the House, including my colleagues from the Liberal Party, agree that status quo in this House no longer is appropriate in 2018 and that, certainly, harassing and intimidating behaviours must cease in this House.

And finally, Madam Speaker, we make no—we don't hide the fact that on this side of the House, we are prepared to debate BITSA. And we're looking forward to the government introducing their budget bill, which I would suggest to you is way past due here.

So we look forward to debating BITSA and seeing what's coming down the pipe for Manitobans and how it will affect them in their daily lives.

Miigwech, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** I will break down my comments into three sections. One will be in reference to the first item raised, which is about rules and House business. Then, I will move into unparliamentary language, and then I will move into commenting on absence of a member.

So on the first one, rules of the House, on the matter of privilege raised by the honourable member for River Heights, I would like to inform 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.

Related to unparliamentary language raised by the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), I would like to inform the House that Joseph Maingot advises on page 254 of the second edition of Parliamentary Privilege in Canada that language that impugns the integrity of members would be unparliamentary and a breach of order contrary to the standing orders but not a breach of privilege. Therefore, the honourable member does not have a prima facie case of privilege.

And on the final matter, commenting on the absence of a member in the House, I would indicate that the minister corrected herself making those comments, and that is why I did not raise it as an issue, because she realized she had made that comment and then corrected herself. So I did not feel that I needed to intervene at that point.

And I would indicate, too, that when members are reflecting on the Speaker or the actions of the Speaker, that is not an appropriate item to be brought up here in reflecting on the rulings and the actions of the Speaker, so I would caution all members on that.

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia):** On a point of order.

#### Point of Order

**Madam Speaker:** On a point of order.

**Mr. Fletcher:** Madam Speaker, I am in the process of searching the rules manual, but I think you will find—and perhaps you can help with the identification, or someone—that in the rules it does say that members should act—paraphrasing—should act appropriately, should not disparage each other, should—I believe the exact quote is, debate should be solemn and serious, or to that effect. And that is in our rule book, and perhaps that's not happening as well as we would like.

Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** I would just like to comment on that by saying that I think a lot of this issue was discussed yesterday, and I think I did make it very

clear that we needed to be more careful in what is said and how it's being said because tone also matters. It's not just what we say, it's the tone and context.

So I would indicate to the member that I do think that was fully discussed yesterday. And I would urge all members maybe that want to revisit Hansard and the discussions of yesterday, that might be something.

Also—and you know what, I'll just leave it at that. I think it was fully identified yesterday that we have some issues and that we do need to resolve them.

#### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

**Madam Speaker:** So then, moving on to routine proceedings.

Introduction of bills? Committee reports? Tabling of reports? Ministerial statements?

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### Education and Training

**Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James):** One of the reasons I ran for office was I believed the provincial government could do a better job in its delivery of education. Based on my experience in education, we must demonstrate the values of truth, integrity and trust for the young people of our province.

While I have the floor, Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize our Government House Leader (Mr. Cullen) for the excellent job he has been doing in this extended session. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, under the NDP, our educational system has faced challenges. Our education system in Manitoba has to achieve higher results. Poor performance by Manitoba students under the NDP has highlighted the need for all educational partners to focus on improving student achievement.

Education and training form fundamental building blocks for Manitoba's future economic success. Our government is committed to closing achievement gaps and ensuring Manitoba students show better results in literacy and numeracy.

\* (13:50)

A focus on interventions in early years of schooling is a must. Madam Speaker, the Minister of Education should be complemented for creating the educational summit allowing input from all educational stakeholders in Manitoba, bringing

together folks from all over Manitoba to demonstrate we trust and value the integrity of teachers, educators and administrators to help develop education strategies in Manitoba.

My observations during the summit were change is needed with an emphasis on getting results and, Madam Speaker, that exactly what our government plans to do.

#### **Manitoba's Imagine a Canada Representatives**

**Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas):** Journey Irvine, Catterie Wood, and Jade Larocque from Gonzaga Middle School's inspiring art was chosen to represent Manitoba in the National Center for Truth and Reconciliation's Imagine a Canada through the lens of reconciliation program, after their student support director, Ms. Siobhan Faulkner, encouraged them to enter.

As a creative exercise, Imagine a Canada encourages students to take part in visionary change for a better Canada through art. By participating, students learn about assimilation policies, residential schools and their culture, allowing them to pass along their knowledge.

This year there were 450 entries across Canada, ranging from poems to paintings, with only one entry from each province or territory being selected to continue on to the leadership workshop and national celebration held here in Manitoba earlier this month.

Journey, Catterie and Jade's entry, titled The Truth, was chosen to represent our province. The girls describe their art as follows: the turtles swimming towards the light represent residential school survivors coming to the light and telling their stories. The turtles, who are different colours yet living peacefully, represent that they are all equal and walking the same path together. For some turtles, it may be different to get to the same light but they will all get there. Humans have the same journey.

They 'jurned'—they joined other honourees in working with elders, survivors, providing the girls the opportunity to learn more about indigenous history and discuss how reconciliation can move forward here in Canada. In collaboration with each—other honourees, they developed a shared declaration for youth on moving toward reconciliation, which they continue to share with their communities.

I ask for all members to join me in celebrating these young, amazing women's accomplishment

and the advocacy for equality, peace that they demonstrate, and how we should all be working towards this and envisioning a better Canada for all.

Miigwech.

#### **Emotional Bonds Between People**

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake):** I stand in the House today to talk about bonds, not the kind of bonds that your investment broker may sell you, but the emotional bonding between people.

I think everyone on both sides of this House can agree, we as humans first develop bonds with our parents as they nurture us, then probably along with our siblings, if we're blessed enough to have them. As we age, we tend to bond with our childhood friends or cousins. As we mature and progress through life, even though we might not know what causes these bonds, they are formed with people who we interact with. Eventually, we start having feelings for our partners or spouses, and again, if blessed, the cycle starts all over again with our children of our own.

Somewhere in the cycle of life, we also make bonds with our colleagues and, as funny as it sounds, Madam Speaker, we bond with the opposition as well. Since being elected in April of 2016, I have developed bonds with many people who I now refer to as friends, not just in our caucus, but throughout this building.

So, as one reflects on life, one may wonder how these bonds start and what keeps them in place. We have all heard the saying, your word is your bond. I may be from the country, Madam Speaker, call me naive, but I still believe this statement is true. Your word is your bond.

Call it what you will, Madam Speaker, trust, truth or integrity, these are what builds our bonds with the people who we love, the people who we respect and the people we work with.

I believe the members opposite need to work on their bonding skills, not only with the members on this side of the House, but amongst themselves, Madam Speaker. And, yes, this includes trust, truth and integrity.

#### **Keeping the Fires Burning**

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** Tomorrow marks Ka Ni Kanichihk's 17th annual Keeping the Fires Burning honouring celebration, which brings together hundreds of Manitobans in celebration

of the achievements of indigenous elders and knowledge keepers, recognizing that, despite colonization, they have kept our culture and traditional fires burning for the generations to come.

This year's theme, Working Together for Reconciliation, acknowledges the critical work involved in overcoming many of the barriers set against indigenous peoples and our cultures as we restore the wellness of indigenous peoples and rebuild our communities across Canada.

Ka Ni Kanichihk is a non-profit, indigenous-led organization that is committed to providing cultural safe programs and services to over 900 community members annually. Their commitment to traditional knowledge and services positions them as a leading advocate in reconciliation work here in Manitoba and across Canada.

This year, Keeping the Fires Burning recognizes the achievements of eight indigenous traditional knowledge keepers and community leaders by inducting them into the circle of honour. They are: Deb Dyck, Garry Robson, Peetanacoot Nenakawekapo, Betsy Kematch, Dan Thomas, Elizabeth Genaille, Sadie North and the late Gwen Merrik.

These Metis and First Nations elders are residential school survivors, educators and activists alike, all of whom have fought to ensure the preservation of indigenous cultures and indigenous people's rights.

This year's Keeping the Fires Burning also recognizes courageous Manitoba families of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls that testified during the national inquiry. Gerri-Lee Pangman will be honoured with the 2018 Oscar Lathlin memorial scholarship for her efforts in honouring the member of her—the memory of her beloved sister and aunt through her advocacy, art and ceremony.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this year's amazing keeping the fire recipients.

**Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas):** May I ask for leave to include the names in Hansard, please?

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave for the member for Point Douglas to include her guest names in Hansard? *[Agreed]*

*2018 Manitoba Imagine a Canada representatives: Journey Irvine, Jade Larocque, Catterie Wood, Colette Wood, Dianna LaRoque. Siobhan Faulkner, student support director.*

### Provincial Nominee Program

**Mr. Nic Curry (Kildonan):** Mabuhay. On June 12th, many of us in the North End celebrated Philippine Independence Day. This past weekend I had the honour of marching in the Filipino street fest for the fifth time, and I will participate in many other celebrations throughout Philippine Heritage Week.

The Filipino community in Manitoba is hard-working, hospitable and contributes great influence to our province and especially in Kildonan. As Progressive Conservatives, we recognize that recruiting and settling skilled immigrants will help us grow our economy while adding to Manitoba's rich cultural diversity.

Under the NDP, the Provincial Nominee Program became so poorly managed that both the stream for skilled workers and the stream for business applications suffered tremendous delays. When our PC government was elected in 2016, there was a backlog of more than 8,000 applications, some dating back to 2008. Under the failed NDP, the Provincial Nominee Program for business was audited, resulting in 13 scathing recommendations from the Office of the Auditor General of Manitoba.

My neighbours in Garden City could not trust the NDP and their handling of the Provincial Nominee Program and they voted in our Progressive Conservative government. Our government reformed the MPNP to include four application streams: international education, skilled worker in Manitoba, skilled worker overseas and business investor.

Enhancements have improved processing times and fast-track nominations to provide job-ready, skilled workers with opportunities to build a prosperous future in Manitoba. After our first year in government, the full elimination of the MPNP backlog allowed the department to guarantee a return of service to a six-month processing time for 80 per cent of applications.

With complete lack of integrity, the NDP used the historical tragedy of the head tax in reference to our government correcting the failures of the NDP. The only thing that people can trust about the NDP is their use of misguided rhetoric and total lack of judgment.

The renewal of the MPNP will ensure our province continues to attract skilled workers and entrepreneurs. Our PC Party developed the MPNP. We fixed it after 17 years of NDP mismanagement.

And now we look forward to seeing the great people that it brings forward to our province.

\* (14:00)

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Post-Secondary Education Funding and Affordability

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** You know, Madam Speaker, Manitoba families want good jobs for their kids, and they want opportunity in this province. They want the ability for their kids to get educated here and then to find a good career and put down roots.

Now, we know that colleges are a very important part of the career path for many people in our province. However, under this government, we are seeing that the unemployment rate is going up. It's now at 6 and a half per cent, worse than BC, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec.

What has the government's response been so far? Well, they are cutting post-secondary education funding. We know that they cut funding to post-secondaries right across the province and that Red River, as a result, is now raising the cost of their programs by hundreds of dollars per student, and they've also eliminated programs. Now, these are important trades and professions for the future of our province.

When will the Premier stop his cuts to our colleges? When will he begin to invest in training and jobs for the future?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Not only beginning, Madam Speaker, but continuing and enhancing investments in education—post-secondary as well as K to 12—in fact, to the tune of an increased budget there of close to half a billion dollars just two years after the NDP left government. So this is a record investment and a record focused investment as well. As well, we've quintupled the amount of money available to assist lower income graduates of high schools in pursuing their education and training by enriching the programs for scholarships and bursaries.

We're continuing to focus on making sure that education—which is the best investment to unlock the potential of our young people—education is a recipient of our focus, Madam Speaker. We'll continue to do that.

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

**Mr. Kinew:** When I speak to other parents in the province, they tell me that they want their kids to be able to get a good-quality education here in Manitoba, an education that they can afford. Now, part of the reason that they want an affordable education—an education that's within reach of both middle- and low-income Manitobans—is because they want their kids to be able to put down roots here after graduation and to get a good job.

Now, the Premier is not investing in education at the post-secondary level. In fact, he has cut \$6.3 million from the budgets of post-secondary institutions in the 2018 budget. We've already seen job losses at Université de Saint-Boniface; we've seen tuition hikes at universities. Now we see that Red River College is forced to cancel programs and to 'wajje' their tuition—and to raise their tuition fees by some \$250 per student.

Will the Premier reverse his cuts to post-secondary education in our province and instead help families get what they want, which is an affordable education for their kids right here in Manitoba?

**Mr. Pallister:** I appreciate any question from the member opposite on affordability, Madam Speaker. And the affordability that Manitobans deserve to have is something we're very much focused on.

That's why we've introduced the largest personal income tax reductions in Manitoba history. That's why we're going to leave more money in the hands of hard-working Manitoba families and seniors, as well, so that they have the opportunity to find their financial freedom and financial security. They deserve that. They had that eroded and taken away by the previous government. We're restoring it.

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

**Mr. Kinew:** So, another thing that I hear in these conversations, whether it's at the soccer field or whether it's on the doorstep, is not only do families want their kids to be able to get an affordable education here in Manitoba so that they can put down roots and get a good job, but many of them are also very upset at having their students' taxes hiked under this government. When this Premier cancelled the tuition rebate, we know that he raised taxes by thousands of dollars a year for Manitoba graduates



who wanted to stay and put down roots right here in the province.

