



Second Session – Forty-Third Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report
(Hansard)**

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Tom Lindsey
Speaker*



Vol. LXXIX No. 61 - 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, May 28, 2025

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-Third Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ASAGWARA, Uzoma, Hon.	Union Station	NDP
BALCAEN, Wayne	Brandon West	PC
BEREZA, Jeff	Portage la Prairie	PC
BLASHKO, Tyler	Lagimodière	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian, Hon.	Keewatinook	NDP
BYRAM, Jodie	Agassiz	PC
CABLE, Renée, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
CHEN, Jennifer	Fort Richmond	NDP
COMPTON, Carla	Tuxedo	NDP
COOK, Kathleen	Roblin	PC
CORBETT, Shannon	Transcona	NDP
CROSS, Billie	Seine River	NDP
DELA CRUZ, Jelynn	Radisson	NDP
DEVGAN, JD	McPhillips	NDP
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
HIEBERT, Carrie	Morden-Winkler	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake-Gimli	PC
KENNEDY, Nellie, Hon.	Assiniboia	NDP
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
KING, Trevor	Lakeside	PC
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom, Hon.	Flin Flon	NDP
LOISELLE, Robert	St. Boniface	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya, Hon.	Notre Dame	NDP
MOROZ, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	NDP
MOSES, Jamie, Hon.	St. Vital	NDP
MOYES, Mike, Hon.	Riel	NDP
NARTH, Konrad	La Vérendrye	PC
NAYLOR, Lisa, Hon.	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
OXENHAM, Logan	Kirkfield Park	NDP
PANKRATZ, David	Waverley	NDP
PERCHOTTE, Richard	Selkirk	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Turtle Mountain	PC
REDHEAD, Eric	Thompson	NDP
SALA, Adrien, Hon.	St. James	NDP
SANDHU, Mintu, Hon.	The Maples	NDP
SCHMIDT, Tracy, Hon.	Rossmere	NDP
SCHOTT, Rachelle	Kildonan-River East	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield-Ritchot	PC
SIMARD, Glen, Hon.	Brandon East	NDP
SMITH, Bernadette, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
STONE, Lauren	Midland	PC
WASYLIW, Mark	Fort Garry	Ind.
WHARTON, Jeff	Red River North	PC
WIEBE, Matt, Hon.	Concordia	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Spruce Woods	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

The 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.

We acknowledge we are gathered on Treaty 1 territory and that Manitoba is located on the treaty territories and ancestral lands of the Anishinaabeg, Anishinewuk, Dakota Oyate, Denesuline and Nehethowuk nations. We acknowledge Manitoba is located on the Homeland of the Red River Métis. We acknowledge northern Manitoba includes lands that were and are the ancestral lands of the Inuit. We respect the spirit and intent of treaties and treaty making and remain committed to working in partnership with First Nations, Inuit and Métis people in the spirit of truth, reconciliation and collaboration.

Please be seated.

Routine—the honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. Nahanni Fontaine (Government House Leader): Could you please canvass the House for leave to waive rule 91(8) and to not see the clock today until all stages of Bill 47, the fair trade in Canada, internal trade mutual recognition act and amendments to—Rick? And amendments to the commemoration of days—*[interjection]*

Sorry, Honourable Speaker. Let me start again.

Could you please canvass the House for leave to waive rule 91(8) and to not see the clock today until all stages of Bill 47, The Fair Trade in Canada (Internal Trade Mutual Recognition) Act and Amendments to the Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Buy Manitoba, Buy Canadian Day), have been completed, including second reading, Committee of the Whole and concurrence and third reading, and also to allow the members opposite to second all stages of Bill 47.

The Speaker: Is there leave to waive rule 91(8) and to not see the clock today until all stages of Bill 47

have been completed, including second reading, Committee of the Whole and concurrence and third reading, and additionally, is there leave to allow the opposition member to second the motion?

Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

The Speaker: Leave has been denied.

House Business

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): Honourable Speaker, could you please canvass the House to see if there is leave to expediate consideration of a number of bills as follows:

(1) At the beginning of orders of the day, government business, today, on—the following bills will be called for second reading or resuming debate on second reading, with no debate and the question put immediately after the motion is moved, as applicable: bills 209, 210, 218, 300, 221, 222, 233 and 47.

(2) Once the questions on those bill motions have been resolved, the House will then consider report stage amendments of the following bills, with five-minute speaking times for the sponsor, a member of—for the sponsor, a member of another recognized party and independent members: bills 5, 11, 21, 24, 39 and 44.

(3) Once the questions on those report stage amendments has been resolved, the House will then consider concurrence and third reading of the following bills, with five-minute speaking times for the minister, the critic and independent members. The House will not see the clock until all questions have been put: bills 5, 11, 21, 24, 39 and 44.

Bills 208, 209, 210, 218, 300, 221, 222, 226, 233 and 47 will be referred to a standing committee on Thursday, May 29, at 6 p.m. Once reported back to the House, these bills will not be eligible for report stage consideration but will be eligible for concurrence and third reading during orders of the day, government business, on Monday, June 2, despite not being listed on the Order Paper.

(5) After the deferred vote on second readings motion for Bill 234 has been completed on Thursday, May 29, the bill shall be referred to the same standing committee referenced in clause No. 4.

(6) At the beginning of orders of the day, government business, on Monday, June 2, the following bills will be called for concurrence and third reading, with no debate and the question put immediately after the motion is moved: bills 208, 209, 210, 218, 234, 300, 221, 222, 233, 226.

(7) Once the question on those bill motions had been resolved, the House will then consider concurrence and third reading of all specified bills, as well as Bill 47, with the bills to be considered in an order decided by the Opposition House Leader. Debate provisions in rule 2(16) shall apply.

(8) In the event of a discrepancy between the provisions of this leave request and rules, orders and forms of proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, the provisions of this leave request are to apply.

(9) The provisions of this leave request can only be amended by unanimous consent of the House.

The Speaker: Is there leave for the House to expedite the consideration of bills as described by the Opposition House Leader?

Is there leave?

An Honourable Member: Yes.

An Honourable Member: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Leave has been denied.

* * *

The Speaker: Orders of the day—[interjection]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

The Speaker: Order. Order.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 236—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Stalking-Related Measures)

Mr. Richard Perchotte (Selkirk): I move, seconded by the member for Dawson Trail (MLA Lagassé), that Bill 236, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Stalking-Related Measures), be now read a first time.

Motion presented.

Mr. Perchotte: The Highway Traffic Act is amended to impose automatic driver's licence suspensions on persons convicted of criminal harassment if a vehicle has been used in the commission of the offence.

* (13:40)

The licence suspensions are in addition to an existing provision under The Domestic Violence and Stalking Act that enables a person who is subject to stalking to request a court order that suspends a stalker's driver's licence.

Further amendments authorize a peace officer to seize and impound a vehicle if the peace officer discovers a person using a vehicle to commit criminal harassment. When a person who previously committed two or more criminal harassment offences using a vehicle commits another such offence, their vehicle is subject to forfeiture.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [Agreed]

The motion is accordingly passed.

Committee reports? Tablings of reports?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Wildfire Update

Hon. Ian Bushie (Minister of Natural Resources and Indigenous Futures): So far, 198,000 hectares have burned in total this season. This is almost triple the amount burned compared to the annual average.

Drier than normal weather are one reason, but most fires this season have been caused by human activity, which is abnormal. This isn't to say that every human-caused fire has been caused by lighting a match. Some of these were certainly accidental, like an exhaust pipe burning too hot or mechanical issue that causes a blaze.

What's important to remember is that these—in—that in these conditions, we all need to be more careful and more aware. Where there are current backcountry travel restrictions, it is imperative that people adhere to these restrictions.

The situation in Manitoba is very serious right now.

We are asking that Manitobans to pay—we are asking Manitobans to pay attention to fire bans, listen and co-operate.

We also cannot stress enough that no one should use a drone in an area affected by wildfires. With the situation becoming increasingly serious, we need to stress the message that if you fly a drone near a wildfire, emergency response teams are forced to ground their operations. This endangers lives, it's against the law and you could face serious penalties. So before flying a drone, make sure there are no smoke plumes or active wildfires nearby.

Let's be fire smart and continue to act responsibly.

As far as the—as the citizens of Flin Flon prepare for a potential evacuation, we will be asked—we all will be asked to band even closer together as a province.

As one Manitoba, we all know that folks in all parts of the province will lend a helping hand. Let's continue to listen to the advice of local officials; let's work with our friends and our neighbours.

Our thoughts are with the firefighter from Parks Canada who was injured in the line of duty.

We appreciate the efforts of all first responders; from firefighters to hydro workers to social and health-care workers, from local representatives to mayors, reeves, local leadership and volunteers.

We thank you, we commend you, we have your backs, and we will get through this together.

And as one Manitoba, let's get through this together.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River): Today, I rise continued concern for the many Manitobans whose lives remain affected by the wildfires burning across our province. While the situation remains serious, we want to continue to thank the relentless work of firefighters, emergency responders and partners working around the clock.

Currently there are 71 active wildfires in our province, due to the lightning and human-caused incidents.

The large wildfire just south of Oxford House community is being maintained and suppressed as much as possible with the help of MWS and the Office of the Fire Commissioner.

For the Manitobans travelling on PR 391 and PR 280, we urge you to drive cautiously and as the visibility reduces due to the wildfires in that area.

As the smoke from the wildfires continues to spread, residents should take precautions to lessen their outdoor activity.

We must all do our part to get through this time of uncertainty, as we protect ourselves and loved ones. Let us remain strong.

We thank our first responders that are doing their best to protect all of us.

To all residents affected: You are not alone; stay vigilant. We stand beside you, and together, we'll get through this.

Thank you.

Rendez-vous Canada

Hon. Nellie Kennedy (Minister of Sport, Culture, Heritage and Tourism): Honourable Speaker, I rise today to recognize the return of Rendez-vous Canada, our nation's premier travel trade marketplace, to Manitoba for the first time in 15 years. This is a tremendous opportunity to showcase the remarkable growth and evolution of our tourism industry since 2010.

Earlier this morning, the marketplace officially opened at the RBC Convention Centre, welcoming 1,500 delegates to our province. Travel buyers from around the globe and sellers from across Canada are actively engaging in business on the marketplace floor as we speak.

Honourable Speaker, the economic impact of this event is significant. Over 800 hotel rooms have been booked, and delegate spending is expected to generate \$4.6 million in direct and indirect revenue for our city and province. In the lead-up to the event, the international delegates participated in nine unique tours, experiencing the diverse and breathtaking tourism offerings across Manitoba. Just yesterday, over 800 participants took part in 20 tours that highlighted some of Winnipeg's world-class attractions.

Honourable Speaker, we are joined here today by a number of distinguished guests, including senior leaders from Destination Canada and the Tourism Industry Association of Canada. I extend my sincere thanks for their efforts in bringing this prestigious event to Manitoba.

Hosting this event not only boosts our economy, but also allows us to share the beauty and vibrancy of our province with the rest of Canada and the world. This event is more than a marketplace; it's a celebration of Manitoba's place on the world tourism stage.

I ask all members of the House to join me in welcoming a number of guests from Rendez-vous Canada who are here today. From Destination Canada, we have president and CEO, Marsha Walden; senior VP of industry advancement and corporate secretary, Caroline Séguin; and board member, Julie Canning. From the Tourism Industry Association of Canada, we have VP of stakeholder relations and engagement, Amy Butcher; and chair of the board, Nina Kressler. From the Indigenous Tourism Association of Canada, we have president and CEO, Keith Henry; director of marketing, Tamara Littlefoot [*phonetic*]—sorry, Littlelight; and director of partnerships, Teresa Ryder. And from Canadian Sky, we have program director, Chris Hawkins.

And, of course, our local leaders in Manitoba who have been integral to the success of this event: co-chairs Cody Chomiak, from Travel Manitoba's VP of marketing; and Natalie Thiesen, Economic Development Winnipeg's VP of tourism. And from Travel Manitoba, we have president and CEO, Colin Ferguson; and COO, Angela Cassie. And from Economic Development Winnipeg, president and CEO, Ryan Kuffner. And the CEO of Indigenous Tourism Manitoba, Holly Courchene. And, finally, the chair of the Tourism Industry Association of Manitoba and CEO of Frontiers North, John Gunter.

Welcome to you all and thank you so much for all you do for the tourism industry, for Manitoba and across Canada. And please enjoy Rendez-vous.

Mr. Richard Perchotte (Selkirk): Honourable Speaker, it's so wonderful to see all the people in the gallery to celebrate tourism in Manitoba. Canada's heart has called Rendez-vous Canada to Winnipeg.

Manitoba is so proud to be hosting Canada's largest tourism trade show, thanks to advocacy by Travel Manitoba and Tourism Winnipeg.

I'd like to say welcome to the hundreds of attendees, industry leaders and investors from around the world who are gathering in the heart of our province this week to discover all that Manitoba and Canada have to offer.

Manitoba is a hub of diverse experiences with something for everyone to enjoy, from world-class arts scene to one-of-a-kind museums and Indigenous cultural showcases to our beautiful parks and everything in between.

I am extremely proud of the PCs' work in government to build Manitoba as a global tourism hot spot, with several key tourism strategies developed with Travel Manitoba still leading the way today.

By our very last year, we were able to increase tourism visits to Manitoba by 1.7 million, supporting 25,000 jobs and doubling the number of Indigenous-owned tourism businesses across the province.

This year, Winnipeg will be hosting both the Canadian Elite Basketball League championships and the Grey Cup thanks to the PC investments.

This kind of momentum that all investors attending Rendez-vous Canada this week will have an opportunity to seize, especially as travellers increasingly seek destinations outside of the US.

Manitoba is worth visiting, worth investing in and worth exploring.

So welcome to everyone and thank you to the Tourism Industry Association of Canada and Destination Canada for helping to showcase Manitoba throughout this event.

* (13:50)

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Ethelbert Echo

Hon. Ron Kostyshyn (Minister of Agriculture): Honourable Speaker, I would like to recognize a remarkable milestone: 50 years of the Ethelbert Echo, a local newspaper based out of Ethelbert, Manitoba.

In 1975, the Ethelbert district action committee met to discuss how to help community grow and thrive. One idea stood out: a newsletter to keep the residents informed about the local news.

By January of 1975, with help of the National Film Board Challenge for Change program, the first issue of the Newly Born was printed and hand-stapled, and a true grassroots effort was met with overwhelming community support.

Later that year, dedicated volunteers evolved the newsletter into a newspaper, and then in 1975, the first Ethelbert Echo was printed at the Dauphin Herald. The name, suggested by Anne Gensiorek, became the lasting symbol of the community spirit.

For over the years, the Echo has stayed true to its mission: to offer a paper of community news, free to the local residents and made possible by the tireless worker of volunteers.

From door-to-door fundraising in the early days of today's generation—generous donations and subscriptions, the Echo has always been powered by the community.

To the current volunteers, and especially those who have been involved in the paper for decades, Gloria Paziuk, Bev Lylyk, Ora Maryniuk, Barb Mikolayenko, Marilyn Kozar, thank you for your dedication that makes this 50-year legacy possible.

Congratulation to 50 years of stories, connections and community.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

Activities in Midland this Summer

Mrs. Lauren Stone (Midland): It is my privilege to stand today to pay tribute to my incredible constituency of Midland.

From wheat fields to rivers, and golf courses to parks, Midland is rich in rural culture and beauty. And there are many exciting and unique events that will take place over the next couple of months that showcase Midland's communities that I want to draw attention to.

This past weekend kicked off the first of many fairs with the annual Miami Tractor Pull and Mud Bog put on by the Miami Power Toboggan Club and agricultural society.

But if you've missed your chance in Miami, head down to Morris for Rumble in the Valley next week, Manitoba's largest and loudest truck and tractor pull. With engines roaring and mud flying, don't forget your noise cancelling headphones, because it gets loud.

But if 4H competitions, petting zoos and horse races are more your interest, the Miami Ag Society will be hosting the Miami Fair and Rodeo at the end of June.

Canada Day celebrations, front and center this year, occurring in Elm Creek, Roseisle, Morris, Lowe Farm and La Salle, to name a few. I thank the many volunteers that are putting on events throughout the day, like pancake breakfasts, BBQ lunches, parades, bouncy castles, pony rides and historical displays. I know Manitobans across our communities will be proudly celebrating our province and our country.

Another major celebration taking place this summer, the Carman fair, celebrates 145 years and is the longest continuous fair in Manitoba, where for miles, families line the streets for the parades, experience the midway, the beer gardens and embrace our rich agricultural industries and rural way of life.

The Rosenort Summer Festival in August is a family-fun event held at Westfield park, where each year, kids look forward to the signature aerial Ping-Pong drop and the awesome prizes donated from the local businesses.

Last, but certainly not least, the one and only Manitoba Stampede will be occurring in July with competitors and visitors from across the world.

I want to thank all the volunteers and local businesses for making all of these events across Midland a success.

Prairie Rose Students' Visit to the Legislature

MLA Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): Today we are joined by 38 grades 5 and 6 students and their teachers from Prairie Rose School.

Just prior to question period, we had some pizza and talked politics. We discussed some of the recent laws that have been passed.

For example, Bill 17, the nutrition equality for lasting learning outcomes, also known as Nello's Law. I explained how the law ensures students have access to foods at school. Prairie Rose students believe this is a good law because some kids don't bring food to school.

Another example I shared with the students was Bill 226, the health system and governance accountability amendment act, which helps ensure transparency and accountability in our health-care system. Well, I asked the students why accountability in health care is so important, and they said, for our own health-care needs and because people deserve to know how their taxes are being spent.

Lastly, Honourable Speaker, I explained how Bill 225, the universal screening for learning disabilities act, will help ensure all students can meet their literacy goals. I further explained that in order for this to happen, the government needs to send the bill to committee. The students said it's important that the bill goes to committee because it's an opportunity for people to speak up and make changes.

Now, in addition to laws becoming legislation, we talked about what our relationship is like with the US, as well as the environment. I'll be asking questions about this later in question period.

In closing, Honourable Speaker, hosting students here at the Manitoba Legislature is one of my favourite parts of the job. We know how important it is to get children involved at a young age as they are more likely to be politically active in the future.

I want to thank the teachers all throughout Tyndall Park for their participation this stretch of session and, of course, the students and teachers who have joined us here today from Prairie Rose School.

Thank you.

Headingley Community Events

Mrs. Kathleen Cook (Roblin): Honourable Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate two remarkable milestones in the community of Headingley.

Earlier this month I was so pleased to attend the 10th anniversary celebration of the Headingley Community Foundation.

Over the past decade, the foundation has invested in projects that truly matter to the people of Headingley, projects like the expansion of the Headingley Library, improvements to Phoenix Community Centre and support for the Headingley Grand Trunk Trail. They've helped enhance recreation, supported education through bursaries and preserved the heritage and beauty of Headingley, all while creating a lasting legacy for future generations.

To the board members, donors, volunteers and community partners of the foundation, thank you. Your dedication, your generosity and your leadership have made this decade of success possible. You've shown what can be accomplished when a community comes together with heart and purpose.

And there's lots to celebrate in Headingley this year. Just this last weekend, my sons and I laced up our sneakers and participated in the 25th anniversary of the Headingley Run for Wishes. What started as a modest fun run organized by the Headingley Fire Department has become a cherished tradition and a meaningful fundraiser for the Children's Rehabilitation Foundation and the Westgrove Family Resource Centre. This event has raised over \$400,000, a true testament to the generosity and spirit of the people of Headingley.

Both of these groups represent the heart of Headingley: neighbours helping neighbours and a shared belief in the power of giving.

Please join me in congratulating the Headingley Community Foundation and the Headingley Run for Wishes on their milestone anniversaries and wishing them many more years of success.

Government Record on Health Care and Affordability

Mr. Mark Wasyliw (Fort Garry): We are just two sitting days from the end of spring session and we're at the legislative halfway mark for this government.

The Premier (Mr. Kinew) promised Manitobans that he would fix health care. We heard from nurses,

doctors and allied health-care workers that, in fact, health-care has gotten worse under this Premier. Going to Manitoba emergency rooms shouldn't be a death sentence, but under this Premier, three Manitobans have died in ER waiting rooms, waiting to see a doctor.

Only a few years ago, wait times in ERs averaged two hours. They are now four times that much and double the national average. We have an embarrassing distinction of having four of the worst performing ERs in Canada, including the very worst ER in the country. The Premier attempted to hire 90 paramedics and could only hire 14. While our population continues to grow, we continue to fall further and further behind having a functional health-care system.

The Premier promised he would make life more affordable, but Manitoba has the fastest growing rents in the country despite being a rent-control province. The Premier has gone back on his word and has not closed the loopholes in the rentals law that caused 40 per cent of Manitobans to see their housing costs skyrocket.

The Premier promised he would take on the big grocery store chains and force them to lower prices, but Manitoba has the fastest growing grocery store prices in Canada. But when it comes to the price of milk, we saw a large US grocery store chain break Manitoba law, price-gouge Manitobans and take potentially millions from Manitoba families. Not only has this Premier refused to prosecute; he's refused to get Manitoba families their money back and he proudly boasts he's a loyal customer of this US giant.