Now, what is he doing beyond this inconvenient, unfortunate truth? Well, now he's slashing the budgets for post-secondary institutions. Their response now is to lay off staff and to raise tuition. We know that they're raising tuition at Red River College. This follows record increases at universities right across Manitoba.

When will the Premier back off this misguided plan and instead bring forward what Manitoba families want: real investments in keeping Manitoba education affordable?

**Mr. Pallister:** Well, that's the dull repetition of previous inadequately researched arguments, Madam Speaker. And the fact is this government has focused its investments more than any other province. We spend a higher percentage of our budget on education, health care and social services than any other province in Canada, second highest in education.

The member talks about affordability and about the damage of raising taxes, and yet that is the legacy of the NDP, not this government. We are lowering the taxes they raised, Madam Speaker. They raised business taxes; we lower them. They raised personal taxes; we lower them.

Madam Speaker, we're reducing unnecessary red tape, a burden on small businesses that create jobs for the children of working families and for the members of working families.

We are reducing taxes and we are forced to address and we will address the challenge of dealing with the inherited massive NDP debt as well. Their concerns for families and children were never evident when they were in government, Madam Speaker, and they're not really evident now, either.

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

#### **Climate and Green Plan Transition to Low-Carbon Economy**

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** So I think the Premier was referring to the fact that he raised taxes by thousands of dollars on recent graduates who stayed here in the province, and he's also making reference to the fact that we, as the NDP opposition, have saved Manitobans something like \$65 million in taxes this year by delaying their misguided carbon tax plan.

Now, when I talk to the average family in—  
*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Kinew:** —this province, I think that the average family wants to do right by the environment. They want to protect the air and water for future generations, for our kids and for our grandkids, but they just need a little help in making that transition to a low-carbon lifestyle.

This government has announced no new programs that will help them. There is nothing in the climate change plan that would actually help the average family or business owner transition to a lower carbon footprint.

I would ask the Premier: Given the benefit of this extended sitting, will he take his misguided plans back to the drawing board and bring forward a real plan to help average Manitoba families and business owners transition to a low-carbon future?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, Madam Speaker, the members opposite are advocating for a carbon tax on Manitobans that is double what we're advocating for. I would say that's dangerous to our economy and I don't think helpful to our environment, either.

We have a plan that will work better for Manitobans in their homes, in their businesses and that will work better to protect our environment here in Manitoba. Madam Speaker, the NDP had no plan for years.

The member speaks without credibility on the issue of taxes as well, Madam Speaker, because, in fact, we are introducing increases in the basic personal exemption over the next two years that will put 2,020 additional dollars in the hands of every working Manitoban, and that would include working Manitobans who are studying and are working part-time. It will leave 2,020 more dollars in the hands of Manitoba workers.

Madam Speaker, the NDP opposes that and instead would like to—and won't admit to it, increase taxes on those very people with higher income taxes, with higher PST and with higher small-business taxes.

Why don't they just come out and say it, Madam Speaker: that's what they want; they want higher taxes on Manitobans.

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

**Mr. Kinew:** I'm a little disappointed that the Premier apparently does not understand the way the basic personal exemption works. Perhaps him and the Finance Minister could take the benefit of the extended sitting and really hit the books, bring back the budget implementation bill and maybe edify themselves as to the way the tax regime works here in Manitoba.

So, when I'm talking to the average family they tell me—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Kinew:** —that they want to do right by the environment. They want to be able to reduce emissions. They want to ensure that their kids and grandkids will live in a beautiful Manitoba where we can all enjoy the environment. But they say that they need help in order to transition to that low-carbon future that they dream of.

And yet, though this government has had something like six or seven press conferences to announce this plan of theirs, they have not announced a single program that will help the average person, family or business owner transition to a low-carbon lifestyle.

When will the Premier bring forward a real plan to help the average family transition to a low-carbon future?

\* (14:10)

**Mr. Pallister:** It's perfect, Madam Speaker. The member is asking to be trusted on taxes. He's asking to be trusted on the environment. The member has no ability to demonstrate that he or his party have ever followed up on a commitment on the environment.

Gary Doer said to Manitobans, he said, if we fail on the environment we deserve to be voted out of office. And, Madam Speaker, guess what? The NDP were devouted out of office for exactly that.

And as—Madam Speaker, as far as taxes are concerned, where the NDP took us was 10th on dealing with poverty, of all provinces, 10th on wait times in health care, 10th on educational outcomes for our young people, dead last. And first in one category and one category only, and that was tax hikes. Where they got it wrong and raised them, we'll get it right and lower them instead.

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

**Mr. Kinew:** So again, Madam Speaker, I sincerely believe that the average family in Manitoba wants to do right by the environment. They want to ensure that there are clean lakes, rivers and breathable air for generations to come in our province, that our kids and grandkids could inherit that legacy. That's why I'm proud to stand up for the environment.

Everyone in the House knows that I'm very passionate about this issue. However, I'm very concerned that this government is not bringing forward any assistance for the average family who wants to make that green transition.

Again, we know that the average family will see no benefits. There is no program. There is nothing to help the average family or business owner reduce their carbon footprint. Instead what their carbon-pricing regime advances is a \$100-million tax grab. That's almost a \$100 million at the centre of their carbon-pricing scheme that will not be returned to Manitobans.

**An Honourable Member:** Wrong.

**Mr. Kinew:** We say that's the wrong approach. Again—and I'm glad to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen) finally agrees with me as he shouts wrong when he hears the details of his plan.

I would ask the Premier: When will he bring in a real plan that will help the average Manitoba family or business owner to reduce their carbon footprint?

**Mr. Pallister:** Maybe the member can get up and explain to Manitobans how he's helping the average Manitoba family by jacking up the PST when he promised he wouldn't. Maybe he'd like to explain to the average Manitoba family how he's going to help them find a job while he jacks up the taxes on small businesses after he said he wouldn't. Maybe he'd like to explain to the average Manitoba family why 16 of 17 years of NDP government resulted in massive deficits that were higher than they projected every single year but one. Maybe he'd like to explain that, and maybe in doing that he'd like to explain what his plan is for doubling Manitoba's carbon tax on every Manitoba household and then taking it and him spending it all, versus our plan of half as much and it all goes back to Manitoba homemakers, households, and seniors.

**Cross Lake Community  
Access to Maternity Care**

**Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas):** Birthdays are an important time to reflect on the love and support of our families and community. In celebration the members of Cross Lake have written the Minister of Health some happy birthday cards that I would like to table.

Cross Lake members want to tell the minister that their community doesn't get to celebrate or support the birth of a child as expecting mothers have to leave home. Thirteen-year-old Shakura Thomas tells the minister that she would love to meet and celebrate her new siblings when they are born.

Will the minister help Shakura and all people in Cross Lake so that families can have their babies closer to home and celebrate those births at home?

**Hon. Heather Stefanson (Acting Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living):** I want to thank the member for that question and—be happy to pass those on.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud, as we all are here on this side of the House, of our Minister of Health, who has made some significant changes, on behalf of Manitobans, of our health-care system that is providing for—certainly when it comes to our emergency rooms, I know that the wait times are down some 16 per cent. We're making progress. There's more work to do. But I know he's working hard, and we're behind him 100 per cent, as are Manitobans who want to see those wait times reduced as well.

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

**Ms. Lathlin:** The 1964 agreement and the minister's own Throne Speech show this government has a responsibility to this community.

Erica Thomas wishes the minister all the best. She is expecting a baby soon. She will have to leave her other children and her partner for at least two weeks. She says, I quote: I hate to leave. I hate that I will have to welcome my child into the world without our family around us. Unquote.

Will the minister hear Erica and provide assistance so that women can have their children in their home community?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** I wish her all the best as she embarks on this new part of her life with the family member, Madam Speaker.

I do—I would like to say, though, when it comes to health care in Manitoba, I do recall back in the days when the NDP government ran on ending hallway medicine in six months with \$15 million. Well—but Manitobans know what happened to that, Madam Speaker. They broke that promise. They moved from hallway medicine to highway medicine. And so we inherited a mess from the previous NDP government, and I know the Minister of Health is busy fixing it.

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

**Ms. Lathlin:** Harold Sinclair wishes the minister well. He asks, though, that the minister think of Cross Lake. He says, I quote: I missed the birth of four of my children because my wife had to leave our home to go have our children. End quote.

Harold asks that you hear his concern and put resources so that babies can be born in Cross Lake.

Will the minister listen to Harold, Erica and Shakura and all the residents of Cross Lake?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** I know that we work—on this side of the House, work together as a team, and I know many of us have had the opportunity to visit Cross Lake and visit that community on a whole host of matters, including on health issues, Madam Speaker.

But I do want to say that I know that we inherited a health-care system that was in a—in complete disarray, from the members opposite, and I know that our Minister of Health is busy each and every day working towards fixing a system that they broke.

**Family Law Reform  
Rules for Relocation**

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** The Minister of Justice released a plan to reform family law in Manitoba with a pilot project to stream certain cases through mediation. Unfortunately, it doesn't properly address one of the most pressing issues in family law right now, Madam Speaker: the relocation of families.

When divorced or separated parents want to move with their children, Manitoba's laws are unclear. It means parents spend years battling in the

court system and pay thousands of dollars in legal fees, Madam Speaker.

Does the minister agree relocating parents deserve clarity on the law so that they can spend less time in court and more time with their children?

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

I was pleased last Friday, along with Allan Fineblit, the chair of the Family Law Reform Committee, to release the report on the modernization of our family law system, Madam Speaker.

And I just want to take this opportunity to thank all of those people, the members of that committee, all the people who participated in this very extensive and robust report, Madam Speaker. There's going to be significant changes. We want to look at ways to make this much less adversarial for families. That's exactly what we're going to do.

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

**Ms. Fontaine:** For Manitoba's family lawyers, the issue of relocation is important. That's why a collection of experts, including lawyers, professors, judges and child-development experts, came together to create a set of rules that governs parents wishing to relocate.

These rules codified Manitoba's family law so that judges can make the best decision for every family, Madam Speaker. The work was praised by Canada's legal community.

Will the minister commit to including these changes in her family law reform strategy?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** What we heard loud and clear from the committee is that we have what is a fairly inaccessible system right now. There's those that don't fall under the category of being able to be covered by Legal Aid, but they also can't afford a lawyer as well, Madam Speaker.

\* (14:20)

And so we want to make this a more accessible system, a simpler system, less complex, less adversarial. That's exactly what we're going to try and do by removing those—taking those matters out of court.

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

### Funding Commitment

**Ms. Fontaine:** Lawyers and judges are calling for more guidance and greater leadership from the minister. But we know meaningful change doesn't fit with the government's plan to cut services, Madam Speaker.

The minister's report says, on page 3, and I quote, in the current fiscal climate, proposing a model that requires any investment of resources, even with the promise of longer term savings, is a hard sell. End quote, Madam Speaker.

Families need support. They need investments. They need resources so children and families can be protected, Madam Speaker.

Will the minister commit to investing the necessary resources to make changes to family law and make it a success here in Manitoba?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** We know that 17 years under the previous NDP government, they didn't make this a priority.

We heard very loud and clear from members in the community that they want a family law system that is more accessible, that is less complex, that is less adversarial and that works for Manitoba families. And that's exactly what we are committed to doing.

### Long-Term-Care Facilities Nurse Staffing Levels

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** Madam Speaker, the KPMG health report recommended cutting services in Manitoba's health-care system to reduce costs. Several recommendations would change the way long-term care is delivered in the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, and one of the most concerning of those recommendations is to review the ratio of long-term-care nurses to patients.

The recommendation is concerning. A report by the Manitoba Nurses Union revealed most nurses believe they don't have enough time to properly care for residents.

We already know that Manitoba nurses are working short-staffed and taking overtime—mandatory overtime more than ever before. Reducing the number of nurses in long-term care would only make this worse.

Why is the minister planning to cut the number of nurses in long-term-care facilities?

**Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance):** First of all, I reject the preamble of the member in the House. The KPMG report was an outside entity looking into government and saying, wow, it's a history of failure under the NDP; what could be done differently in order to bring savings to Manitobans?

It's about listening to experts. And while the NDP didn't, we are listening to experts.

When it comes to his question about nurses, nurses are asking for a better system in which to work. They also want better care, sooner in our system, and that's exactly what our government is working on.

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

**Mr. Swan:** This minister can listen to accountants. We're listening to patients and families and nurses and others working in our system.

The minister has had the KPMG report on his desk with that recommendation since January 2017. The next month, he sent a letter to the health authority saying they had to find ways to cut their budget by \$83 million.

We know this minister is cutting front-line workers who keep our health-care system working. We know the health authority is increasing pressures on nurses throughout the system. And we know this minister is obsessed at trying to keep the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) promise to cut costs, whatever the human cost may be.

Why has this minister directed the health authority to cut long-term-care nurses?

**Mr. Friesen:** Well, Madam Speaker, just because he repeats it doesn't make it any more accurate that—his preamble is laden with inaccuracies. But probably the biggest inaccuracy is when he says that he's listening. He even said his own leader wasn't listening, and that's why he led a revolt.

Madam Speaker, that—his former government received a report by PWC. It sat on the shelf on procurement. They didn't even crack the binding to look into it.

They are not based on evidence. We are. We're listening to experts. We're listening to Manitobans. Thirty-five thousand people responded to our prebudget consultation.

We are building a better system for all of us, and we are getting it done.

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

**Mr. Swan:** Well, I've got a leader that's listening. Unfortunately, the Minister of Finance has a leader who's not listening to what Manitobans are telling him.