* (14:00)

Manitoba has the worst GDP growth out of any province in the country. We've once again become the child-poverty capital of Canada.

We have over 170,000 Manitobans who do not earn a living wage, most of whom are young women with children under the age of 18. Many are newcomers.

Sadly, this Premier continues to leave many, many Manitobans behind.

It's clear that Manitobans voted for change. It is also clear this Premier isn't delivering.

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

And I would ask the honourable member for Kildonan-River East (Mrs. Schott) to make sure she comes to order.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: Before we move on, I've got some guests in the gallery that I'd like to introduce.

We have, seated in the public gallery, from Willow Grove School, 19 students under the direction of Darcy Reimer. The group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko).

We have, seated in the public gallery, from Sandy Lake Christian School, 16 students under the direction of Daniel Wiebe.

We welcome you here today.

Also seated in the public gallery, we have Kathy Valentino, who is a councillor for the City of Thompson and president of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities; and Emma and Shane Flanagan, who are guests of the honourable Minister for Housing, Addictions and Homelessness (Ms. Smith).

And we welcome you all here today.

Further, in the public gallery, we have with us today from UCN law enforcement program: Dawson Robertson, Robby Sinclair, Paige Harrison, Cordelia Therrien, Norbert Constant, Darby Brown, who are the guests of the honourable member for The Pas-Kameesak (Ms. Lathlin).

We welcome you here today.

And further, we have seated in the public gallery residents from the Point Douglas community who are guests of the honourable member for Morden-Winkler (Mrs. Hiebert).

And we welcome you here today.

I would draw the attention of all honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery, where we have with us today and pleased to welcome Christine Ivory, the Parliamentary librarian of the House of Commons in Ottawa. And she is here today as a guest of our Clerk, Rick Yarish.

We welcome you here today.

* * *

The Speaker: And now, as it is the season of sad news, we have another Legislative page leaving us today, Janlloyd Dabalos.

Janlloyd is a grade 11 student in Sir Maurice School [*phonetic*]. This fall, he will begin his senior year, where he will take on the role of social justice committee president. With an affinity in science and

math, Janlloyd plans to pursue engineering at the University of Manitoba in 2026.

His experience as a page in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba has been nothing short of incredible. This role has taught him countless valuable lessons, including an understanding of how the provincial government functions and how elected officials work to improve the lives of Manitobans.

By making a single, out-of-character decision to apply, he learned about the importance of stepping out of his own comfort zone and navigating new experiences. And from members, he has learned the power of speaking up, using one's voice to advocate for others and how to make a positive change in one's community. He has also learned the value of patience and kindness.

Janlloyd would like to thank everyone who has shown him patience as he's learned from making mistakes. Janlloyd is incredibly grateful to have been given the opportunity. As he moves forward, he hopes to carry these lessons with him, to be a positive force in his community and use all of the blessings he has received to make meaningful change for others.

He would like to thank everyone at the Chamber branch for everything they have done for him. This year would not have been the same without all of you.

And also leaving us today is Seth Stepaniuk. Being allowed to participate in the Manitoba Page Program was a transformative experience for Seth, offering a unique glimpse into the inner workings of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly.

During his time as a page, Seth has had the opportunity to observe first-hand the legislative process, attend parliamentary debates and interact with members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly from across the province.

The experience enhanced Seth's understanding of provincial politics and fostered a deep sense of civic responsibility and pride. Engaging with diverse colleagues and participating in various Assembly activities helped Seth develop valuable skills, including public speaking, professionalism and teamwork.

Due to Seth's accelerated grade 12 graduation—a year early—he will, unfortunately, no longer be able to continue with the Page Program. But Seth would like each and every one of you to know that it is upon your humour and smiles that he will continue to build his philosophy of life.

Special thanks to his bosses—the Dave, Cam and Rob machine—who also fostered his skills and democratically guided his parliamentary path.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Fair Trade in Canada Act Timeline for Passage of Bill 47

Mr. Obby Khan (Leader of the Official Opposition): Honourable Speaker, in Manitoba, more political games by this Premier and this NDP government.

If fair trade was so important, why didn't this Premier and failed Government House Leader (MLA Fontaine) introduce Bill 47 earlier?

We, on this side of the House, proposed a pathway to ensure that Bill 47 gets across the finish line—*[interjection]*

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Khan: —before the session is over. And yet, the NDP voted no. This failed Government House Leader voted no.

I understand the government is embarrassed that we beat them to the punch, so I'll ask the Premier: if he really wants what's best for Manitobans, why won't he accept the fair proposal put forward today that passes Bill 47?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): Honourable Speaker, I come bearing news from the King, the real King.

The King wants there to be free trade in Canada by Canada Day. We've signed the MOUs. We've brought the legislation, Bill 47.

The only thing standing in the way of the King getting what he wants is the Progressive Conservatives? I thought they were the party of King and country. Whatever happened to the fiscal discipline? Whatever happened to the loyalty? To the majesty? Oh, they've fallen so far from grace, haven't they?

But we know what's really going on here with that leader who thanks Donald Trump every chance he gets. They don't want to stand with Canada and pass Bill 47; they would rather stand with the 47th President of the United States.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. Order. Order. Order.

Mr. Khan: Manitobans, you can see right there the sheer arrogance and the Premier making light of this, making light of the fact that the only person standing in the way of this fair trade bill is the incompetent

Government House Leader, the Government House Leader that introduced the bill late. They're the only ones standing in the way and Manitobans can see that here today.

In opposition, our job is to ask questions and get answers from this Premier. We're not getting anything. Manitobans can see that loud and clear.

This Government House Leader was too busy filming TikTok videos that she delayed the introduction of this bill.

* (14:10)

So if this bill is so important and this Premier's newfound love for the—*[interjection]*

The Speaker: Order, please.

The honourable Minister of Families needs to come to order.

Mr. Khan: As I said, Honourable Speaker and Manitobans, the only thing standing in the way is this incompetent Government House Leader.

So I'll ask the Premier again: If fair trade is so important and he loves the King so much, why won't he vote in favour of the proposal we brought today that will ensure the passing of Bill 47?

Mr. Kinew: If the Leader of the Opposition has a critique to make, I invite him to make the critique to me. There is no substantive presence here. I have to stand up and defend the Government House Leader.

Honourable Speaker, do you know that the Government House Leader is the longest serving House leader in Manitoba history? I think that that's something that's worth celebrating. When we think back to the last election campaign and the landfill ads, why is it whenever the PCs are in trouble, they want to strike out at Indigenous women in Manitoba?

Let's keep it on the topic of interprovincial trade. The member opposite should point out the following: The King flew to Canada. He was here yesterday and he said he wanted interprovincial trade. We have a bill, Bill 47, that brings about interprovincial trade.

The members opposite are delusional. The leave request doesn't even make sense. They lost the last election. They don't get to dictate what happens—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

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

Mr. Khan: Honourable Speaker, and Manitobans know that this failed Government House Leader is the one that missed the deadline to bring this bill forward. The Government House Leader and the NDP are now embarrassed that we, on this side of the House, brought a fair trade bill forward over two months ago. Other provinces have brought them forward three, four months ago and already have them passed.

This Government House Leader (MLA Fontaine) and Premier prioritize fair trade as their very last bill this session. It clearly shows the incompetence maybe not only by this Government House Leader, but maybe by the whole entire side led by this Premier.

So will the Premier stand up today and agree to the proposal brought forward that will ensure what's best for Manitobans today?

Mr. Kinew: Honourable Speaker, if he's not going to bow down to the King, perhaps he'll bow down to Wally Daudrich, who again—Wally Daudrich, let's remind everyone—got more votes than this member in the recent PC leadership contest.

I wonder if Wallay [*phonetic*] was here today, would he direct the questions to me or would he put his head down and continue to throw shade at the Government House Leader? I think probably Wally would be performing a bit better than what we see across the way. I'll leave that for the disaffected, divided, disillusioned PC caucus to ruminate on as we sit here, the entire summer long if it takes, in order to pass Bill 47.

The True North will always be strong and free. We love this country. We will never be the 51st state. While they and their leader thank Donald Trump, we're knocking down barriers to interprovincial trade so we could build, build, build Canada, Canada, Canada.

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

Safe Consumption Site Point Douglas Location

Mr. Obby Khan (Leader of the Official Opposition): You can see the Premier struggling once again when he goes to personal attacks on myself. You can see and you can hear the laughter, the arrogance, on that side of the House.

We're asking real questions. And I'm going to ask real questions for the residents of Point Douglas now.

Manitobans have demanded answers from this government for months about a drug injection site. The NDP tried to hide their plans to impose a drug injection site in Point Douglas. It was only after federal applications were released to the media that we were able to confirm that the government had already chosen a site in Point Douglas, ignoring the facts that there's a high school, a daycare and families around that location.

Will the Premier just admit today that he's already selected a location in Point Douglas?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): No. Our minister has made clear that we're going to listen to the community, and if it becomes clear the community doesn't want this location then we'll move on.

But I want to remind the House and you, Honourable Speaker, about a recent, kind of magnanimous interaction that I had in the Committee of Supply recently. There I pointed out that it's important to use the right terminology, to listen to the experts in addictions medicine and to say that this is a supervised consumption site. I then went on to point out how inflammatory language undermines the tenor of public debate.

I was encouraged to hear a member from the other side say, you know what? It's important; language matters; I'm not going to use inflammatory language anymore; I'm going to use supervised consumption site every single time I talk about this.

Do you know which member it was who said that in the Committee of Supply just some two weeks ago? The member for Fort Whyte, who now comes in here and tries to throw around these inflammatory terms to score cheap political points. Shame on him. Shame on the PCs.

We're listening to the experts and we're listening to communities.

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

Mr. Khan: It's sad to see the Premier stand up and struggle so hard—struggle so hard when he says he's listening to the residents of Point Douglas and listening to Manitobans. So much so that the government, that the minister herself, wouldn't even meet with the residents of Point Douglas—that the minister wouldn't even meet with the residents of Point Douglas.

So I'll ask the Premier today: He says he's listening. That's what he said in his answer right there, so I'll ask the Premier: If he's listening, will he sit

down with the residents of Point Douglas today that have come to join us in the gallery, and hear their concerns, yes or no?

Mr. Kinew: So when it comes to the minister, you got the best minister in the entire country when it comes to this file, and she has listened to the community for eight public consultation sessions, including ones that were not organized by the government.

When it comes to those folks who are here today, sure; we're dealing with the wildfire situation, so I do have to attend to that, but if you want to come and share your perspectives, I'll make time for you after question period.