And according to the Manitoba Nurses Union—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Swan:** —most long-term-care nurses don't believe the current baseline staffing requirements are adequate. Most of them say, even as it is, they don't have enough time to properly care for residents, and this is because there simply aren't enough staff to carry the load. And who loses? It's seniors in long-term care.

This has been the minister's plan all the way along, and that's why he sent that KPMG report to the health authority and directed the authority to cut \$83 million out of the budget.

Why has the minister directed the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority to cut long-term care?

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, we know where NDP approach has got us: the—one of the most expensive health-care systems in all of Canada, with some of the worst results when it came to wait times and access to physicians and things like that.

So we're changing the system, and change is hard, and change is hard for that member, but we're bringing it.

Let me leave him with this thought. In BC, Alberta and Saskatchewan, there are a total of less than 20 bargaining units. In the WRHA, there are over 180. We're changing that, and it's going to work better for the patients in the system and all Manitobans.

### **Indigenous Education Graduation Rates**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, the report from the Manitoba Auditor General brought to light the little progress made in the province in closing the high school education gap for indigenous students. The statistics are clear, and we know that the graduation rate among indigenous students is at an alarming low of 49.3 per cent.

With such profound evidence, why has this government only fulfilled two of the 19 recommendations from the Auditor General, and why is there absolutely no plan to address the issue?

**Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Relations):** I'm pleased to address the issue of indigenous students as well as indigenous education in the province of Manitoba.

I've seen in the past two years great strides that our education system has taken not only for the indigenous students but also in getting the indigenous message through to our younger students. There was an—just this past week, my grandson in MacGregor, a small rural community in Manitoba, had students from Long Plain come into their school to bring them the message of who they were as children. This is where we start.

Our province is leaps and bounds ahead of that already, but we will continue.

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

#### **School Trustees Government Intention**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, we see red flags going up all around in this government's legislation. We have noticed changes, like the removal of municipal obligations to consult with school boards. We also noticed how school tax rebates no longer need legislation to be changed.

Madam Speaker, very simple question: Is the Minister of Education planning to get rid of school trustees, yes or no?

**Hon. Ian Wishart (Minister of Education and Training):** I thank the member for the question, and the member should be aware that we have committed to do a full review of the K-to-12 system beginning early next year. We expect a lot of interest in this, both from the community at large but also from trustees and school boards and municipal officials as well.

We look forward to listening to Manitobans and hearing what they have to say about changing the design of the education system as we move forward.

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

#### **Future of School Boards Centralization Inquiry**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, the discussions on the yet-to-be-tabled budget bill has Manitobans all very nervous because of this government's lack of transparency. A very common theme with this government is the centralization of decisions being made under the ministerial offices rather than the community, rather than our constituents.

As people, as MLAs, it is our job to represent our constituents, and that includes the ministers.

I ask the minister: Is it this government's plan to dismantle the school boards and centralize decisions under the Department of Education?

**Hon. Ian Wishart (Minister of Education and Training):** I thank the member for the question. If she had listened to my response from the last question, she would know that we are going to Manitobans to listen to what they have to say about the future of school boards in Manitoba: the size, the number and the authority and responsibility.

\* (14:30)

#### **Municipal Road Maintenance Operating Grant Announcement**

**Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye):** Manitoba's municipalities and local communities know that our PC government has been hard at work to reduce red tape and support municipal decision making.

Today, there was an announcement detailing how our PC government is further fulfilling our commitment to give municipalities a fair say, unlike the NDP who had no respect for municipalities and who, when they were in power, called them howling coyotes whenever their voices—their concerns.

Can the Minister of Municipal Relations please inform the House on today's important road-maintenance announcement?

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

Madam Speaker, we made a promise to reduce red tape and respect Manitoba's municipalities. Today, we announced important changes to provide greater certainty and flexibility for 12 communities across our great province.

Our PC government is delivering on our promise, Madam Speaker, to give fair say to municipalities by rolling out \$2.75 million into an operating-grant basket for these 12 municipalities. We on this side of the House understand how important local councils are to the vitality of their community, unlike members opposite, who eliminated this funding back in 2012.

Madam Speaker, our PC government is keeping our promises to Manitobans to ensure we fix our finances, repair our services and rebuild our economy. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

### **Budget Implementation Bill Request to Introduce**

**Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia):** Madam Speaker, we know that this province is, in fact, faced with an urgent financial matter, namely this government's refusal to bring forward its budget implementation bill.

It's clear that our caucus won't move forward in the budget process until we see this bill, a bill that, last year, contained some of the biggest cuts to municipalities in decades. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Wiebe:** So, indeed, it's, in fact, undemocratic for this Premier to refuse to reveal his plans to the House.

So I ask: When will this minister bring forward the budget implementation act before this House?

**Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance):** I thank the member for the question. It gives me an opportunity to respond to inaccuracies that the Leader of the Opposition put on the record this after—and he expressed concern about unemployment rates, but what he didn't report is that Manitoba's GDP has actually been revised upward in this year and that our economy added more than 10,100 jobs between measure this year and last year. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

The honourable member for Concordia, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Wiebe:** It sounds like the Minister of Finance is ready to debate these issues, so why won't he bring forward the bill so that we can debate them before the House?

It's clear that the Premier is refusing to be open or transparent, and his refusal to introduce this budget bill is against the democratic practice that this House has had for decades. It's happened every single year, except in election years, until this Premier came along.

Quite frankly, this Premier's refusal is an antidemocratic refusal, and the Premier has tried to use the BITSA bill in the past to hide funding cuts to transit and infrastructure.

Why won't he bring this bill forward so we can debate it?

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, I'm only too happy to bring an issue of urgent financial importance to this House.

The Dominion bond rating agency today published their rating of Manitoba. They indicated that for the first time in over 10 years, all trends are stable; the Province is committed to deficit reduction. And they observe a shift in the culture of institutions of government getting better results.

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

**Mr. Wiebe:** Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Premier said that the public committees of BITSA haven't been held for 20 years or longer. But the Premier really probably should have spoken to the member for Morris (Mr. Martin), because on June 4th, 2009, and on June 2nd, 2010, the member for Morris, then as a member of the public, spoke at those BITSA public hearings.

Now, it's possible for the member of Spruce Woods gave the Premier bad information, because he was at that 2010 committee hearing as well. So we don't need the Premier to retract his statements, but he may want to reconsider where he gets his information from.

While he's at it, will he introduce the budget implementation bill? *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Always happy to respond to a question from the NDP on accuracy.

Gee, it was just the year after the member cited a moment ago that the NDP went to every door in Manitoba and they asked Manitobans to believe them. And they looked them right in the eye and they said, we promise you, we promise you we won't raise your taxes.

And the next two fiscal years—and the member asks for accuracy in reporting, Madam Speaker—seriously, he asks for accuracy in reporting. He needs to consider the record. Take a look in the mirror, because in the two fiscal years thereafter, the NDP jacked up taxes by \$500 million, after they promised they wouldn't, on the people of Manitoba.

Now the member talks about accuracy in budgeting. Let's give everybody here a little break, Madam Speaker. Seriously—[*interjection*]

**An Honourable Member:** You need a break.

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** —the member for Minto (Mr. Swan), Madam Speaker, needs to understand. He was one of those people who went to the doors, knocked, looked people right in the eye and put his word on the line. And then he instigated a rebellion against his leader because it was his leader's fault. That speaks well of the member of Minto, but not in the ways of integrity, not at all. [*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

#### **Economic Development Strategy Request for Government Plan**

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** We know this province is faced with an urgent financial matter: namely, that—this government's lack of an economic development strategy. Back in December, the Premier created a board, a board that was given six months to come up with a strategy to kick-start the Manitoba economy.

Well, it's been six months, Madam Speaker. Can the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade provide the House with that strategy? [*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade):** Madam Speaker, it's taking longer because the NDP, previous government, made such a mess it's going to take us longer to get it cleaned up.

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

**Mr. Lindsey:** I can't really say that I'm surprised by the minister's non-answer. The former minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade said they would have a duty to 'constult' strategy by May—oh, that was May of 2017. So we're still waiting for that strategy.

Meanwhile, Manitoba's steel, aluminium, dairy industries are faced with unpredictable consequences

because of American tariffs, a looming crisis that this government won't even debate.

Will this minister stop avoiding the questions and produce a job strategy today?

**Mr. Pedersen:** Well, again, Madam Speaker, Dave Angus and Barb Gamey have heard an awful lot from the business community, from all Manitobans, about the sad state of what the NDP did to the economy in Manitoba, so it's taking them a bit longer to get this, but—my staff within Growth, Enterprise and Trade has had over 700 submissions given to them during this economic development review.

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

**Mr. Lindsey:** Amazing. Last summer, Manitoba's economic development agencies were hit with a funding cut bloodbath. Last fall, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce said this government is doing economic development backwards, slashing funding with no strategy.

\* (14:40)

This year, the backwards bloodbath seems to be continuing. The minister cut funding for 'fruturpreneur' and Entreprises Riel in half. He decimated funding for Innovate Manitoba by more than—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lindsey:** —90 per cent. He cut nearly three quarters of the funding for the 'consiel' du développement économique.

Will this minister stop cutting 'minatoba' innovators, put the horse before the cart and actually produce an economic strategy? [*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, Madam Speaker, again, I appreciate any question from a member opposite on an issue around job creation.

Really, the only opportunity that they had was—well, they just had that little period, I guess, of 17 years to produce an economic development strategy, and they failed to do that. And so the commentary and analysis, that we received, of their strategy was that there wasn't one.

Seventeen years with no economic development strategy, now the member's in a hurry for us to get one. Well, we're in a hurry to get one too, but we're going to listen to Manitobans first.



They had 17 years to develop a duty-to-consult framework; they never did. They had 17 years to, well, frankly, deal with a lot of issues they never did.

We got Freedom Road under construction. We're getting the outlet built. Madam Speaker, we're doing a lot of things the NDP promised to do but never seemed to get around to doing. I'm glad of the fact that we have a team on this side of the House that actually takes these issues seriously enough to put shovels in the ground and get things done.

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

Petitions?

**An Honourable Member:** Madam Speaker, a point of order.

### Point of Order

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

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia):** Just before question period, I spoke on a point of order, and I was mistaken in my attribution to—I got the right quote, wrong book. What I meant to refer to, and to correct the record, was the Legislative Assembly rules and regulations, sections 54(1), sections 55, 56 and 57. These deal with that—for example, Madam Speaker, I know you know the rule for if a member speaks on a subject not at the time of discussion or interrupts a member while speaking, except to raise a question of privilege, or transgresses any rules, any member may, and the Speaker shall, call on that member to order. And it goes on to say, private conversations: no member shall engage in private conversations in such a manner as to interrupt the business of the House.

Well, there you have it, Madam Speaker. Zing, zong, done. Thank you for your time.

**Madam Speaker:** I would indicate to the member that he does not have a point of order, as points of order are to be raised at the time of the infraction, and points of order are not to be used for debate in this House. So the member does not have a point of order.

### PETITIONS

#### Tina Fontaine—Public Inquiry

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

These are the reasons for this petition.

(1) Tina Fontaine was murdered at the age of 15 years, and her body was found in the Red River on August 17th, 2014.

(2) Tina Fontaine was robbed of her loving family and the Anishinabe community of Sagkeeng First Nation.

(3) Tina Fontaine was failed by multiple systems which did not protect her as they intervened in her life.

(4) Tina Fontaine was further failed by systems meant to seek and pursue justice for her murder.

(5) Tina Fontaine's murder galvanized Canada on the issue of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls, MMIWG, as she quickly became our collective daughter and the symbol of MMIG—WG across Canada.

(6) Manitoba has failed to fully implement the recommendations of numerous reports and recommendations meant to improve and protect the lives of indigenous peoples and children, including the Manitoba Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and the Phoenix Sinclair inquiry.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the Premier of Manitoba and the Minister of Justice to immediately call a public inquiry into the systems that had a role in the life and the death of Tina Fontaine, as well as the function of the administration of justice after her death.

(2) To urge that the terms of reference of a public inquiry be developed jointly with the caregivers of Tina Fontaine and/or the agents appointed by them.

Signed by Ozten Paul, Kelly Butler and Jonathan Flett and many, many other Manitobans.

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

#### Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The provincial government has announced the closures of three emergency rooms and an

urgent-care centre in the city of Winnipeg, including closing down the emergency room at Seven Oaks General Hospital.

(2) The closures come on the heels of the closing of a nearby QuickCare clinic, as well as cancelled plans for ACCESS centres and personal-care homes, such as Park Manor, that would have provided important services for families and seniors in the area.

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

This petition is signed by many Manitobans, Madam Speaker.

### 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 province-provincial government nor the City of

Winnipeg considered better suited locations in rural, semi-rural or industrial locations such as St. Boniface industrial park, the 20,000 acres at CentrePort or existing properties such as the Shriners Hospital or the old Children's Hospital on Wellington Crescent.

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

(4) There are no standards that one would expect for a treatment centre. The Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living has stated that the department of Health has no role to play in the land acquisition for the 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 parks and recreation uses concerning 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 and River Heights, have not been considered for this Manitoba Housing project, even though there are hundreds of acres of parkland available for development at Kapyong Barracks or parks like Heubach Park that share the same zoning as Vimy Arena site.

\* (14:50)

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

(8) The provincial government does not have a co-ordinated plan for addiction treatment in Manitoba as it currently underfunds treatment centres which are running far under capacity and potential.