But we all know what's happening here with the PCs. Whenever they're under pressure, they go to the same old bag of tricks, try to use inflammatory issues, try to divide Manitobans. That was rejected in the last election.

Why are they doing that? Maybe it has something with the fact that for the first time in Manitoba history the Ethics Commissioner has ruled against their former premier Heather Stefanson and fined her 18 grand; ruled against two other ministers, including one former minister who's currently in the House and fined them as well.

The members opposite know the answers to those unanswered questions which the commissioner was unable to provide—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

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

Mr. Khan: Manitobans and the residents of Point Douglas can see that ads—asked him a question, and what does he do? He pivots away onto something else. He pivots away because he doesn't want to answer the question because he knows the truth to that question.

If the Premier has not picked Point Douglas as a site, will he list off other sites? Will the Premier stand up and list off other government sites that they want to have for this drug injection site?

But he can't, because he's already picked the site in Point Douglas. That's why he can't list off anything else.

Would the Premier be okay with an injection site opening in his riding of South Osborne? Or what about River Heights where there's tons and tons of kids playing? Or what about Lagimodière or Waverley or anywhere else in this province? Will the Premier

stand up today and say that he's going to move the drug injection site to South Osborne?

Mr. Kinew: Well, actually the riding's called Fort Rouge, and it's the best riding in Manitoba. It's in a 57-way tie with all the other ridings in Manitoba. And, yes, I intend to win every single riding before we're done here in the province.

But here's what's really sad about the member opposite: when you talk to him directly, oh, yes, language matters. We have to say supervised consumption site. But then he runs away with the political staff and the Heather Stefanson B team and then sees people from the community and then says, you know what? We're going to go back to the same rhetoric. We're going to go back to inflaming people. We're going to go back to trying to divide.

Let's bring this down to the real actual facts: People are dying in Manitoba every single day. I invite anyone who has an interest in this issue, including the heckling member opposite right now, to talk to a physician with an expertise in addictions medicine. They will tell you that a supervised consumption site—

* (14:20)

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

Safe Consumption Site Point Douglas Location

Mrs. Carrie Hiebert (Morden-Winkler): Honourable Speaker, the residents of Point Douglas care deeply about their community and had made their voices heard. When they felt excluded from the minister's consultation on the location of the drug injection site, they took it upon themselves to organize their own public meeting, attended by hundreds of residents that don't want the site in their community.

Why do the residents of Point Douglas have to organize their own meeting to be heard?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): The minister is doing important work on this, and attended the consultation, so again, the invite was proffered and the minister responded.

But I do want to ask this member whether they support the hypocrisy of their leader. Again, it was on the record: anyone in Manitoba can go listen to Hansard and, again, it was a very chastened tone, saying yes, we're talking about people losing lives; I'm not going to say drug injection site anymore. Language matters; we have to take it serious.

Does the member opposite agree with that? When you talk about people who are losing their lives in Manitoba today, is it important for us to get the right solutions in place? Yes, we're funding recovery. Yes, we're 'fundering' health care.

But the experts, the physicians with the expertise, tell us that a supervised consumption site is part of the solution. Engage with this in a substantive way instead of trying to divide Manitobans. The member opposite should invite her leader to follow the lead of the science instead of the political staff of Heather Stefanson, who was recently fined—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

The honourable member for Morden-Winkler, on a supplementary question.

Mrs. Hiebert: Honourable Speaker, at that meeting I heard from a mother who was scared for her daughter, that she would have to walk past the injection site every day to walk to school. That would never be acceptable in other neighbourhoods.

Why is the minister facing—or forcing this on Point Douglas residents without truly listening to the people who live there?

Mr. Kinew: The members come here and they want to raise this issue, so I invite them to have a real debate on the topic. What happened under the PCs in office while they were there for year after year? The bathroom at Tim Hortons became an unsupervised drug consumption site. The streets of Point Douglas became an unsupervised consumption site.

These problems are long-standing and they have complicated causes. We're taking the time to listen to community. I'll take the time today to ensure that I have a real, substantive engagement with these folks.

What I would invite the PCs to do is to be very straight up with these folks as well. Tell them, you know what, people are dying today. Here's what the addictions medicine experts do say. The government has actually held numerous consultations and attended consultations that you organized.

If you acknowledged all of those individual points, what would be left on the members opposite's agenda? Nothing but simple, divisive, inflammatory rhetoric. The member opposite who's heckling from his chair right now in Fort Whyte is trying to fear monger—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

The honourable member for Morden-Winkler, on a final supplementary question.

Mrs. Hiebert: I'm asking this question of the Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness, the minister that closed the door—had a closed-door meeting with residents and that had—residents had to ask to join. And when they did, they were met with silence instead of answers.

Family members like that concerned mother just want the best for their children.

Why did the minister ignore their concerns about the location of the drug injection site and not listen to Point Douglas residents?

Hon. Bernadette Smith (Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness): We're actually listening. We're collaborating. That's why we've gone to every single meeting that's been held, including the ones that the residents put on.

We're listening; we're a listening government. We've—we're taking everything that everyone has brought forward. That's why we're taking our time to make sure that we're getting it right, unlike members opposite, who turned a blind eye to, you know, issues where people were dying on the streets. We're not taking that approach. We're going to make sure that we are supporting people, we're meeting people where they're at, which includes harm reduction, education.

Enforcement is pretty important for us, and we're going to make sure that we are supporting and meeting people where they're at, unlike members opposite, who allowed people to die in the streets—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

Manitoba's Homeless Population Establishment of New Encampments

Mrs. Kathleen Cook (Roblin): Once again, it took media involvement for the Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness to listen to her own constituents.

A resident of Point Douglas saw Main Street Project staff helping individuals reoccupy an encampment and was rightfully concerned. The Main Street Project receives millions in taxpayer funding.

Can the minister guarantee that no government funding goes to helping re-establish encampments instead of helping people get into housing?

Hon. Bernadette Smith (Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness): As I stated in this House, these folks have the supports that they need now. Under that former government, they didn't have those supports. The former government was selling

off housing. They weren't investing in maintenance. They were firing security guards. They were underfunding police officers—in fact, firing police officers.

We're not taking that approach. We are working with residents. We are ensuring that folks are getting housed with the supports that they need. Unlike members opposite, we're not going to turn a blind eye and leave members on the streets without the supports that they need in tents, like they did.

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

Mrs. Cook: The minister told this House on Monday that 33 people have been housed since January 16. We're glad for those 33 people, but now it's the end of May and there are hundreds of people in our city and more in communities across our province experiencing homelessness—33 people housed since January; hundreds more waiting.

Homelessness is getting worse under this minister, not better. Why did she—[interjection]

The Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Cook: —go out in January and make so many promises that she knew she couldn't keep?

Ms. Smith: We have a big mess to clean up after seven and a half years of bad government. They were selling off housing; 185 Smith, hundreds of units. In fact, some of those folks that were in that apartment went to live in encampments because of those folks. Those folks need to apologize to those folks. They should be—shame on them for doing that.

They pushed people into deeper addictions, didn't provide the supports that they needed. We're not taking that approach. We're going to meet, support and give people the housing they need with the supports that they need including getting them dignified housing, wrap-around supports with service providers, working with the City, with the federal—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

The honourable member for Roblin, on a final supplementary question.

Mrs. Cook: Honourable Speaker, the reality doesn't match what this minister is saying at all. Encampments in our city are growing under the NDP. New ones are being established. Encampments that were cleared are being reoccupied; the exact opposite of what this minister promised.

How many encampments have been re-established since this minister went out and promised that encampments that were cleared would not be reoccupied?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): The member is wrong. We've now housed 40 people; 37 of those were housed by Main Street Project. They're an important partner.

Under the PCs, more and more people were in bus shelters and in encampments. They didn't build a single unit of housing. That's why it's going to take the better part of six, seven more years to repair the damage that they did. And this is what we campaigned on, actually.

But I want to ask the member for Roblin, when she hears this quote from the member to her right: The Premier's right, language does matter. I'll use the term he wishes and experts have used: supervised consumption site. That was a slip of the tongue. I didn't mean anything by that.

When she hears that, and then the rhetoric that he comes in to use in the House today, does she cringe? Does it make her feel gross that the member ignores his own words on the record of this House? I just want to know how they square the hypocrisy that is present in the PC world view, that has so poisoned them that even the Ethics Commissioner finds—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

* (14:30)

West Hawk Lake Residents Wildfire Response Concerns

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): Once again, Honourable Speaker, and to you, Manitobans watching this afternoon, and you're seeing no answers coming from this government's side. Matter of fact, it's come to our attention that even Manitobans can't get regular communication from this government.

I've heard from my constituents, from West Hawk Lake, who feel left out of the loop and ignored by this Kinew government. Residents who have written to these ministers with their concerns, but have not received anything back.

When will this minister responsible start communicating with area residents and business owners?

Hon. Mike Moyes (Minister of Environment and Climate Change): Well, I'm happy to say that our Parks department is doing such great work in lockstep with the Wildfire Service and first responders. I acknowledge that communication is very important, which is why we have our Manitoba Parks website up

to date every single day so that people can get the information that they need.

In addition to that, we are doing daily wellness calls with all folks that are evacuated, all the permanent residents, so that they have the information they need. We're going to continue to do that work each and every day so that Manitobans can feel safe.

Thank you.

Mr. Ewasko: Honourable Speaker, this minister's covering up from another minister that's actually not doing his job in communicating properly. These residents and business owners are watching the fire maps. They're consuming publicly available data. This is their home, their community and their livelihoods.

This is all at risk, and this government is keeping them in the dark. There just doesn't seem to be consistent rules, Honourable Speaker.

What is the plan for West Hawk Lake when it will—when it comes to communication to business owners and residents, Honourable Speaker?

MLA Moyes: Well, I'm happy to provide an update to the House that there will be a bulletin going out. We're happy to say that there is an update for West Hawk Lake. We're able to open up other parts of that area in the Whiteshell. Unfortunately, there are parts of the Whiteshell that are going to have to remain closed. We want to ensure that the safety of Manitobans comes first.

I really take issue with the fact that the member for Lac du Bonnet is trying to muddy the waters right now. We're trying to work on behalf of all Manitobans.

Mr. Ewasko: Honourable Speaker, the waters are crystal clear. It's clear that this minister's covering up for another minister for the lack of communication.

The frustration from my constituents as they have done everything that they have been asked to do. Now they're evacuating—they're evacuated. They're watching on their security cameras as Parks staff goes and does some preliminary manicuring of the grass and all that while they're evacuated. And they have no idea when they can return home and their businesses. *[interjection]*

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ewasko: If it's safe, this government needs to communicate it. If there are other risks, then this government needs to communicate it.

Why is this government just simply not—

The Speaker: Member's time as expired.

MLA Moyes: You know, honestly, that's pretty shameful. Our Parks department is working in absolute lockstep with the Manitoba Wildfire Service.

Let me go through the different ways that we're communicating with Manitobans. The Parks website has up-to-date information on park closures, restriction and it's updated daily. There's daily wellness calls from Parks staff to make sure that everyone that's evacuated, all permanent residents, have the information. Parks staff provide an update to cottages and businesses by email, and those are shared out by the cottagers association. Fire bulletins are shared on the Parks Facebook and bulletins are shared regularly as well as updates are available from all park district offices.

Clearly, the members opposite are just absolutely off the rocker.

Manitoba's Wildfire Response Utilization of Retired Firefighters

Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River): We all know resources are stretched thin with the 71 fires raging. We need all the help we can get to protect lives, property and our province as a whole.

I have heard directly from retired fire crew members that want to help. They have the experience; they have the desire. But why does the minister not find the time to answer their calls?

Hon. Ian Bushie (Minister of Natural Resources and Indigenous Futures): Honourable Speaker, 18 active wildfires; I do want to correct the member on that.

So when it comes time to this situation—this is an extreme situation, and they're taking this opportunity to do nothing but politicize and try and shame the Wildfire Service, try and shame the parks—try to shame the civil servants that are putting their own lives on the line, each and every day, for the benefit of all Manitobans.

So I encourage that member opposite to get on board and be part of this process and be part of the solution, not part of the problem.

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

Mr. Wowchuk: The only one who should be ashamed is the minister for not answering the question.

It is not new to sign temporary contracts with retired experts, especially in a crisis. People in the North are important. We need the help. This is—there is a wealth of knowledge on standby, and the government is keeping experts on the sidelines.

Is this because the government cut funding for emergencies?

Mr. Bushie: I notice the member did not say there's a wealth of knowledge in that caucus, because that's something that does not exist. I encourage that member just to lean forward and tap their member for Riding Mountain (Mr. Nesbitt) and ask him why he decimated the Wildfire Service, why he decimated the Conservation Officer Service.

Well, here we are, in a state of emergency across all portions of the province, and what are they doing? They're trying to score political points.

So yes, we are engaging with leadership all across Manitoba—retired, current—to see how they can help and how they can step up. We're having those conversations, something members on the opposite never ever did.

The Speaker: The honourable member for Swan River, on a final supplementary question.

Mr. Wowchuk: Absolutely shameful to listen to this minister making jokes about this caucus when there's people's lives, people's cottages—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please.

The government bench needs to come to order.

Mr. Wowchuk: And there's people's lives and people's cottages and personal property at stake.

It's not about funding. Then there is no reason that this minister has not taken these retired experts up on their offer to come back and help.

Will the minister return those calls today and sign those wildfire experts up to help?

Mr. Bushie: Honourable Speaker, that is not a joke. There is no wealth of knowledge, absolutely, on that side of the Chamber. That is not a joke; that is an absolute fact.

So here we are in a state of emergency across the entirety of the province. This is a novel time of year, something that members opposite totally ignore when it came time to being able to staff up the Wildfire Service, being able to do those necessary investments.

Here we are, making up for lost ground that they didn't do, nothing they ever did. So I encourage that member to either step up and help out or sit down and get out of the way.

Tyndall Park Students Questions for Government

MLA Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): Many students in grades 5 and 6 are learning about global events and international relations. They are wondering how tensions between Canada and the United States might affect people here in Manitoba, especially when it comes to things like trade and travel, wanting to develop a stronger country and having affordable goods and services.

Can the Premier tell us what steps the government is taking to protect Manitoba's interest during these times of international uncertainty?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): I thank these students for sharing their important question today.

I think one of the things that we've seen as a result of Donald Trump's threats of tariffs is almost all Canadians rallying together around the flag and saying: We'll never be the 51st state. Let's find ways to build up our Canadian economy.

And I'm really happy they asked this question today, because we've actually got a great bill, a bill supported by the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce: Bill 47, which the Chambers say, you know, this is encouraging sign of 'menmentum' and clear wins for the Chamber network and for the businesses we represent.

You'll note that I said almost all Canadians are doing that. The sad exception, of course, are the PCs who are apparently anti-business now, as well as anti-king, as we found out earlier in question period today.

And then it's no surprise, because their Leader of the Opposition thanks Donald Trump every time he gets: twice on a podcast, six times in this very esteemed hallowed Chamber.

The Speaker: The honourable member for Tyndall Park, on a supplementary question.

MLA Lamoureux: Students living in Tyndall Park recently asked: What more can we do to support local farmers, artists and small businesses?

They want to see more made-in-Manitoba products in their homes and schools, particularly vegetables, cheese, milk, treats and Pokémon cards.

* (14:40)

What is this government doing to make it easier for families to buy local and support our communities?

Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation): I thank the students for the question through the member opposite.

And I'll say clearly: we want more Canadians and more Manitobans to buy and support local. That's why we launched our buy local campaign and supporting our local initiatives. That's why we are re-opening our trade office in Washington—which members opposite closed—so that we can support better trade relationships. That's why we brought forward Bill 47, to make sure that we reduce those interprovincial trade barriers so businesses in Manitoba have more opportunities to sell their products to Manitobans and to Canadians right across the country.

We want all Manitobans, all Canadians, to be united on this effort, including members opposite, who appear to be opposed to this. Let's get them on board. Let's support buying and supporting Manitoba, buying and supporting local, buying and supporting our country. They seem to have forgot that lesson. Hopefully, the students and them can—and members opposite can relearn that lesson and finally support Canada.

The Speaker: The honourable member for Tyndall Park, on a final supplementary question.

MLA Lamoureux: The students I met with today are the future of Manitoba and they are worried about our environment.

In addition to learning about wildfires, flooding and extreme weather, they have been doing their part through gardening, recycling and trying not to use plastic.

With the rise in forest fires and other climate-related events, what is the government's plan to protect Manitoba's environment and promote a healthy climate for generations to come?

Hon. Mike Moyes (Minister of Environment and Climate Change): Well, thank you very much to those students for asking the question on environment.

And I'm very proud to be a part of a government that believes in climate change, first of all. And we're doing a—we're taking a lot of initiatives that I think the students can take stock in.

We're protecting nature, first and foremost. That starts with Seal River. It's going to expand out to a whole variety of other areas. We're building up wind

power. We're also—we put in the first electric vehicle rebate that has seen an increase of 125 per cent in electric vehicles, which is going to reduce the amount of emissions.

We're also ensuring that our lakes and rivers are going to be better off than in years past with an increase in investment: \$1.5 million in our water—

The Speaker: Member's time is expired.

Fair Trade in Canada Act Manitoba's Role in Nation Building

MLA David Pankratz (Waverley): Last week, our government introduced Bill 47, the fair trade in Canada act. We're working to build up Manitoba. We are united in building up Canada. This bill is helping to do that.

And, yesterday, the Premier was in Ottawa reminding people from across the country the important role that Manitoba can play in nation building and in national unity projects.

While the members opposite are living in ethical grey areas, undermining our democracy and thanking Donald Trump, our government is working hard for Manitobans and for Canada.

Can the Premier please tell the House more about the excitement he heard from Canadians about Bill 47 while he was in Ottawa?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): Wow. That was a question. I'm going to take my hat off to the member for Waverley, because there's a lot to unpack.

Like, did I hear from Grant Jackson, the recently fleeing-the-ship colleague, who basically said, whoa, good thing I'm not there anymore given that ethics bombshell? Yes, I probably did.

Did I have a chance to listen to His Majesty call on Canadians to build one unified economy? Definitely did. And that's what our Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation (Mr. Moses) has with Bill 47.

Now the members opposite want to turn their back because they can't face up to what leadership's all about. They turn their back on Canada. They turn their back on the anti-Trump sentiment and go a hundred and eighty degrees in the opposite direction to thank Donald Trump.

We'll never do that. We say never 51, never 47. Unless it comes to the bill we're advancing, and then the message is: pass it today.

What are you doing? Manitobans elected us to deliver results—

The Speaker: Member's time is expired.

Construction of Pipeline to Churchill Government Position

Mr. Mark Wasyliw (Fort Garry): Brian Pallister wanted to ship tar sands oil through the Port of Churchill. In response, the Manitoba NDP said this: We oppose the building of pipeline to Churchill that would put the community, the environment and our vulnerable polar bear species at risk, and I'll table the comments.

The now-NDP minister went on to say, and I quote: We're proud to stand with the community who've already rejected this project. Now, this Monday on CBC, the Premier did a complete flip-flop. He now takes the position that Manitoba is in favour of a pipeline shipping dirty tar sands oil to northern tidewater.

The 'Premier' is no—*[interjection]*

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wasyliw: —longer proud to stand with the community, no longer concerned about the environment, or—*[interjection]*

The Speaker: Order.

The Minister of Education needs to come to order.

Mr. Wasyliw: —change.

What does this Premier have to say to Manitobans who've been devastated by wildfires?

Hon. Mike Moyes (Minister of Environment and Climate Change): What I can tell you is that we're in a moment right now where we need to build, build, build Canada, Canada, Canada. And that can start with all kinds of different energy.

We have a comprehensive environmental plan that I'm so proud to be a part of. That includes an affordable energy plan that has wind, that has heat pumps, it includes different things like hydrogen, as we move into that.

We're also talking about things like getting into EVs and transforming different sectors. The member is completely off base.

The Speaker: The honourable member for Fort Garry, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Wasyliw: CBC, says that he brushed off the idea of shipping oil to Hudson Bay. Heather Stefanson

pledged \$7 million towards studying an alternative oil and gas transportation route to northern tidewater.

One of the first acts this Premier did was cancel Manitoba's contribution to the study, and I'll table the article. Weeks later, the Premier then does a big flip-flop and now supports oil to northern tidewater. This Premier once again finds himself agreeing with Brian Pallister and Heather Stefanson. Manitobans deserve an explanation.

Why was Brian Pallister, Heather Stefanson and Pierre Poilievre right on oil pipelines, and why was this Premier wrong?

Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier): Let's say we build the corridor and we put tens of thousands of Manitobans to work and we add billions of dollars to our economy, and in that scenario, this pipe transports green hydrogen. What would the member say then?

And then, I would further ask: why would any self-respecting progressive not ask about the ethics report? It's the first time in Canadian history. Heather Stefanson was fined because she not only broke the law after they lost the election, ignoring your direction as voters, but she was unconstitutional. They all supported it.