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

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

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

This has been signed by Lisa [phonetic] Hornby, Jennifer Schoenberger and Brent [phonetic] Bannatyne and many other Manitobans.

#### **Tina Fontaine-Public Inquiry**

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

These are the reasons for this petition.

(1) Tina Fontaine was murdered at the age of 15 years, and her body was found in the Red River on August 17th, 2014.

(2) Tina Fontaine was robbed of her loving family and the Anishinabe community of Sagkeeng First Nation.

(3) Tina Fontaine was failed by multiple systems which did not protect her as they intervened in her life.

(4) Tina Fontaine was further failed by systems meant to seek and pursue justice for her murder.

(5) Tina Fontaine's murder galvanized Canada on the issue of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls, MMIWG, as she quickly became our collective daughter and the symbol of MMIWG across Canada.

(6) Manitoba has failed to fully implement the recommendations of numerous reports and recommendations meant to improve and protect the lives of indigenous peoples and children, including the Manitoba Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and the Phoenix Sinclair inquiry.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the Premier of Manitoba and the Minister of Justice to immediately call a public inquiry into the systems that had a role in the life and death of Tina Fontaine, as well as the function of the administration of justice after her death.

(2) To urge that the terms of reference of a public inquiry be developed jointly with the caregivers of Tina Fontaine and/or the agent appointed by them.

This petition is signed by Phyllis Tolsma, Mike Brit [phonetic], Gino Sossai and many other Manitobans.

#### **Gender Neutrality**

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** 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 and government documents should reflect gender neutrality to prevent issues that may arise from intentional bias on gender, and misgendering. The people described above face anxiety and discrimination in many aspects of day-to-day life, such as: (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 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 on the—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.

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.

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

Signed by Paul Pommer, Juda [*phonetic*] Pommer, Spencer Bucci and many others.

Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Grievances?

## ORDERS OF THE DAY GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

**Hon. Cliff Cullen (Government House Leader):** Would you call Bill 29.

### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

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

**Madam Speaker:** To resume debate—it has been announced that we'll resume debate on second reading of Bill 29 and the amendment thereto proposed by the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Kinew). Second reading Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Safe Hunting and Shared Management), standing in the name of the honourable member for Fort Garry-Riverview, who has 19 minutes remaining.

**Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview):** I'm pleased to be able to complete my thoughts on this particular bill that I started yesterday, and it might be worthwhile—probably not for members, but maybe for myself—to remind myself where I was and where I was going. But I had started off by saying that here we are debating a bill that was not identified by the government as something that was critically important to them; otherwise it would've been designated much earlier, and we actually would've been done with the debate over this particular bill. It was not designated as an important bill for them, though we never doubted for a moment the seriousness and importance of this particular issue.

*Mrs. Colleen Mayer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

And instead, we were to be done last week and finished and then back out in our constituencies

doing the very important work that each of us do in our communities, only to find that we were called back by the Premier (Mr. Pallister) on a matter of, apparently, an emergency, to be called into session on an emergency basis over very important financial matters that we have yet to have articulated either by the Premier, certainly not by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen) and certainly not by the Government House Leader (Mr. Cullen) as well.

\* (15:00)

So we're left in this kind of deliberative parliamentary limbo where we're in an emergency session but not debating anything of emergent interest and left, instead, for government to call bills that they didn't previously designate.

And so we're doing, I suppose, their work for them here today and for the last week by continuing to debate bills that weren't otherwise designated of importance to the government prior to what had been the official ending of the session before the Premier called for an emergency session that, as I said earlier, remains a mystery to all of us.

And at that point, I said, well, even though there is this kind of parliamentary limbo that we're in right now, maybe some good can come out of what we're doing here together if members on all sides of the House take seriously the very important reasoned amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, the good member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew), that really suggests that there are—that the bill itself has much to commend about itself but there is something about it that needs to be revisited before it can go on to second reading and on to public hearings.

And this issue is over the matter of co-management of resources which, if the government had been genuinely interested in pursuing this particular matter, would have resulted in a much more convivial atmosphere in the House as we debate this bill.

The—maybe even the reasoned amendment put forward by the member for Fort Rouge wouldn't have been necessary if the government had instead put forward a proposition around the co-management of resources.

Then we would have been on to something really worth talking about because, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, it would have been, in our view—I think certainly in my view, anyway—a genuine act of reconciliation to—that I—frankly has not been

occurring in this House since this government was elected in April 2016.

In fact, the absence of a reconciliation agenda by the Pallister government, I think, is among many other issues that we can quarrel about—has been something that suggests quite clearly that they're not onside of—government's not onside with reconciliation, nor are they onside of trying to build a more inclusive Manitoba where everyone matters.

And so we put forward—the member for Fort Rouge put forward the reasoned amendment. I think if the government takes this reasoned amendment seriously, votes with us—votes with the member for Fort Rouge on this idea, then they can go back and do the kind of work that should have been done previously in order (a) to get the bill right, but (b) to embark on a genuine gesture of reconciliation that can help to rebuild relationships between indigenous peoples in this province and those of us who are descendants of the settlers and colonists.

Now, I want to say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that this issue may well have been addressed had the government undertaken the kind of consultation that was necessary in order to achieve the kind of outcomes that you want in a good bill leading to a good law.

And let—that—yet we remain quite concerned that there was not sufficient consultation. Certainly, section 35 of the constitution sets out the duty to consult, and what we've seen routinely is the Minister of Indigenous Affairs, who I have great respect for, going out and telling us that she's visited many, many communities.

She told me that quite directly in Estimates but that, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, doesn't really constitute a consultation as understood under the constitutional provision in section 35 and in terms of the duty to consult.

And we have no less of an authority on this subject than Arlen Dumas himself, the Grand Chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, AMC, who, when asked about this particular piece of legislation said, and I quote: If the government wants to restrict night hunting it can negotiate agreements with our First Nations or include us in comprehensive co-management of natural resources. Chief—Grand Chief Dumas then goes on to say, and I quote again: There are options available to the government to address this issue, but they require co-operation. The

Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs was not consulted on this ban being imposed by the Province. End quote.

And so here we have, in Grand Chief Dumas's words, two essential points that all members of the House need to take seriously when thinking about both the bill itself and the reasoned amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

On the one hand, Grand Chief Dumas says, and says quite clearly, if the government wants to restrict night hunting, can negotiate agreements with our First Nations or include us in comprehensive co-management of natural resources.

Now, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, that's exactly what the reasoned amendment put forward by the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) calls for: comprehensive co-management of natural resources. And so, in that, it suggests very, very concretely, very thoroughly, that there is a different level than one which is contemplated by the current bill and that consequently the bill itself does not be able to reach its full potential, and Grand Chief Dumas puts forward that very mechanism that can complete the bill in its entirety so it does exactly what the government wants to do.

On that basis alone, on the advice given by Grand Chief Dumas, I would suggest that that's enough for all members of this House to vote for this amendment, not allow the bill as currently constructed to move to second reading and go back to the drawing board and do the kinds of discussions that need to have happen and come back with a comprehensive agreement on co-management of natural resources. Then, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, we have something to talk about and, quite likely, something to be proud about.

But the other element of the quote that I just read by Grand Chief Dumas is the one that is deeply, deeply concerning to members on this side of the House, certainly in the NDP caucus, in which Grand Chief Dumas quite clearly says: The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs was not consulted on this ban being imposed by the Province.

Now, I would suggest that in consultations it's quite possible that you didn't get to everyone and those things kind of happen. I think—and so you do your best to make sure that you listen to every voice, every piece of advice, make sure that you're attentive when listening and try to act on that advice.

But, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, when you don't consult with the Assembly of Manitoba

Chiefs, I would suggest and suggest quite strongly that maybe you weren't engaged in productive consultation at all, and that's a very disturbing element and a very disturbing part of a government who came forward—and I don't have the wording of the press release at hand, but of course it was, as usual with this government, an overstatement about the kind of consultation that was done; as usual, hyperbole at its best, coming from the government.

And yet what we see here, in no less than the words of the Grand Chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs in Manitoba, saying quite clearly: Nobody ever called. Nobody ever talked to them. There was not sufficient—not only was there not sufficient consultation, there—we were not consulted on this ban. And I would suggest very strongly and very clearly that that is a significant omission that may well reflect the fact that other significant consultations didn't happen at all.

\*(15:10)

And that alone suggests to us that it would be very important for all members of the House to listen very—to read very closely what chief—Grand Chief Dumas has said, but also what the reasoned amendment proposed by the member for Fort Rouge suggests, in order that we can go back to the drawing board—not proceed to second reading—go back to the drawing board, do more extensive, more comprehensive, more elaborate, more genuine consultation than just a meet and greet in a community, and then come back with a plan for a comprehensive co-management plan for natural resources that actually allows a—both a genuine collaboration and co-operation on the one hand and then on the other constitutes, in my view, a genuine act of reconciliation as well.

But we know, in fact—and this has been one of the most difficult parts of this particular debate—where all of this started, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker. We know that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) of this province, frankly, went out and started speaking about this issue—I think at a Conservative Party fundraiser. As my friend from Wolseley said yesterday, please, let's prevent the Premier from making any more announcements at Conservative Party fundraisers. And I think he was quite right about that because every time he intends to do so, he makes a mistake; he makes it worse. And his hyperbole—which continues to be a source of such division in our province—his hyperbole led to, in fact, not a genuine act of reconciliation but to create

an even greater divide with indigenous communities in this province. And it's a tendency that this Premier (Mr. Pallister) seems to have routinely, on a day-to-day basis.

The obligation, in my view, the role of the premier is to find ways to unite Manitobans, to find ways in which we can all be one with the strength of many, as the slogan—well, not the slogan, but the words of the City of Winnipeg state. Instead, what he constantly does, what this Premier constantly does, what the member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Pallister) constantly does, is to find ways to divide Manitobans and find ways to send people in opposite directions rather than actually trying to find ways to unite them.

Now, we know his comments—and it's been touched on, I think, by most members on this side of the House, that his comments about night hunting leading to a quote, race war, was all—not only a sad, sad episode in our history but especially a sad episode in the era of reconciliation that—one that promotes division as opposed to unity, but that it also represented a government that hasn't taken the appropriate time to understand the nature of the relationship between indigenous peoples and non-indigenous peoples through history, through time, into the current era and onward to tomorrow.

And, in fact, what the Premier's comments did was simply, perhaps—I'm sorry to say this as this was true, but perhaps plays well to a small percentage of Manitobans that make up the Conservative Party base but otherwise, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, reflects a way of thinking and an approach which is quite clearly out of step with contemporary thinking on the path to reconciliation that we all need to make.

*Madam Speaker in the Chair*

And so the reasoned amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition comes to the aid of the Premier—after having made a terrible mess out of something—comes to the aid of the Premier and of the government by ensuring that there's a genuine gesture of reconciliation that promotes unity rather than off-the-cuff, unnecessary hyperbole that only serves to divide Manitobans one against the other.

And, of course, on this side of the House, we're not interested in that kind of division. We're certainly not interested in that kind of hyperbole. We're certainly not interested in words where there are no actions and, even worse, where there are words that

spawn the kind of actions that none of us feel comfortable with, that none of us came here to fight for or to advocate for. In fact, they are words that ultimately, when the Premier characterized this as some kind of quote, raise—race war would only engender not only division, as I said earlier, but mistrust, a dislike, a disharmony. That's not the kind of society that I want to live in. It's certainly not the kind of society that my family wants to live in, certainly not the kind of society that my colleagues on this side of the House want to fight for and advocate for every single day.

And so I would suggest that the reasoned amendment put forward by the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) offers an opportunity from the government—the Premier—to step back from the brink of hostility and instead move forward with the bonds of unity, and in that sense—in that sense, Madam Speaker, it will provide some reason for us to actually be sitting in this session right now in the absence of the government being able to articulate an emergency that has brought us into an emergency session being able to articulate what the financial issues are that we desperately need to be discussing.

What my friend from Concordia made clear today in question period, that there is a way forward here and that is simply for the government to introduce the budget implementation bill as it's been done traditionally in this place for a long, long time. Then we'll have a chance to evaluate it. Then we can determine where we want to go with concurrence. Then we can reach a deal and we can all get back into our constituencies and doing the kind of community work that I know is central to every member on this side of the House and, I have to say, I'm sure on the other side of the House as well.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to conclude with just a few seconds left in my remarks to simply say the opposition—the leader of our party, the member for Fort Rouge has put forward an olive branch here that is designed to make this emergency session more important and more meaningful than it is otherwise going to be.

I would advise all members of the government caucus to think clearly about this amendment and vote for it when the time comes.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill 29. But I want first of all to make a couple of comments because we were brought back for this emergency session and we were brought back for an emergency session to deal

with financial matters because there are significant financial matters that are not completed.

There is a BITSA bill, which has not been presented. There are a number of budget steps that have to be completed. There is Interim Supply that will be required. All these matters need to be completed and yet we are dealing with this bill, Bill 29, and although we see this as a significant bill, there are elements of it which clearly are not ready for the stage where this bill should be.

And so the government would have been wisest to deal with the financial matters that we had this emergency session called for and instead of dealing with this bill, which, in fact, as it's presented to us, is clearly in a number of elements not really ready to be the sort of bill that it should be.