But I think the worst thing that we've seen in question period is this: all the harrumphing high-and-mighty condescension from the PCs and they can't even sustain a whole question period. We get the question A data, weekend's almost here, what do you say we start planning the scrum?

No. Stay here all night, all summer. Pass Bill 47. Reject Donald Trump—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

The time for question period has also expired.

The honourable member for Morden-Winkler—

An Honourable Member: Petitions.

PETITIONS

Location of Safe Injection Sites

Mrs. Carrie Hiebert (Morden-Winkler): Honourable Speaker, I wish to present the following petition.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The Province of Manitoba has filed paperwork with the federal government proposing the establishment of a drug-injection site for illegal drugs at 200 Disraeli Fwy. without sufficient public consultation.

(2) The decision to locate the facility at 200 Disraeli was made despite the—that the site is located in the immediate vicinity of a daycare centre, a high school, a multiple community—sorry, a—multiple community gathering sites, including churches and cultural institutions.

* (14:50)

(3) Residents, business owners and community organizations have raised concern that the location is incompatible with nearby institutions serving thousands of youth and families and believe it is eroding the—it will erode the public safety and confidence in the area.

Existing—(4) Existing community consultations specifically ignored concerns about public safety and were criticized by community members for being artificial and scripted.

(5) The provincial government has failed to introduce legislation and regulations to control where the drug injection sites can be located.

(6) Other provinces are closing drug injection sites and adopting a recovery model following the expertise of groups such as the Canadian centre for recovery excellence.

(7) This decision to ignore the experts will leave people unsupervised in addiction, suspended in addiction, and will not give Manitobans their lives or their loved ones back.

(8) The provincial government has failed to fund and operate any treatment or additional Rapid Access to Addictions Medicine clinics to break the cycle.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the provincial government to cancel drug injection sites in the Point Douglas community, including the proposed location at 200 Disraeli Fwy.

(2) To urge the provincial government to legislate that no further site will be proposed without community support.

This petition has been signed by Audrey Lynn Kinolsley *[phonetic]*, Rappel *[phonetic]* Castro, Joven Sacuman *[phonetic]* and many, many thousands of other Manitobans.

Mr. Obby Khan (Leader of the Official Opposition): Honourable Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The province of Manitoba has filed paperwork with the federal government proposing the establishment of a drug injection site for illegal drugs at 200 Disraeli Fwy. without sufficient public consultation.

(2) The decision to locate the facility at 200 Disraeli was made despite that the site is located in the immediate vicinity of a daycare centre, a high school, and multiple community gathering sites, including churches and cultural institutions.

(3) Residents, business owners and community organizations have raised concerns that the location is incompatible with nearby institutions serving thousands of youth and families and believe it will erode public safety and confidence in the area.

(4) Existing community consultations specifically ignored concerns about public safety and were criticized by community members for being artificial and scripted.

(5) The provincial government has failed to introduce legislation and regulations to control where drug injection sites can be located.

(6) Other provinces are closing drug injection sites and adopting a recovery model, following the expertise of groups such as the Canadian Centre of Recovery Excellence.

(7) This decision to ignore the experts will leave people suspended in addiction and will not give Manitobans their lives or their loved ones back.

(8) The provincial government has failed to fund and operate any treatment or additional Rapid Access to Addictions Medicine clinics to break this cycle.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the provincial government to cancel drug injection sites in the Point Douglas community, including the proposed location at 200 Disraeli Fwy.

(2) To urge the provincial government to legislate that no future site will be proposed without community support.

Honourable Speaker, this petition has been signed by many Manitobans: Joah *[phonetic]* Melo, Maria Melo, Armin *[phonetic]* Alota and many, many other Manitobans.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

The Speaker: No further petitions?

GRIEVANCES

Mrs. Carrie Hiebert (Morden-Winkler): I want to say, from the bottom of my heart, that I care deeply—I care deeply, sorry, for loved ones in our community who are struggling with addiction and homelessness. These are just not issues, they are people: our neighbours, our brothers, sisters, parents and friends. No one chooses this path, and no one should have to walk it alone.

I believe in compassion, in support and in creating real solutions that offer dignity, hope and a way forward for everyone. I want to speak you-to you today also as someone who cares deeply about the community of Point Douglas: a community that has been through so much and yet continues to show strength, resilience and heart every single day; a community where members were not part of a consultation process when the NDP government decided to put a drug injection site in their neighbourhood.

Point Douglas is filled with kind-hearted residents that would do anything for anyone in the community. That's why it's so difficult to see them left out in such a critical decision. People in the community will have bottles of water in the back of their vehicles and food and snacks just to hand out all over their community when somebody is in need.

This is a community who deeply loves those around them that need help and support. When the government submitted paperwork to bring the 'djug' injection site to Point Douglas, the very people who live there were not consulted. Yes, meetings were held, but residents describe them as performative, where questions went unanswered and concerns were brushed aside, and in 'mony'—many instances, they were not even invited to the meetings, and people were hand-picked to attend consultation meetings in the beginning.

This is too bad. It's sad. This is not how we do things in our province. As elected officials, we need to be supporting our communities and the people that have elected us that we represent. How can we claim to build solutions if we don't even stop to listen?

Point Douglas is not just another dot on the map, it's families raising children. It's elders who live in—who have lived there their whole lives. It's small businesses trying to thrive. And it's a community that already carries more than its fair share of hardships, with crime and addiction around them.

They are not saying they don't care about those struggling with substance use. In fact, they care deeply. But that's why they're asking for simple respect and a voice at the table, for solutions—real solutions. The proposed site at 200 Disraeli Fwy. is steps away from a school, homes, daycare centres.

Parents are legitimately worried, with every right to be worried, and they are asking to be included in decisions that will shape the future of their neighbourhoods.

The MLA for Point Douglas must do better. The MLA must listen to the constituents and talk to them. We need to talk about other solutions, not just harm reduction but treatment recovery. We need balance; we need a focus on treatment and recovery so that we don't have the same situation happening constantly over and over again, where people are suspended in their addiction.

We must work on relationship. It must be built with trust, compassion and understanding. But no one knows—and no one knows that—what a community needs better than the people who live there. Point Douglas deserves respect; they deserve safety, dignity and a right to be heard.

The residents of Point Douglas set up their own consultation meeting, their own town hall. I was at that meeting. The room was packed full, standing room only. I heard so many people come up and speak that night. Most of them, 99 per cent of them, did not want this drug injection site in their neighbourhood or in their backyard, and they were told over and over again by the Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness (Ms. Smith) about housing, about housing, about housing. But their concern at that time was about, you know, the safety for their children, about drugs rampant and drug addiction, and the safety and that this would be located in their neighbourhood, next to their schools. They weren't heard.

* (15:00)

But I was there to hear. I listened. And as the minister ridiculed me because I only spoke for a minute in opening remarks, it's too bad, because that was my job that night, was to listen to the community and to the residents and that's what I did.

And that's why I'm here today. That's why I'm doing this grievance.

I want to talk about one of the people who spoke that night. It was a mother who was heartbroken that this could be happening in her community. She has a

daughter who's already struggling in school and has so many things already going against her. And she said, how could the community even consider letting this come into the community when her daughter was in so much trouble, already struggling.

This would just make it more difficult for all the kids in the neighbourhood. We need to think about others, too. We need to think about the whole community as a whole.

This is my grievance today, is that we need to start putting recovery first. We need to start listening to the community. And we need to take a real look at how this will impact those living there and the neighbourhoods that are there, how this will impact the families, the children and the elderly that live there as well.

It's an important thing we need to do. As legislators, we vowed to represent our communities and our—those that elected us. And I think it's time that we do that, we listen to everybody. And we need to make sure that their voices in Point Douglas are heard.

Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

House Business

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): On House business.

The Speaker: The honourable Opposition House Leader, on House business.

Mr. Johnson: Honourable Speaker, could you please canvass the House to see if there is leave to expediate consideration of a number of bills as follows:

(1) At the beginning of orders of the day, government business today, the following bills will be called for second reading or resuming debate on second reading, with no debate and the question put immediately after the motion is moved, as applicable: bills 209, 210, 218, 300, 221, 222, 233 and 47.

(2) Once the question on those bill motions have been resolved, the House will then consider report stage amendments of the following bills with their five-minute speaking times for the sponsor, a member of another recognized party and independent members: bills 5, 11, 21, 24, 39 and 44.

(3) Once the question on those report stage amendments have been resolved, the House will then consider concurrence and third reading of the following bills with five-minute speaking times for the minister, the

critic and independent members; the House will not see the clock until all questions have been put: bills 5, 11, 21, 24, 39 and 44.

(4) Bills 208, 209, 210, 218, 300, 221, 222, 226, 233 and 47 will be referred to a standing committee on Thursday, May 29, at 6 p.m. Once reported back to the House, these bills will not be eligible for report stage consideration but will be eligible for concurrence and third reading during orders of the day, government business on Monday, June 2, despite not being listed on the Order Paper.

(5) After the deferred vote on second reading motion for Bill 234 has been completed on Thursday, May 29, the bill shall be referred to the same standing committee referenced in clause No. 4.

(6) At the beginning of orders of the day, government business on Monday, June 2, the following bills will be called for concurrence and third reading, with no debate and the question put immediately after the motion is moved: bills 208, 209, 210, 218, 234, 300, 221, 222, 233, 226.

(7) Once the questions on those bill motions have been resolved, the House will then consider concurrence and third reading of all specified bills, as well as Bill 47, with the bills to be considered in order decided by the Opposition House Leader. Debate provisions, rule 2(16) shall apply.

(8) In the event of a 'discrepancy'—discrepancy between the provisions of this leave request and the rules, orders and forms of proceeding to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, the provisions of this leave request are to apply.

(9) The provisions of this leave request can only be amended by unanimous consent of the House.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

The Speaker: Is there leave for the House to expediate the consideration of bills as described by the Official Opposition House Leader?

Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no. Leave has been denied.

* * *

Hon. Nahanni Fontaine (Government House Leader): Honourable Speaker, could you please canvass the House for leave to waive rule 91(8) and to not see the

clock today until all stages of Bill 47, the fair trade in Canada, internal trade mutual recognition, act and the amendments to the commemoration of days, weeks, months act, buy Manitoba, buy Canadian day, have been completed including second reading, Committee of the Whole and concurrence and third reading, and also allow for the member of Midland to second all stages.

The Speaker: Is there leave to waive rule 91(8) and to not see the clock today until all stages of Bill 47 have been completed, including second reading of Committee of the Whole and concurrence and third reading?

Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no. Leave has been denied.

And just for everyone's information, we are no longer in grievances; we're in orders of the day.

MLA Fontaine: Can you—do I—Tim? *[interjection]* Okay, perfect.

Honourable Speaker, could you please canvass the House to see if there is leave to not see the clock until the following bills to be called at report stage today have also had concurrence and third reading questions put: bills 5, 11, 21, 24, 39, 44.

The Speaker: Is there leave to not see the clock until the following bills to be called at report stage today have also had concurrence and third reading questions put: bills 5, 11, 21, 24, 39 and 44.

Is there leave?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

The Speaker: Leave has been denied.

MLA Fontaine: Members really don't want to work.

Can you please call second reading of Bill 44, the fair trade in Canada, internal—*[interjection]*

The Speaker: Order.

MLA Fontaine: Can you please call second reading of Bill 47, The Fair Trade in Canada (Internal Trade Mutual Recognition) Act and Amendments to The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Buy Manitoba, Buy Canadian Day).

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 47—The Fair Trade in Canada (Internal Trade Mutual Recognition) Act and Amendments to The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Buy Manitoba, Buy Canadian Day)

The Speaker: It has been announced that we will now resume debate on second reading of Bill 47, the fair trade in Canada, internal trade mutual recognition, act and amendments to the commemoration of days, weeks, months act, buy Manitoba, buy Canadian day. *[interjection]*

And I would remind honourable members that the Speaker is standing and speaking and should be heard in silence.

So the debate is standing in the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet's name, who has one minute remaining.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): Because I've only got a minute left of this incredible, important debate time, Honourable Speaker, on Bill 47, which we, on this side of the House, absolutely support free trade all across this great country of ours.

It is not the Progressive Conservatives' fault that this bill has been brought to this House at the eleventh hour when we know darn well, and this whole House knows, the NDP side knows that their failed House leader has no chance and no opportunity and has no recollection of even how this House is managed and runs. It is their fault that they didn't bring this important bill forward.

Anyways, they should've passed Bill 227, brought forward by the MLA for Midland earlier. We would've been well under way on this great free trade opportunity, Honourable Speaker. The NDP had over six months to get this done. They didn't get it done. Poor management—they had other things on their plates.

Here we go, let's get going with the—

The Speaker: Member's time has expired.

* (15:10)

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): It's with great regret that I only heard the member for Lac du Bonnet speak for a minute. I think that this House was demanding much more of his wisdom on this particular issue, and I even saw members opposite show some signs of disappointment on their faces that the member for Lac du Bonnet was concluding his comments. We might want to revise the rules at some

point so the member could start over again with their 40 minutes if they were beginning to debate.

But those rule changes will be for another day. This particular bill is an important bill to debate at an important time in Canada's history. It is a critical matter of public policy, more so than I've seen in my time in the Legislature. How it is that is only came to be a matter of debate in this Legislature in the last two weeks, from the government's perspective, is something of a mystery, because it was no mystery that these challenges and these issues were forthcoming after the election of a new administration down south in the White House.

It was clear because it had been clear before, when that administration held the White House, that there were issues around tariffs. We saw, in the first Trump administration, we saw tariffs being applied to steel and aluminum and other products at a lower level at that time, but it was clear that the Trump administration had an affinity for tariffs. For whatever reason, they didn't look at Canada the way past American presidents have generally looked at Canada: not as a competitor to be quashed, but as a friend and an ally to be worked with.

And it is often said, Honourable Speaker, that between Canada and the United States, we don't just trade; we build things together. And that is in no place truer than when it comes to automobiles. For many years—decades—there's been a conscious effort to ensure that the production of automobiles between the United States and Canada, largely centred around Windsor and Detroit, would be a seamless process that resulted in vehicles often crossing the border seven or eight times to be completed. Various parts were put—built on one side of the border, assembly might happen on the other side of the border.

And as I've heard Republicans say, in listening to Republican lawmakers in the United States, they have talked about that this process was intentional; that the Canadians do what the Canadians do well and the Americans do what the Americans do well; and collectively, that makes for a good product at a better price.

That is the whole idea of free trade. It is not a zero-sum game. It ultimately makes everybody better if it's done well. Countries or areas can focus on the things that they do well, in terms of quality, in terms of price; and when it comes to those components or other products, then other parts of the country or the world can focus on the things that they do well at quality or price.

And, collectively, everybody is better off. It makes the consumer better off, because they can afford more products, they can have more disposable income, they can save their income, they can do whatever they want with the money that they save because of the benefit of free trade.

Somehow this is lost on the current administration in the United States. But this is not a surprise. It may be disappointing—and, I think, for Canadians, it might be shocking—but it is not a surprise because the current occupier of the White House had indicated for quite some time—not just on the election—re-election trail he was on prior to last fall's election, but prior to that in his last term in office—that this is what he fundamentally believed.

And while I and, I think, most Canadians and most free-market believers don't think that that's right, it's not a surprise that he feels that way, and so this issue of internal trade within Canada and the need to bring down trade barriers across our country is not surprising. It's been talked about for a long time as being important, and now, of course, it's become urgent because Canada is in something of a crisis.

And the trade war with the United States is a crisis because we've become dependent on the Americans to such a great degree over the last 30 or 40 years. And people can talk about the wisdom of that or not, but there is a reality that when you live right next to the largest economy in the world, you are naturally going to gravitationally move towards trade and commerce with that entity; that's not surprising. It would almost take a dedicated effort to pull away from that central gravitational economic force. So, not a surprise given this particular administration.

Now, it's also worth saying, because I've heard some members on the opposite side—in their speeches or in some of their questions that they've put to themselves in question period—say things like, not enough was done or nothing was done when it comes to tearing down interprovincial trade barriers previously, and nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, I used to wonder why it was that Brian Pallister, the former premier, had such a fascination—more than that—such an obsession with lowering trade barriers between provinces.

He would go to First Ministers' meeting, to the COF meetings, and prior to going to those COF meetings—members will know who were in Cabinet who go to FMMs, First Ministers' meetings, you always sort of set out something of an agenda. You would try

to get a communiqué almost approved before you get on the plane to go to the meeting, which always seemed like a strange process to me.

But it's about ensuring that you have priorities before you go to these meetings. And for Brian Pallister, the former premier, every—I don't think I'm exaggerating. Maybe I shouldn't say every because somebody's going to come back and correct me. But I would say 90 per cent of the First Ministers' meetings, the COF meetings that he went to, he put on that priority list: internal trade, reducing trade barriers, getting involved with the New West Partnership.

It was a significant priority to him. And there were a lot of people at the time who simply didn't get it. Now, he was somebody who believed in free trade, so for him it didn't seem like—not like he was predicting the future about would happen in terms of future US administrations. He just genuinely believed in it and had always believed in it.

And so, he pushed very, very hard to reduce those interprovincial trade barriers. In fact, I recall that at times, he did so unilaterally. So, the premier's modus operandi going to these First Ministers' meeting was to try to have some sort of a trade-off. You know, if you drop these barriers, we'll drop these barriers.

But often what happened for Manitoba under Premier Pallister is, he would just say, We're just going to drop them on our own and we hope that you'll end up following suit and following the example and also drop those trade barriers on your side. But there was never any guarantee, and some did and I think some didn't, but that just shows how dedicated that former premier was to reducing trade barriers.

Now, there might be some members on the opposite side who don't know that history, don't care to look up the history, and be given talking points and say something different. And that's fine. That's what they've been provided.

But I would encourage them to do a little bit of their own homework because I know somebody who in this particular case has actually done their homework, and that is the Premier (Mr. Kinew). Because I heard the Premier—I don't spend a lot of time necessarily trying to listen to every media interview he does, but sometimes they just come across my podcast or across my TV—and he did a podcast talking about trade barriers. I think it was the first day he was in Ottawa.

And he specifically said to that national media journalist: Well, we actually don't have that many

interprovincial trade barriers in Manitoba. He acknowledged that Manitoba, compared to most other provinces, actually has very few interprovincial trade barriers.

Now, he didn't go that one step further—and I was sort of trying and—to encourage him through my podcast or my TV to—don't forget to end the sentence. Because the sentence was: Manitoba just doesn't have a lot of interprovincial trade barriers.

* (15:20)

The reason we don't is because the former Progressive Conservative premier, Brian Pallister, was so determined to get rid of them. Now, I don't want to put false information on the record because, ultimately, the longest serving House leader in Manitoba history, as I learned today, would probably then stand up and raise some sort of a point of order or a matter of privilege.

But I do believe that if you look at the history of the debate at that time when the former premier was trying to knock down these trade barriers, the then opposition NDP, they certainly weren't overly supportive. Now, I don't want to suggest that they voted against the bill. They might've voted against the new west trade partnership, I'm not sure. But they certainly weren't championing and yelling for less trade barriers, for more free trade. That was not a priority of the then-NDP opposition, which might explain why it wasn't a priority now either.

And it gets back to this point of: Why are we here? We're three days left in this session, according to the calendar. Why are we here debating this bill only now? Why is it that the government didn't have the foresight to know that this should've been a priority?

Now, this will quickly put anybody who's watching to sleep when it comes to House rules, but the member, the honourable Government House Leader (MLA Fontaine) knows, as I do and others, that there is a rule in this House that if you want essentially guaranteed passage of a bill within the legislative calendar of that session, that it has to be introduced by a cut-off date. Now, every House leader knows that, and the bureaucracy knows it, because there's a great flurry of activity to try to get bills drafted before that date.

Now I think this time, for sure, maybe last time as well, the government actually introduced bills but didn't table them, so they weren't actually printed or ready. I'm not sure why they didn't pull that little trick on this particular bill because they could've just

introduced a title and not actually produced any sort of written text, and then the bill would've been guaranteed passage when they actually decided to table it. They've done that before, and that wouldn't have been a real difficult thing to do, so I'm not sure why that wasn't done.

But I do know who did have the foresight to know that this was going to be an issue. I mentioned Brian Pallister; he certainly didn't anticipate this issue, but he was dedicated to bringing down interprovincial trade barriers. But who foresaw this particular issue was the member for Midland (Mrs. Stone). The member for Midland saw what was going on in the United States, saw what was happening with the Trump administration, saw the impact that it would have on the Canadian economy.

Now, the member for Midland, being an astute legislator, and I—and a valued colleague for myself and all who serve with her, knew that there was a limited number of things that a provincial legislature could do to affect the Trump tariffs. There was only so and so much a provincial legislature could do. Now, there's certain policy things that could be done to sort of respond. One could say, as a minister might know, could say: well, we're not going to provide any more money through contracts to American contractors. Now, they could say that and then continue to provide tens and tens of millions of dollars to those American contractors. That wouldn't, of course, help the problem, and I hope that the minister is well on his way trying to repair that problem.