I hope that the government will start addressing the financial matters. They are clearly important that the government has the authority through the Interim Supply. It is clearly important that we complete the concurrence. I—we have additional questions if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen) particularly would come forward because, you know, these are—this was an emergency session to deal with financial matters. So it would be appropriate that we are asking some questions of the Minister of Finance in concurrence, and, hopefully, that will happen soon.

\* (15:20)

The lack of preparedness of the government with regard to the BITSA bill is somewhat surprising given the stage we are at in terms of when the budget was introduced and the normal process that we have followed on most occasions in the past in having the BITSA bill here. Given what has happened in terms of the additions to the BITSA bill in past years, it is natural that members of the opposition, members of our Liberal Party, are somewhat skeptical of what the government may or may not put in the BITSA bill, and so it is important that we have the BITSA bill and that we deal with it so that we can move forward with the overall business of this Chamber.

Now, I want to deal with a number of items in Bill 29. The first of these is the issue of safety. And we clearly see safety as an important issue. It is important that all hunting, whoever is doing the hunting in Manitoba, is approaching this with a strong view of safety. And, Madam Speaker, there are clearly rules for the handling of firearms, and these firearms safety measures have—which—some of

which are provincial, some of which are federal—are clearly there and have been in place for some time.

It is an issue of safety which crosses the background of the individual. We were living outside of Winnipeg, near St. François Xavier, for a fair number of years, and adjacent to us there was some bush where there were deer from time to time. We decided after a number of years there that the wisest matter was to stay out of the bush during hunting season just because of concerns over safety. I think that we are probably not alone. We had, indeed, some concerns that there were people who were, on occasion, hunting before—or, in what would be called night hunting. And that would be defined as hunting beginning in the—later than 30 minutes after sunset and before 30 minutes before sunrise.

Madam Speaker, of the individuals who were of concern, none of those was indigenous individuals. And it—we have to be very careful when we address this that we are addressing this not with a racialized bias, because sometimes people in the indigenous community feel that they are being singled out or targeted. Indeed, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) spoke in a very unfortunate fashion about some—at one point about this bill being racially motivated in some way. Clearly, this needs to be a bill which is about safety, but which is about how all people hunt, and it is not a bill, and should not be a bill, which targets specific groups of people.

The bill, in that respect, does—and appropriately—recognize that there are indigenous hunting rights. And in that sense, it is important that those hunting rights are continued to be recognized. It is also important that there be appropriate and very substantial consultation and discussion with indigenous people all over Manitoba—the First Nations, Metis, Inuit—so that there has been adequate description of the sort of approach that the government was going to take and adequate ability of people in communities all over Manitoba, including First Nation, Metis and Inuit, to be able to have input.

Now I will talk specifically about some areas. The government has decided that there should be a division between north and south in Manitoba, and that division seems to have some reasonable perspective, but—and some reasonable rationale overall. But there is a considerable concern about where precisely the boundaries are drawn and, in fact, my colleague, the MLA from Kewatinook, has been trying to get a larger resolution map so that she



can determine which community specifically in Kewatinook are included in the northern area and which in the southern area, and that actually is very important.

Indeed, it is important that we, as MLAs, know which communities, but it's also important that the government has, in fact, gone out and talked with people in communities about where that line should be drawn, to ask people if they would like to be included in the northern or in the southern area of Manitoba, and this is the first area where one would have expected that the government would have had some substantial consultation, but there doesn't appear to be any consultation having occurred at all with regard to communities to decide and help them come to a suggestion or have input into consideration of whether they'd be considered in the North or in the south of Manitoba.

And, because of the different ways in which the North and the south have been handled, this is clearly an aspect which should have been discussed with communities before the line was drawn. And we are not sure why the government has not discussed this matter with communities in terms of where the line is drawn, but it is the first of a number of areas where it seems to me and to us in the Liberal Party this government could have done a much better job and why this bill, as it's being brought forward, has been brought forward in a premature way before having the discussions and the consultations which we would have had expected.

With regard to these consultations, I had asked at-in questions around this bill for the minister to indicate who she had consulted with, and the minister replied, and I quote: We sent letters out to every chief in Manitoba.

Well, Madam Speaker, I would have expected at a minimum that the minister would have tabled that letter so that all would be clear. We would like to know whether that was the same letter to all chiefs, whether it was a form letter that went out to everybody or whether it was an individualized letter.

Did that letter address whether the community was being considered for the northern part or the southern part of the province? Did the issue of structuring the advisory committee or committees, was that part of what was in the letter? We don't have that letter tabled and it would have been helpful to have that letter tabled and put forward in the Legislature and so that some sort of a judgment

could be made in terms of the value of that letter and the meaning of that letter as part of the consultation.

\* (15:30)

Did the minister invite the chief to be a part of the meeting or meetings? Again, we don't know because the letter wasn't tabled and we don't have it in hand.

There are clearly big differences in wildlife populations and wildlife managements in the North of Manitoba and in the south. In the south, for instance, we might be dealing with an area with a lot of white-tail deer, but in an area which may have very few to rare moose, but in the North, there are few white-tail deer and lots and lots of moose. And, clearly, the management of the two species is being done in quite a different fashion, and right now there are some major concerns about moose populations.

So, clearly, if this was going to be a valid attempt at consultation, it would have been a letter which talked about these specific wildlife species—and the minister said iconic species, so we include, therefore, at least, iconic fish species like pickerel and northern pike, and we would include iconic bird species that may not be hunted—birds, for example, like the bald eagle. And—so that—clearly, there are significant issues which would vary from community to community, and one would have expected if this was the proper approach to consultation, that not only would it have been a letter which was preliminary to a meeting, but it was also a letter which was individualized in terms of the individual community—their needs, their concerns, their geographic locations and the individual species which may be of concern to the advisory committee or committees.

And so we are left at this point with the appearance that sending out a letter was not sufficient consultation. It might be a lead-up to consultation, but it was not—be considered a consultation. We don't even know that all the chiefs actually received the letters. And so once again, we have a situation where, based on the evidence that we have at the moment, the decision to bring this bill forward was premature.

And, thirdly, I want to talk about the co-management approach that is being put forward in this bill. It is said, in 88.1, that the minister may appoint persons to a shared management committee that will make recommendations to the minister on

measures to conserve and manage a specified species of wildlife in an area designated by the minister.

Now, on her question and her response to a question, I had asked a question earlier on in the debate on this bill to the minister, about the shared management committee or committees. And the minister said, I am open to suggestions. It appears that there are a lot of details of the shared management committee. In fact, as I recall, the minister had said that she didn't want to do—get too far down the road; she didn't want to say must appoint because she still had to consult with people in the First Nations and Metis and Inuit community and the—here is another area of concern.

We would have expected a bill like this to have details of the shared management committee or committees laid out and that the minister would have had some consultation with the individuals in various parts of Manitoba, with all the chiefs and others who are involved here, and so that there would've been a proposal which was much clearer and—in terms of what was going to happen.

I am personally concerned that the word may appoint persons to a shared manage committee means something less than a full commitment to having such shared-management committee or committees, and that the opportunity here would be to have a shared-management committee or committees, which could have a major impact on the management of wildlife and fisheries. The minister says this covers 'incourt'—iconic species and indeed species which are not necessarily hunted so that the shared-management committee, it appears, because it's dealing with iconic species, has a broader range of potential input than just dealing with the species which are hunted.

In this context, let us talk for a moment about the fisheries, which would be an important area of concern which could be dealt with at the shared-management committee given that a number of fish species are certainly iconic in our province.

We have reports, which go back a number of years, saying that we have the worst managed fisheries on our three largest lakes. The worst managed fisheries—I think it was in the world—but certainly it was worst-managed fisheries I think in at least North America. And that was a pretty black mark on this province.

We know very well that since 1960, under both Conservative and NDP governments, this province

has failed badly in managing the fishery on Lake Winnipegosis. This suggests a critical need for a partnership with indigenous people in the Lake Winnipegosis basin in managing properly this fishery.

Now the minister has talked elsewhere, has committed, has promised, has said she's already working on it—a eco-certification of fisheries like Lake Winnipegosis, and it would be important to know how this process, which is in this bill, is going to work in the process eco-certification. If she's setting up two separate processes, is this a process that will work in both areas? More questions which are not answered, and more reasons to believe that it was premature to bring this bill forward.

We know that there have been also significant concerns about the management on—and some of the species on Lake Manitoba, and certainly there have been some widespread concerns on Lake Winnipeg with the algae blooms and zebra mussels, et cetera.

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

Are these shared-management committees going to be set up in different parts of the province to look at different areas? Are they going to be a single shared-management committee? The—I asked in question, would it be the minister's objective to have one shared-management committee for the whole province or would they be different ones in different areas of the province?

The minister appears not to be sure what her plans are. She says I'm certainly open to suggestions. It would've been valuable if the minister had conducted the sort of—a consultation which would be able to give her feedback and input onto critical questions like this so that this effort could move forward.

\* (15:40)

The options in terms of the function of the shared-manage committee are considerable. It has significant potential. One would hope that the optimum operation of shared management committee or committees would provide us much better management of, for example, moose populations. We know that under the previous NDP government that they weren't adequately doing regular surveys, and they weren't adequately having a substantive partnership with indigenous people.

And so the result was that we continue even today, as I understand it, to have concerns about our

moose populations and that, clearly, to come back to the committee or committees, moose populations are important in northern parts of the province, but not in—so much in, say, southern parts of the province.

So, if you're going to have a committee which deals with the management of moose, you want to make sure it has substantial numbers of representatives from the areas where moose populations are in concern.

In a—in an era, for instance, with caribou, there is some interesting and helpful work being done, for example, in the Interlake where DNA samples and DNA testing is being used to give an understanding of the size of the Interlake caribou population. To what extent will the shared management committee have the ability to make recommendations which would be implemented in terms of monitoring populations, in terms of using both traditional knowledge and sophisticated technological approaches—in some cases might include things like drones—to be able to assess these populations. And certainly one would hope that the shared management committee, if it were to be there—the government says may—or committees—that there is the potential for very significant and helpful co-management.

But the government has not done, to this point, the adequate consultation, got the adequate homework to know even how many shared-management committee or committees there would be, as well as precisely how this committee would work, and those kinds of details would clearly be very important to have in hand.

Now, there's one other area of significance that I want to talk about, and that is that, in this bill, it deals with spotlighting and night hunting. And, if we look at section 12(2), Conduct deemed to be night hunting, a person is deemed to be hunting at night if they are (a) they, or another person in their company, directs an artificial night—light at night into an area where a vertebrate animal may reasonably expected to be found; (b) they are in possession of a firearm or have already access to a firearm; and—and is important—their firearm is loaded or they have ready access to ammunition for their firearm.

There is implication in the way this bill is put together that all night hunting is done by spotlighting. I've discussed this matter with the MLA for Kewatinook. The traditional approach to night hunting was to be using the light of the moon, not to be using spotlighting, and, indeed, it is important to

distinguish between spotlighting and night hunting, and yet this bill tries to lump them together and in the attempt that has been made to categorize the nature of night hunting, and the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has tried to imply that night hunting is really being done just or primarily by indigenous people while, in fact, he has not much evidence to support his case. And there is evidence, indeed, that others are involved in night hunting as well and in spotlighting.

So we need to be careful in terms of how we link things together and in terms of the implications of certain aspects of this bill in implying that spotlighting and night hunting are the same.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring my remarks to a conclusion. As I have said, safety is important. It is important to all of us. And we need to recognize that. That there are aspects of this bill, as I have outlined, which clearly are not fully developed, and the aspects where the consultations that have been done to date were not sufficient in areas such as where the boundaries would be set between the North and south divisions of Manitoba, in areas like the matter of the letter-based consultation process that the minister engaged in—what was in the letter, how many people did she actually meet with and not just send letters to, in the development of the approach to co-management or shared management committees.

We should have a situation where indigenous people are real partners in management, but we are not seeing that here because there is a—maybe there will be shared management committees, not must. There is no framework for how many such committees will be put in place. There is clearly not enough detail in how these committees will operate and whether, in fact, they will really be such that the committee has a major role in management or, as has happened too often in the past under various governments, that the committees are set up but they're not really listened to adequately; they're not really involved as much of they should be.

So, with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I pass on to others to continue this discussion.

### **Introduction of Guests**

**The Acting Speaker (Dennis Smook):** Before I recognize the next speaker, I would just like to acknowledge a group of students we have in the public gallery. We have seated in the public gallery from Pineland Colony School 25 grade 2 to grade 12 students under the direction of Susan Squires. The

group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook).

\* \* \*

**Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas):** I just want to point out first, with all due respect, we were called back here for emergency session, and it's disappointing that nobody has got up to speak to this bill, so I'll take over.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to stand here before you as the MLA for The Pas and especially as a treaty woman. This bill declaring a ban on night hunting should be looked at in a much bigger picture. In fact, this whole process should be looked at.

The—this proposed change to The Wildlife Act is an infringement upon my treaty rights. I am a First Nations woman; my treaty number is 2697; from Opaskwayak Cree Nation, formerly known as The Pas Indian band. My former treaty number was 802, which was my late father's treaty number. My whole family's number included my late mother. She was from James Smith Cree Nation near Melfort, Saskatchewan. My treaty roots and my ancestors are extended in two provinces in this wonderful country as a Swampy Cree woman and as a Plains Cree woman.

Indigenous hunters—indigenous people—have a right protected by the Constitution Act of 1982 to hunt animals for food at night, provided it's done safely and meets certain conditions, including that the hunting is done on reserves, unoccupied Crown land or private land with permission.

\*(15:50)

It needs to be put on record that this legislation was put forward without proper consultation with indigenous people about the issue, which is a constitutional obligation. SCO grand chief stated, quote: The use of the phrase 'shared management' in the bill is misleading. In substance, this bill merely proposes to create recommendation committees. This is a complete failure to accommodate calls for negotiations with First Nations on a true shared management regime on wildlife hunting. End quote.

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

The minister stated that, quote, we understand our constitutional responsibility and we take that responsibility very seriously, end quote. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have to

'disagree'—disagree. As a critic for Indigenous and Northern Relations, I have witnessed a complete opposite such as in committees watching our fishermen from Norway House come in to speak against cutting ties with the freshwater fisheries management. Because they cut ties with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, this cut hundreds of First Nations fishers out of a job.

My journey here as an elected MLA for The Pas started as a young Cree woman from northern Manitoba with some rez cred. My self-esteem as a First Nations woman expanded through the tool of education when I was a student at the University of Manitoba, where I studied Native Studies and political studies. My self-esteem as an indigenous woman in this country rose as I learned about our rise in our political movement and the activism of our young leaders back in the day, which included my father and Ovide Mercredi and Phil Fontaine.

So, when I was in university, I learned something that quite shocked me and at the same time it didn't. I just want to share a little bit what I learned—1969 White Paper. The 1969 White Paper was a proposed Canadian government policy on indigenous peoples, proposed by Pierre Trudeau and Jean Chrétien. The paper was met with widespread opposition, which encouraged the creation and mobilization of protesting on a national level. This movement of 'activism' caused the government to repeal the policy, but the effects of the national anger and—the paper caused had—has already taken.

These movements continued to push forward indigenous political activism and positive changes to policy today. A white paper is what the Canadian government terms legislative proposals set forth by the Canadian government. Many indigenous people, however, felt the title served as a connection to a racial inequality and white privileges that were relevant at the time and still 'prevelet' today, sorry. The 1969 White Paper was a proposal set forth by the Government of Canada. It is a Canadian policy proposal made in 1969 by Prime Minister Trudeau, Pierre Trudeau. The White Paper—purpose was to abolish all legal documents that had previously existed, including the Indian Act and all existing treaties in Canada.

Under the legislation of the White Paper, Indian status would be eliminated and all First Nations people would be assimilated under the Canadian state. First Nations people would be 'incorporated'—incorporated fully into provincial government

responsibilities as equal Canadian citizens and reserve status would be removed, imposing the laws of private property in indigenous communities. Any special programs or considerations that had been allowed to First Nations people would—under provisions legislation, would be terminated.

So with that—with the 1969 White Paper, I believe that was the start-off on our 'actism' that led us—that we still contribute today.

As a Native Studies student at University of Manitoba, as—learning our political movement, there was a couple of court cases that are very important that should be acknowledged that has to do very—that has to do with this very bill.

*R v. Sparrow* 1990: This case is considered the first Supreme Court test of the scope of section 35 of the Constitution Act, which recognizes and affirms the existing Aboriginal and treaty rights of Aboriginal people of Canada and has been at the centre of many court battles over land and resource rights.

In its decision, the court, for the first time, set out a criteria for determining whether a right can be considered to be an existing right and whether the government is justified in curtailing such a right.

This case stems from 1984. Ronald Edward Sparrow, a member of the Musqueam band in BC, was charged with violating fisheries regulations when he used a net that was longer than his fishing licence allowed.

Sparrow argued that his right to fish with the net was an existing Aboriginal right protected by section 35 of the Constitution Act. The court agreed but stipulated that the right is not absolute and can be, in certain circumstances, infringed upon.

Another court case that I learnt as a Native Studies student at U of M: *R v. Marshall* 1999. This court battle over fishing rights in Nova Scotia inflamed tensions between Aboriginal and non-Native—First Nations fishermen in Maritimes and Québec.

Donald Marshall Jr., a Mi'kmaq man from Nova Scotia, had been charged with fishing eels out of season, fishing without a licence and fishing with an illegal net, but argued that Aboriginal rights stemming from the 18th century treaties with the British Crown exempted him from fisheries regulations.

After the Supreme Court ruled in his favour, upholding the Mi'kmaq and 'masileet' peoples' right to earn a moderate livelihood from commercial fishing and hunting, First Nation lobster fishermen interpreted the ruling as granting them rights to catch lobster out of season and clashed with their non-Native counterparts, who feared lobster stocks would be jeopardized.

But, after a particularly heated showdown in Burnt Church, New Brunswick, the court was forced to issue a clarification of its ruling which underlined that the ruling applied to fisheries only and not to all natural resources and that the government could restrict Aboriginal fishing rights in the interests of conservation.

The ruling was considered a key test of Native fishing rights and sparked debate over what should be and what shouldn't be considered traditional use of natural resources.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to elaborate on comments on night hunting from the Premier (Mr. Pallister). Quote: Young indigenous guys going out and shooting a bunch of moose because they can, because they say its their right, doesn't make any sense to me. End quote.

This is what Pallister—or the Premier told a few dozen party members in January 2017. The statement he made—that doesn't make sense to me—well, let me help inform this government and help make sense of this for him.

Again, I have to bring up what the heart of this debate is: section 35. The existing Aboriginal and treaty rights of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed. (2) In this act, Aboriginal peoples of Canada includes Indian, Inuit and Metis peoples of Canada. (3) For greater certainty in subsection (1), treaty rights includes rights that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired. (4) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Aboriginal and treaty rights referred to in section 1 are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.

In 1982, when section 35 was entrenched into the Canadian constitution, Delbert Riley, the national leader of the National Indian Brotherhood, later known as Assembly of First Nations, was quoted, saying: Aboriginal rights are what First Nations define them as. Their rights are what they were before European contact, and remain the same after European contact. Aboriginal rights refer to the

activities, practice and traditions of Aboriginal peoples in Canada that are integral to the distinctive culture of Aboriginal peoples. The word existing in section 35 has created the need for the Supreme Court to define what Aboriginal rights exist.

In *Sparrow*, the case I had just mentioned, the court also held the words recognized and affirmed incorporate the government's 'fiduciary' duty to the Aboriginal peoples, which requires them to exercise restraint when applying their powers and interference with Aboriginal rights.

\* (16:00)

This further suggests that Aboriginal rights are not absolute and can be encroached upon given sufficient reason. After the support—the *Sparrow* case, provincial legislation can only limit Aboriginal rights if it's given them appropriate priority. However, in the *Sparrow* case, the court did not have to address what was, in fact, an Aboriginal right for the purposes of section 35, since neither side disputed what Musqueam and an Aboriginal right to fish for food.

To add further, the—Canadian Aboriginal law is the body of Canadian law that concerns a variety of issues related to indigenous peoples in Canada. Canadian Aboriginal law is different than indigenous law. In Canada, indigenous law to—refers to the legal traditions, customs and practices of indigenous people in groups. Canadian Aboriginal law provides certain constitutionally recognized rights to land and traditional practices. Aboriginal is a term used in the constitution of Canada that includes First Nations, Inuit and Metis people. Canadian Aboriginal law enforces and interprets certain treaties between the government and indigenous people and manages much of their interaction.

And I must make clear that a major area of Aboriginal law involves the duty to consult and accommodate. In Canada, the duty to consult and accommodate with Aboriginal people arises when the Crown contemplates actions or decisions that may affect Aboriginal persons, Aboriginal or treaty rights. This duty arises most often in the context of natural resource extraction such as mining, forestry, oil and gas.

The broad purpose of the duty to consult and accommodate is the advance of—is to advance the objective of reconciliation of pre-existing Aboriginal societies with the assertion of Crown sovereignty. This duty flows from the honour of the Crown

and its 'fiduciary' duty to indigenous people. The obligation to provide consultation and a decision-making process that is compatible with the honour of the Crown is embedded—again, section 35 of the Constitution Act. This is the heart of this debate.

I must add further, the Crown constitutes the—both federal and provincial governments. Therefore, the level of government contemplating an action or decision has the responsibility to consult and accommodate. Although in many provinces and is—it is 'indursty' 'propoments' that consult with Aboriginal rights holders, the ultimate 'substansive' duty to ensure proper consultation and accommodation lies with the Crown.

Now, just to talk more on a personal base, as a Aboriginal woman, as a treaty woman, No. 2697 from Opaskwayak Cree Nation, I was disappointed when the Premier (Mr. Pallister) spoke disrespectfully of First Nation and Metis people and is still unapologetic in his views. He described the issue of night hunting as a race war. He described indigenous hunters as young indigenous men with criminal records. When he finally returned, he refused to apologize. And he said there was nothing to apologize for.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was interviewed by the media about his comments. I was sitting at my apartment taking this phone call. And my two oldest girls were sitting right beside me at the table. After learning that the Premier made these ignorant and hurtful comments, I felt sorry for these two young ladies that I'm doing my best to raise to become proud indigenous women.

I went through a lifetime as a First Nations woman facing barriers, racism, discrimination, and at one time, accepting defeat that those stereotypes of how our society labels us as Indians. As young as grade 1, I was going through racism already, called chief, brownie, go back to the reserve. I didn't like chief too much. But today, still today in 2018, I am—along with our Aboriginal communities and people—we are still living with those stereotypes casted upon us as Indians.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's sad to say that the Premier of Manitoba endorsed and fed those stereotypes that I am trying to protect my children from. Those comments about our indigenous hunters again fed those very stereotypes that we're criminals, not worthy, and, as a woman, mother, aunt, I will

still try and will always protect my girls from that very stereotype.

We are in the era of reconciliation. That's what didn't make sense to me when I heard the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Pallister) make those comments. Those comments actually took us a few steps backwards as we're striving forward on this path to reconciliation. Those words did not honour, did not recognize what reconciliation means for everyone in our province and our country.

In fact, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, one of the 94 recommendations was to make it mandatory for civil servants to take cultural awareness courses. As a—my former job at University College of the North, as a representative workforce co-ordinator, it was my job to put forth those cultural awareness courses because 75 per cent of our students were Aboriginal.

So, with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this recommendation from the TRC, I think this should apply not only for our civil servants, but it should apply to our folks here in this Chamber.

And, in closing, I just wanted to just sum up again what I'm trying to say as an Aboriginal woman, as a treaty woman, that my journey here went from having a low self-esteem as an Indian—accepted racism. I accepted the fact that I belong to a group of people that can be disposed of—Aboriginal women disposed of and a lot of people won't care. So, as my journey went on to—through education, university, through work, and now I'm here as the MLA for The Pas and as the first First Nations woman elected to this very Chamber.

I feel hopeful and optimistic that we will, and I'm asking every member in this Chamber to join me, and the Premier, to go forward on this path to reconciliation. And the beauty about apologies from the Premier—the beauty about apologies to our indigenous people of Manitoba and our country, the beauty is it's never too late to apologize.

Thank you.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** I'm very pleased to follow the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin), and it was a very nice speech, very well crafted, very well delivered.

I just want to say at the beginning that I would feel a lot better about the—this bill if the government had used the proper processes allowed for in the rules. You know, we negotiated a set of rules, both

parties did a couple of years ago, to try to improve what we thought were rules that, you know, weren't doing the job for us.

\* (16:10)

And so you can argue about whether you're happy with the rules or not, but at the end of the day we established a formula for dealing with bills, and—but I think we all agree that this particular bill required a lot of consultation. There's a—any bill, any bill you bring in here, one of the questions that comes up in the question period constantly—from the Conservative side, too—their very first question is, well, who'd you consult with. And certainly a government bill sort of has a higher standard than a bill from the opposition, primarily because it has a better chance of passing the House. And, generally, they have to adhere to that higher standard and they have to be able to tell the public as to who they've consulted with.

And after those consultations, they have a period of time—the government has a period of time to introduce the bills into the Legislature. Otherwise, if they miss that deadline there's no guarantee that that bill will pass. And so their deadline is actually 20 days—20 sitting days after the Throne Speech.

Well, now, let's do the math here. You know, the Throne Speech was way back in November and there were 20 sitting days that they had. And now, all of a sudden, this bill is coming out of, like, out of nowhere. So they're—got a good head start, I guess, I would say, on the new session. They have a good head start, but they're going to mess that up, too. And why? Because they're going to spend all summer debating this bill. We're not going to pass it, so you're not going to be successful, and now we're going to have a Throne Speech in November. You're going to have 21 days—sitting days—to get this bill reintroduced, which you will, I assume.

Just where and when are you going to do all the consultations? You know, we're going to be sitting here a year from now because it will be a bill that will actually meet the requirement of being introduced within the first 20 sitting days after the Throne Speech, so I'll give them that. And now the opposition has an opportunity to choose it as one of the five that we'll hold over to the fall. So either this thing will pass next, you know, June 2nd, or November the 9th. Those are the choices that we have here.

So, given the requirement for proper consultations, it's only fair that this government withdraw this bill immediately. You know, admit you are wrong and you've messed up, and that's not unusual for the House leader of the—the current House leader of the Conservative Party—government. I'm going to give the previous House leader a bit of a break here and say—but currently, the existing House leader doesn't seem to be able to get anything right. So I'm going to say that he should, you know, get this bill withdrawn and start a—*[interjection]*

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

**Mr. Maloway:** —series—start a series of consultations that are more or less required on a bill such as this, and withdraw the bill and do it right.

Now the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), I listened to his speech with a lot of interest and he was saying that his experience in his life was that during hunting season it was a wise idea to stay out of the bush. And you know, I couldn't agree with him more because, you know, I—while I'm not a hunter and I don't see a lot of moose in Elmwood, although I do see the odd deer on the way down the river there, there's—I see the odd deer when I'm driving my boat down the river. I see lots of signs, for sure.

But, you know, I remember back in the 1990s, the RCMP had—pre Shelly Glover—had a person who held her position for the RCMP—*[interjection]*—that's right, and it was the press, and the press person for the RCMP, you know, gets constant coverage because they're always doing press releases and conferences. And this fellow's name was Wyman Sangster. And I remember the Conservatives were so happy with this guy that they were even going to run him. I think they nominated him, possibly; they were going to nominate him in the provincial election and—but—

**An Honourable Member:** What was his name?

**Mr. Maloway:** Wyman Sangster was his name.

And Wyman got into some trouble because, I think, towards the end of his career with the RCMP as their PR person, he happened to be driving his truck down a road one night, I think, you know, later on at night, and, I gather, the conservation people have decoys. You know, they have a decoy moose or a deer or something like that out—*[interjection]* yes, out in the field. And Wyman decided to stop his truck and get his gun out of the truck and started shooting at this decoy. Next thing you know, he's

got—he's in handcuffs and he's in the front page—he was shooting this decoy.

So, you know, there are other stories, many stories, and the members from the rural areas could probably tell me many I haven't heard of before. But there are American hunters. I know Donald Trump Jr. is quite a hunter, I understand. He shoots big game, and I don't know that whether Canada has any big game that would fit his criteria, but someday he might be up here too.

But we've heard stories for years and years and years of American hunters coming across the border and all of a sudden there's some missing farm cows, and, you know, there's a lot of drinking going on with these farmers. So that's why I'm telling you it's dangerous to be in the bush sometimes.

And then the border security people are dealing with these American hunters who are arriving with a farmer's cow strapped to the roof of their car. Now, I don't know whether this is a true story or not, but I've heard it—

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

**Mr. Maloway:** —I've heard it enough times to believe that at least once or twice it must've actually happened.

So, you know, clearly, there is a problem that should be dealt with that probably should've been dealt with years ago—*[interjection]*

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

**Mr. Maloway:** —and, you know, and not only in this province as well.

But you can't be introducing legislation just for political expediency, and that's what this is all about. There was—it's—like, they kind of, like, dreamed it up, you know, in the middle of the night and decided to fast-track this bill, introduce the bill, don't do the consultations and think that somehow that this is going to be acceptable. And the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin) has explained why it's not acceptable, and the member for Riverview has explained why, and the member for Minto (Mr. Swan) has also—and his speech was the best, let me tell you, because, you see, this is a way to get free legal advice. My legal advice cost me an awful lot of money and it's not guaranteed, but this member provides a lot of legal advice for free. The price is right, and the advice is good.



So the fact of the matter is that this particular bill is a general prohibition of night hunting. It's established in southern Manitoba, only allowed to hunt by permit. The spotlighting is still allowed unless prohibited by regulation or a term or a condition imposed on the permit. Shared wildlife conservation and management committees may be appointed in a specific area, and these committees must have half First Nations representation and there must also be a representation from hunters, outfitters and local landowners.

And there, too, there is—things are very unclear as to how the government is going to proceed because there's no consultations; they've not done the consultations. Matter of fact, there's reference been made by other speakers to the fact that the bar for consultations has to meet or exceed the—what we had for Bipole III. And we don't have that. We're not close to that.

\* (16:20)

Now, we agree that—with the idea of working to improve safe hunting with the collaboration of indigenous nations and governments, but we think this bill should be amended to better achieve that goal, and we want the Manitoba government to be successful in its efforts in shared management of our big game population. But they are so far away—so far away—from achieving that.

And what's even worse is they not making any pretext to even wanting to do it. Like, you can't—you have to accept that consultations have to be done. They have to be on a level with Bipole III. They have to be meaningful. You can't—as the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) pointed out, you just can't send a letter—few letters out and expect that that's their consultation.

That's all that we've able been to determine at this point. And if you're going to do that, then do it right, because otherwise the law, the bill, has no legitimacy. You know, if you don't have buy-in—you can have all the bills you want, but if you don't have buy-in from the public—you know, I'm sure it would interest some enforcement people in this province to know that there's certain rules and regulations passed by the Legislature, by City Council, that actually, you know, don't get enforced at the local level.

And I'm thinking of, you know, some grocery stores in town and so on who—not even aware of some of the rules that are supposed to be following, don't follow them, never have, don't know about them and never will follow them.

But we think we've done a great job here as legislators because we're making all these fine speeches, and we're debating, and we're passing bills, and all of a sudden, you know, what we passed here is going to be—have an effect on people, and its going to be implemented. Well, I have news for you: there's lots of examples where that just isn't so. And this, probably, is going to be one of them, because you're not going to have the consultation. You're not going to have the buy-in. Matter of fact, you may end up getting yourself involved in more legal entanglements. And I mean, maybe that's what the government really is looking for here.

I mean, it's hard to gauge just what's going through the brains opposite on all of this, right? I mean, is they—is there a desire here to actually solve a problem? Or is the desire here to just, you know, do some dog-whistle politics and stir up some issues where at the end of the day, we might be—you know, have a beneficial effect on some voters that might kind of see it our way, right?

**An Honourable Member:** How about saving lives.

**Mr. Maloway:** And, well, you know, and that's the concern here. And the members opposite can argue. We don't hear any comments from them. As far as I know, the last member speaking was one of my colleagues and the member before, and, well, it was the member for River Heights who's sort of one of our colleagues, I guess. I'll consider it some days, that some days he's standing up with us, and some days he's standing up with them.

**An Honourable Member:** Big tent.

**Mr. Maloway:** But—the big tent, yes. But, you know, I mean, he spoke on this bill as well, but I haven't seen any Conservatives standing up and speaking on this bill. Oh, I wonder why that is, you know.

And so, madam—Mr. Deputy Speaker, like I've said, we agree with the idea of working to improve safe hunting with—but with collaboration from indigenous nations and governments.

And we also want the government to be successful, but they're doing their utmost not to be successful, just of the virtue of the fact that they don't follow the rules. They bring it in in a summer session. They expect, what, we're going to just roll over and pass the bill? It's not going to happen.

And so what're they going to do, spend all summer here talking about a bill that's not going to

pass that they're going to have to reintroduce next year? So you'll is—going to have to listen to me again next year for forty minutes, and I know you're not looking forward to that. But our laws need to be effective and enforceable and actually meet the province's legal obligations, including the constitutional obligations.

The member for the Pas (Ms. Lathlin) explained what those constitutional obligations are through section 35, and the Province's own legal obligations are spelled out in the minister's own transition binder, and I don't know whether the minister's even read that. We expect that she probably should.

Says that major changes that have a major effect on Aboriginal hunting require significant consultation with all Manitoba First Nations. And in the questions and answers—and I only have the questions here; I don't have a copy of what their answers were, but I can extrapolate. I can sort of figure it out. And I'm sure they don't know the answers either, but the point is that when we asked about the consultations, her own briefing notes say that the scale of the consultations would exceed that of Bipole III, which was Manitoba's largest consultation to date.

Now, we're not convinced that the Pallister government has met its legal requirements, as set out by their own department, indigenous government. Both First Nations and Metis have said that the government is not properly consulted and the law must also live up to its billing. It must be a real system of shared management of hunting in this province, and there's been very little thought given to this shared management idea. And how could there be when they're not just consulting with anybody? Right? Basically, there's a silo here.

The bill pays lip service to the idea of shared management but leaves all power in the hands of the government, and so that is the concept here. The government will have the full power to pass the bill, implement the bill, and they will not actually be listening to the people that they're supposed to be listening to in a—with a bill like this.

When the principles of shared management are ignored, it only makes it more likely that there'll be problems implementing the bill. One of the principles of shared management is consultations—clear the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has failed to properly engage the Province's partners. And there's also a lot of practical concerns that we have with the 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 the processing of the application. And, evidently, in the Water Stewardship and Biodiversity Division, the division that's responsible for these policies, there's currently a 25 per cent vacancy rate and the government has eliminated dozens of positions in its regional offices. So, you know, there's going to be very few people around that are going to be able to implement the requirements of this bill.

This division's already starved for resources, implementing this major change without appropriate staffing would overburden existing staff and lead to problems when issuing the permits.

We also have serious concerns that this application process will not work in practical terms. And we're also deeply concerned with the way the Premier has used this sensitive issue to incite anger. And, you know, I'm not going to get into this issue again because it's been dealt with by a number of my colleagues. But, you know, just suffice to say that, you know, the member was quoted in the paper today that he has all his 20 years of experience and, you know, he's been in Parliament and he's been in the Legislature for a little while and he came back again, and nothing wrong with that guy. So I mean—

So—but my point is that he's pretending that with all that great 20 years' experience that he actually learned something. And yet he makes, you know, a grade 1 error by inflaming the issue and making these comments that he shouldn't make. And he—and when he was asked to apologize, he wouldn't apologize. So that just tells me that maybe there's another agenda at play here, because just common sense would say that you would apologize for making comments like this.

That—now he's also—and, of course, there was the experience with Maclean's magazine, as well, and those comments that he should not have made. And it's—also, there's a number of people who have actually—and it's the Metis federation who've actually gone out and moved further ahead of this bill, before this bill was even contemplated by the government, the Metis federation passed a resolution—I'm trying to find it here—but the Metis federation—in September of 2017, Manitoba Metis Federation members voted to ban spotlighting for their members. This was on CBC of September 21, 2017, and their new resolution places further restrictions and limitation on night hunting. And we see this self-governing approach that the MMF took as a step

in the right direction. It actually goes further than what the Province is currently proposing.

\* (16:30)

Indigenous leaders have said they're willing to work with the Premier (Mr. Pallister), but this requires working together and meaningful consulting, something, once again, the Premier is unwilling to do. And, when he does it, I don't how much, you know, he's following Donald Trump or Donald Trump's following him, but he seems to be kind of out of step, but maybe deliberately so, with mainstream thinking and current realities.

*Madam Speaker in the Chair*

There's also additional requirements. We have said before and many times that we want the government to be successful in its efforts for shared management of the big game populations. I—we don't understand how it is that they can just make arbitrary decisions without consulting with the Native organizations who have—and, by the way, who may have different opinions of their own, but certainly as a group they can come up with an agreed position and the government should take all that into account when passing this legislation and drawing up the regulations.

Now, you know, the legal responsibilities are something that, as I'd indicated, have been dealt with by some of our previous speakers, and sometimes, you know, you can get yourself into a lot of trouble where you're going to end up in court and cost yourself a lot of money, and that's what I think is actually probably going to happen here where they—our government is going to find itself on the wrong side with the lawyers, taxpayer-funded lawyers, fighting to basically—a cause that they're clearly going to lose, and, as the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin) talked about section 35 and the requirements of section 35, there are, you know, there are issues there that the government maybe looking for precedents—I have no idea, but they could avoid all of this by simply having an agreed solution rather than letting the courts make decisions on each and every case.

Now, in terms of consultation and consensus instead of legislation, indigenous and non-indigenous people can and should live alongside with one another respectfully and engaging in meaningful conversations with—to identify resolutions, to identify issues. 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 who want safe and sustainable hunting practices and meaningful consultations are essential to the success of changing hunting culture in the province.

Once again, the buy-in has to be there. People have to be in agreement that the law is fair, the law is just, and, if so, and if they agree, they will follow that law. But, if you've not, you know, involved them in the process in the first place, then I have my doubts whether they're going to be following the law too consistently.

If safety ethics and animal welfare are the real reason, then the government should be working co-operatively with First Nations to ensure they reach the end goal without impeding on treaty rights. Now First Nations Canadians have a right to hunt for food, a right protected by the Constitution Act of 1982 and, once again, the proviso is it's done safely and under certain conditions.

This legislation is very heavy-handed. Instead of antagonizing people with it, it would be better to help to consult in a collaborative and meaningful way to an established agreement that favours all parties. And, once again, this is not just in this particular instance, but in general we're seeing that this is something that this government is actually not doing.

I could never in my—if someone had told me anytime in the last, maybe, 20, 30 years, that a government in the future would come in and just arbitrarily, you know, whack three out of six hospitals in Winnipeg, I would've said, that's not possible; that could never happen. And yet—and what we see this—you know, developing and happening right before our very eyes. Like, who would believe this? But, once again, they're attempting to do it.

Many First Nations appear to be unsupportive of the current bill. Once again, many of them don't even know that we're probably here speaking about it right now, because you haven't consulted with them in the first place. You know, maybe we're going to have to start sending out our speeches and do our own consulting. I mean, I—if the government won't don't it, somebody has to do it.

During this government's announcement, 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. And he had—he said, that has barely

started. There has to be meaningful conversation, Dumas said, I wouldn't call it a bill yet; it's just a recommendation.

The reasonable voices get crowded out by the government's inflammatory comments, and, once again, we got into this—the Premier (Mr. Pallister) talking about a race war last year.

There needs to be meaningful dialogue between the government and First Nations to come up with reasonable solutions that are safe and sustainable. I had explained already about how the Manitoba Metis Federation, as of September '17, prior to this government bringing in this bill, had developed their own ban for night hunting, and their ban exceeds this one and it's—more comprehensive.

Like any form of hunting, monitoring and enforcement are needed, and whether it's self regulation or provincial regulation, the division responsible for implementing this legislation has, as I'd indicated, a 25 per cent vacancy rate. We're deeply concerned that the Pallister government has not put forward the necessary resources to set up a system, and the government needs to work more closely with indigenous peoples when they're dealing with indigenous hunting rights.

The previous comments towards indigenous people in Manitoba are damaging to reconciliation efforts and they perpetuate a negative stereotype. Premier is leader of our province—should be leading by example. But, time and time again, he does it. He continues to insult Manitoba's indigenous population. We know there's a duty-to-consult framework that must be the basis for good governance of Manitoba, engagement in a meaningful collaboration with Manitoba's indigenous nations, the urban Aboriginal community, and the indigenous organizations must be a priority. However, the Premier and his government repeatedly failed to present a comprehensive duty-to-consult framework with Manitoba's indigenous people. 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.

Now, Madam Speaker, I know the members would love to listen for another half hour, if I had it—another half hour—

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave. More.

**Mr. Maloway:** I know my colleagues are really digging in for the long haul, but I don't feel that I have the unlimited speaking spot on this bill.

So I want to thank you very much, and I'm sure we'll be delivering this speech again 'rery' soon.

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** A couple of tough acts to follow there. Certainly, the institutional knowledge that the member from Elmwood has is tough for me to follow up on, being relatively new, and the heartfelt speech given by my colleague from The Pas that really talks about the heart of the issue, and really puts a real face to the issue, is so important. And, really, that's the basis of what consultation is, isn't it?

\* (16:40)

I mean, the true, strict, I guess dictionary definition of consultation means that people should be listened to. But, really, this consultation that we're talking about is really so much more than that. It's taking into account not just the opinions but where those opinions come from, Madam Speaker. And, really, that's the part that I think this government fails to grasp. I think a lot of their consultation consists of putting a survey online and thinking they've actually consulted with somebody and—somebody other than their own party members that fill the surveys out, which clearly is not what is intended.

But, before I get too far down that road, I want to just talk a little bit about why we're here today, Madam Speaker. This government recalled us for an emergency session, and they're trying to convince us that discussing this Bill 29 is an emergency. Now, hunting safety is certainly very important, and it's something that shouldn't be taken lightly.

So, when this government—oh, wait, they weren't the government at the time. They were making campaign promises at the time, so this would have been 2015, prior to the 2016 election—or it could have been early 2016—where they first raised this issue and said they were going to do something about it. So, for two years, this government, as they do with so many things, sat on their hands. Now, clearly, it wasn't an emergency—wasn't an emergency for this government from the time they got elected when, really, they said in 2016 that they were going to address this. So here we are now in June of 2018 in an emergency session of this Legislature when, really, what we should be talking about is budget bills and things of that nature.

But, instead, the government is extending this session in an attempt to, I guess, finish some of their legislative business that, through their own—I don't want to use the word incompetence because that would not probably be parliamentary, so I won't use that word, Madam Speaker—but through their own inability to get their own agenda forward. They've now extended the session on a make-believe emergency to try and meet some of their perhaps supporters' questions as to, well, you said you were going to do this, why has it not been done. What's the hold up? What are you waiting for? So they go ahead and they introduce this bill.

Clearly wasn't an emergency when they got elected in 2016. It wasn't an emergency when they had their first session in 2016. It clearly wasn't an emergency when they were discussing bills and things of that nature, legislation in 2017. Now, all of a sudden, here we are in June of 2018, and all of a sudden it's become an emergency. Well, if this is how this government deals with things that are emergencies, we're all in a world of trouble, Madam Speaker. I hope there are no real emergencies that come up that we expect this Premier (Mr. Pallister) and his Cabinet ministers and his government to deal with, because it will be too late for us all.

So, with those few comments about, really, the gist of why we're here, I'll leave that aside for now, and let's just look at what we're talking about today, Madam Speaker. So The Wildlife Amendment Act, Bill 29, the safe hunting and shared management act. So our Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Kinew) introduced an amendment. The amendment really says that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word that and substituting the following: this House declines to give second reading to Bill 29, The Wildlife Amendment Act, safe hunting, shared management—and I won't read the French part of that because, clearly, I don't know how to speak French—because Bill 29 fails to institute the principles necessary for a real system of co-management for safe hunting in Manitoba.

And really that's the problem that we on this side have with what the government's done so far is they failed in the duty to consult. Now, they say that they've consulted and they think they've done quite a lot of consultation but, clearly, when we read some of the articles that have been in some of the newspapers—sorry about that; didn't mean to cause distress for the people listening to the mic.

So, on May 14th, 2018, in CBC News—in an article titled Against our treaty rights: indigenous mom, night hunter slams Pallister's plan to ban spotlighting—so an indigenous hunter who relies on night hunting to feed her family says Brian Pallister's promised ban on the practice known as spotlighting would fly in the face of her treaty rights. Pallister promised the ban Thursday at the Progressive Conservative Party spring fundraising gala, and legislation for the ban is expected to be introduced.

So, when the Premier is at a fundraising gala of, one would assume, staunch Tory supporters, he says that he's going to bring in a ban. Now, at that point in time, he really hadn't done those consultations yet, but he's already announced that that's what's going to happen, here's what I'm going to do, here's the law I'm going to bring in; oh, by the way, now we're going to talk to somebody about it, because I guess he didn't really care what the people would have to say because he already had his mind made up what the legislation was going to look like. So that flies in the whole face of consultation right off the start, Madam Speaker.

So, whether this Premier, this government, whether anybody particularly likes it or not, indigenous people have rights. They have rights guaranteed by the constitution. There's been numerous court cases that have not only backed up those rights but have tried to define more clearly what some of those rights are. And I'll get into that, perhaps, in a little bit, depending on how much time I have.

So we know that the Constitution Act of 1982 gave indigenous people a right protected to hunt animals for food at night, provided it is done safely and meets certain conditions, including that the hunting is done on reserves, unoccupied Crown land or private land with permission.

So the constitution of the country guarantees that right to indigenous people. Along comes this government, in a non-emergency fashion, and decides that they're going to do something that affects that right. And they claim they've consulted with people. Clearly, they have not, at least not sufficiently to actually accomplish their goal.

Now certainly, all of us on this side are concerned. Certainly, from my life, safety is very important. It's something I've devoted a lot of time to, a lot of effort, and all of us are agreeing that safety is paramount, but how to achieve that level of safety, whether it's in a workplace, in a community,

in a field, is the challenge that's before any government, is how do you go about making sure that you arrive at the best possible solution? That's the point of consultation, Madam Speaker, is to make sure that all parties that have an interest are not just there, but they're actually actively engaged in the process of developing that consultation.

\* (16:50)

Now, again, I get back to sometimes this government has a little trouble with interested groups being actively engaged in a consultation process. I guess that's why they did away with the minister's advisory committee on workplace health and safety, because they weren't really interested in true consultation, they want to have the illusion of. Well, a lot of First Nations people aren't going to fall for that anymore, Madam Speaker. And nor should they.

We know that the Southern Chiefs' Organization says that this legislation would come without proper consultation with indigenous people about the issue which is a constitutional obligation. So right—as soon as word got out that this is what this government—well, and I probably shouldn't cast that kind of aspersions on all members of the caucus opposite. Really, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) came out with this plan, probably didn't really consult with his own caucus before he came out at the fundraiser and said this is what he was going to do. So he clearly didn't consult properly with all the parties that needed to be involved.

And I just want to add a couple of little personal comments here, that when I was a kid growing up, I grew in farming country in southern Saskatchewan. My dad was a hunter. I went hunting a couple of times myself. And certainly there was problems with things getting shot that should not have gotten shot. But I can tell you, Madam Speaker, it was not young indigenous men; it was white guys from the city that came out with not one clue what they were doing. And they'd shoot at anything that moved. The indigenous people and—that grew up—or that lived around the community where I grew up were very respectful and really understood how to hunt and how to hunt safely and properly.

So, for the Premier to come out with some of the comments that he made, and maybe I should just read that into the record so that people understand exactly what the concern is. So this—I'm going to quote from CBC posted January 31st, 2017, and in this article it says: In the town of Virden, he clearly

stated his belief that night hunting is in conflict with the sustainable hunting practices. Pallister also said that he intends to bring elders forward to speak with younger indigenous hunters who, he said, are responsible for most of the night hunting.

Now, this is a quote that the CBC article attributes to the Premier: What is fair about going out and shooting at a pair of eyes in the night with a high-powered rifle? What's sustainable about that? We've tripled the charges from the NDP, we've doubled the number of possessions of vehicles, but it isn't going to change unless people's attitudes start to change about this. This is a poor practice, a dumb practice, an unfair practice—how's that? Am I mincing my words? It's just not right. It should stop. So what are we doing? We're organizing. We're organizing to bring indigenous people together and say the same thing that I just said, because it's becoming a race war, and I don't want that. Their elders have been intimidated by them to not say anything—let me just read that part of the quote again—their elders have been intimidated by them to not say anything. They need to come forward and they need to be involved in this discussion. This is not how most indigenous people think. They think seven generations into the future. In eastern Canada, that's the culture of the Mohawk, the Six Nations people, is to think into the future.

So now, here we have a Premier of the province of Manitoba, I guess, thinking back to the old days where the Great White Father would tell indigenous people what to think, how to think, how to act. Perhaps it's time that the Premier stepped into the 21st century, 2018, and learned about what consultation is and learned about saying things that really do more damage than good.

Certainly, we look at the MMF, which kind of strange that this government has so much trouble with some of these groups, and let me just find the article that I want to quote here. The MMF has—there we go—so last fall, the Manitoba Metis Federation, and this is—I'm quoting from an article, Canadian Press, published Friday, May 11th, 2018. In it—in this article, it says that last fall, the Manitoba Metis Federation adopted a ban on spotlighting, spotlight hunting around developed areas of southern Manitoba. Chartrand said—that's President Chartrand—said that they were supposed to have a meeting with the Province after the federation had adopted its ban. They were supposed to have a meeting with the Province after the federation adopted its ban. He goes on to say: We haven't had a

meeting since. We thought they would embrace us with open arms. If they want to do it right, in a very co-operative way, you'd think they'd call us together.

So here we have an indigenous group, the Manitoba Metis Federation, that this Premier seems to like to pick fights with and not really listen to and not consult with, just dictate to, here they've taken a bold step and introduced a ban of their own that you would think—I'd tend to agree with David Chartrand at this point that when they came out with that, you'd've thought that the Premier and the government would've said, gee, we should've sat down and talked to you beforehand because maybe what you've already suggested is a good way to go and should be incorporated into whatever we're doing; let's sit down and have that conversation. Madam Speaker, that would've seemed like a good idea, but, according to President Chartrand, at least up until May of this year, that meeting hadn't taken place, which is very unfortunate because, well, I guess we've seen a lot of the history of how this government has consulted with the Manitoba Metis Federation and not much success there.

So I just want to—let's see, this article I'm reading was by Larry Kusch and Nick Martin, posted on 05,16,2018. Hunters would have to apply for permits to hunt in yet-to-be designated areas. Night hunting with spotlights would still be generally allowed in the province's North, with some restrictions.

So the government led by Premier Brian Pallister introduced a bill that more clearly defined—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

I believe the member has just used the name of a MLA, and members are not allowed to reference somebody by name of—by their name; they have to be recognized either as the leader or by their constituency.

**Mr. Lindsey:** Just on your ruling, Madam Speaker, I was quoting from the article.

**Madam Speaker:** Still not allowed. *[interjection]*  
Still not allowed.

**An Honourable Member:** I apologize for that then, and I shall do better.

On Wednesday, the government's—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**An Honourable Member:** On Wednesday, the government—*[interjection]* On Wednesday, the Pallister government introduced a bill that more clearly defines night—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

When this matter's again before the House, the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 13, 2018

## CONTENTS

### Matter of Privilege

Gerrard	3035
Fletcher	3035
Cullen	3036
Fontaine	3036

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Members' Statements

Education and Training	
Johnston	3037
Manitoba's Imagine a Canada Representatives	
B. Smith	3038
Emotional Bonds Between People	
Johnson	3038
Keeping the Fires Burning	
Fontaine	3038
Provincial Nominee Program	
Curry	3039

#### Oral Questions

Post-Secondary Education	
Kinew	3040
Pallister	3040
Climate and Green Plan	
Kinew	3041
Pallister	3041
Cross Lake Community	
Lathlin	3043
Stefanson	3043
Family Law Reform	
Fontaine	3043
Stefanson	3044

#### Long-Term-Care Facilities

Swan	3044
Friesen	3045

#### Indigenous Education

Lamoureux	3045
Clarke	3046

#### School Trustees

Lamoureux	3046
Wishart	3046

#### Future of School Boards

Lamoureux	3046
Wishart	3046

#### Municipal Road Maintenance

Smook	3046
Wharton	3046

#### Budget Implementation Bill

Wiebe	3047
Friesen	3047
Pallister	3047

#### Economic Development Strategy

Lindsey	3048
Pedersen	3048
Pallister	3048

#### Petitions

Tina Fontaine–Public Inquiry	
B. Smith	3049

#### Seven Oaks General Hospital Emergency Room

Swan	3049
------	------

#### Vimy Arena

Fletcher	3050
----------	------

#### Tina Fontaine–Public Inquiry

Allum	3051
-------	------

#### Gender Neutrality

Gerrard	3051
---------	------

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### Debate on Second Readings

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

Allum	3052
Gerrard	3055
Lathlin	3060
Maloway	3063
Lindsey	3068



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>**