But the member for Midland clearly understood: all right, I can't actually impact what's happening in the White House, because almost nobody can impact what's happening in the White House, it seems, regardless if you're in the Senate, if you're in the Congress, or if you're a state governor or if you're a state representative. Clearly, nobody has a lot of influence there.

But she clearly recognized: but we can do something in Canada. Because if you want to be able to try to minimize and never completely mitigate—I mean, nobody should think that eliminating interprovincial trade barriers between provinces is going to be a complete solve for the economic damage that a trade war with our largest trading partner is. It's not going to be that kind of an impact. But you have to do what you can do. You have to be able to find things that are going to make it better, if not make it perfect.

So the member for Midland, I suppose because she's got a hundred different initiatives that she's working

on, and she's brought a lot of different pieces of legislation here.

But she recognized this should be a priority: this isn't something that I should put off; this isn't something that I should put to the back; this isn't something that I should do after I've gotten everything else on my list done. This is really important, so I'm going to put pen to paper, and I'm sure she had some help from the good people in Legislative Counsel to write up a bill, essentially the same bill that we see before us today, and introduce it weeks ago.

Now that's essentially the same choice that the NDP had, the NDP government, and with far more resources than the member for Midland is afforded through her office. But the member for—or, the government knew that the deadline for introducing bills, if they wanted guaranteed passage, was on a certain day.

The bureaucracy is focused on that; they understand there is a certain day that legislation has to be in, is probably gone through whatever their version of legislative and review committee is, maybe it's still called the same thing; they've gone through that process. It's gone through, you know, the calling from the deputy ministers for bill ideas; it ends up going through Cabinet I'm assuming, the different bills.

There's a significant process. But they didn't have either the time—but I suspect they didn't see it as a priority to put that bill on the forefront.

Now look at some of the other bills that they did: the minor amendments and corrections act, one of my favourite bills of the Legislature, that corrects spelling and typographical errors and translation issues that happen in legislation. Not actually as easy a bill to put together as one might think, because it requires the different departments to go through their various bills that they're responsible for and try to see where the translation problems are, or try to see where there are minor amendments and corrections, and then they had to compile them all together and put them into one bill.

I use that as an example, though, because while it is an annual bill in the Legislature, I don't believe that there's a rule that says it has to be an annual bill. It's not a rule that says the minor amendments and corrections act must come before the Legislature every year. It's just kind of tradition that it does.

But if the government was pressed for time, as one example, they could have said, all right, like, which bills could potentially wait until next year? Could we potentially take the minor amendments and

corrections act, which might, you know, put a comma in or remove a period somewhere where it doesn't belong, should we maybe put that one to the side and dedicate our drafting resources and our attention to a bill which the Premier (Mr. Kinew) seems to indicate has the unity of the country resting upon it?

And yet the NDP said, no, actually that bill that removes commas and maybe places in a period and corrects a couple of type—that's actually more important than the bill that is going to determine the future of our country in the words—or, paraphrasing—the words of the Premier.

So they actually made a conscious choice. They made a conscious choice not to prioritize this particular bill. Now, there was an out for them, of course: if they were so busy doing whatever it is that the government's doing—and I'm not here to say that, you know—government isn't easy. I get that. I understand that.

And so if that was the issue, that they just simply couldn't, you know, marshal enough resources, or marshal enough time, well, the member for Midland (Mrs. Stone) gave them a perfect out. Like the Jerry Maguire movie, she was, here, help me help you. She wanted to help the Government House Leader (MLA Fontaine). She was—well, a best friend might be too strong a word, but clearly, through her actions, she wanted to support the work of the Government House Leader and the government writ large.

She did the work. She got the—she said, okay, like, there are certain things that are less of a priority on the many things that I have to do; I'm going to put those to the side. And by the way, you know, she has a family and she's got lots of other things going on, so those aren't easy things to prioritize. I know that.

*(15:30)

And she put those things to the side and she said, I'm going to prioritize this internal free trade bill. And then she brought it to the Legislature, and members opposite didn't really say anything negative about it. They kind of, oh, looked at it and probably thought—probably some of the backbenchers who aren't involved in drafting legislation would have said, well, that seems like a good idea, and looked down to the lower benches on the government side, wondering who's doing that on our side.

And then nothing happened. Nobody did anything on that side because they were busy drafting the minor amendments and corrections act or whatever as opposed to a bill that they self-describe is important to saving the very nation that we call Canada.

So one would think in a crisis, that's been self-described by new Prime Minister Carney, we should all be able to work together.

Now, I don't have a lot of knowledge of Mr. Carney or how his governing style is going to be, and I'm certainly willing to give that time and to be open-minded about that. But his words were: this is the time where everyone has to work together. He said that about the opposition—Conservative opposition in Ottawa. He said that about the now handful, or less than a handful, of New Democrats who have survived their purging. But he said we should all work together.

So what an opportunity for the government, who didn't have the opportunity, well, couldn't find it a priority, to draft this bill, to just walk over across the aisle—not in front of the mace because we're not looking for those folks—but like just to walk over across the aisle and to the member for Midland, and say, of all the times in Canadian history that we've been alive—and there's certainly been other times of crisis in Canada that, you know, people gave their lives for and did amazing things that we're lucky to be here—but in all the times that we've been here as elected legislators, this is one of the most important. This is one of those hinge moments, as the new Prime Minister likes to say.

And they could have walked across the aisle and they could have said, you know what, you've already done the work, you already got a bill in the Legislature, we need to get this passed. How about we just move your bill forward?

Now maybe they would have said, you know, there's a couple of things we'd like to change; there's a couple of things we can add to it. None of that's difficult. We've all done that before here in the Legislature for bills that were far less substantive than this one. And this bill will—would have already been enacted. It already would have been passed.

But it calls into question the motive and the sincerity of the government, and I know that the Government House Leader is upset that this bill didn't just fly through the process. I think she actually wanted Committee of the Whole, so she wanted to stop the public from coming and speaking to it, and let's just, like, don't blink an eye, let's quickly get this through.

But one of the reasons they're taking time to debate this is because not only did the then-opposition NDP not seemingly support the lowering of trade barriers

that happened under Brian Pallister and his desire to lower interprovincial trade barriers—

An Honourable Member: They fought it.

Mr. Goertzen: They may have fought it, as my colleague says. They certainly resisted it, and they certainly didn't enthusiastically support it. They also then didn't come across to my colleague for Midland who drifted the bill—or, drafted the bill—and say: How about we work together and we'll take, you know, the basis of your bill and bring it forward?

Because they didn't do either of those things, it does cause people to go, how dedicated and committed are they? Because you can pass a bill, but if you don't really believe in it and you don't really believe the sort of things that are spoken about in the bill, then you've passed a bill and not done much else because you're not going to be motivated to put those things into action and you're going to slow walk them and do all the things that sometimes governments do.

And that's why this debate is important, because it's not just about passing the substance of a bill, the words that are written on paper. It is about knowing the motivation of the government, because a bill that passes in words but has no motivation from a government that's going to be responsible for enacting it isn't anything.

And by virtue, so far, of the actions of this government, by not introducing a bill when they knew that there was a problem months ago, by not accepting the bill that the member for Midland (Mrs. Stone) brought forward—even if it needed to be tweaked a little bit—and by not supporting these measures when they were in opposition, and when Manitoba was a leader, Honourable Speaker, not part of the pack, not near the bottom, a leader in the country in reducing trade barriers—by not doing any of those things, by not making it priority, by not having a history of supporting these sort of things, by not reaching across the aisle, it goes to the motivation of the members opposite.

Do they actually really want this, or is this about the Premier (Mr. Kinew)? He flies off to Ottawa, he has a new-found love for the King, now, apparently; says nothing about monarchists on the other side now. And so we welcome them to the great supporters of the monarchy.

So he goes to Ottawa and he goes on bended knee and kisses the ring of the King, or whatever they do in terms of those ceremonies, and then he flies back to us and talks to us today like he has a word from the King. A—you know, I could—I think that for some

members opposite, not the least of which is the Government House Leader (MLA Fontaine), if they could've, sort of, slowly slid out of the frame of the TV, they might've tried to do that, because I saw a whole lot of people who were uncomfortable over there.

But anyway, he comes back with this sort of message of this word for the King. But is that truly motivation? When this bill passes, if it passes, are they actually going to then put the work in, to put it in action? Because it is true that we would all benefit. I mean, every province would benefit if we were to eliminate those interprovincial trade barriers; all of us would benefit from it.

You could see it a long time ago. The member for Midland saw it a long time ago; sprung into action, did what she could do; recognized there were things that are beyond the control of this Manitoba Legislature. We might all think we're invested with great power or authority, but things that are happening in certain places of the United States just simply are not within our purview to influence. But we can influence things in Canada.

And so through the forethought and the wisdom of the member for Midland, who brought the bill forward—and, I believe, reached across the aisle to say that she was willing to work to pass that bill with the government—that would've shown that the government was motivated on this. Because at some point this bill's going to pass. There are mechanisms by which the government could pass bills; sometimes it takes days, sometimes it takes weeks, but they ultimately have mechanisms to pass bills. That's good. We support the reduction of interprovincial trade barriers. We prove that year after year after year.

But if you don't truly believe it, if you're not willing, as the former premier did—Premier Pallister—willing to go to a COF meeting, a council of federation meeting, and saying, all right, we're going to take down our barriers even if nobody else is going to take down theirs. Might have some implications in Manitoba; maybe won't—not everybody like it, but we're going to lead by example. If you don't have that kind of motivation, if it doesn't stir in you in that way, if you don't have those kind of principles, well, then, this is just nothing but a bill that's got a bunch of words that's going to up on the website under the consolidated statutes and then sit there. And that's it. And it's not going to have the impact that we need.

And this isn't a time for performative politics. This isn't a time where, oh yeah, I'm going to go get a

picture with the King and I'll put it in my scrapbook and that's going to be great.

And you know what? Good for the Premier (Mr. Kinew). I actually have no problem with him going and meeting the King because, unlike a lot of members opposite, I've been supportive of the monarchy in its own way, for a long time. There's some recent converts on that side, suddenly. But I don't have a problem with him doing that.

What I have a problem with is the feeling that this isn't actually something the NDP believe. It just feels that they have to do it in the moment. And this moment demands better than that. Canada, at this stage, demands governments that stand behind things that are important, put them into action and believe it in their heart.

Thank you. God bless Canada.

* (15:40)

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield-Ritchot): I would like to take the Chamber back to the early 1980s where trade actually—that would be 1980s—where trade started to become an issue. And it started in the early 1980s, and it started to become a significant issue in North America.

And I happen to know a little bit about that. I was clearly a very young university student at that time. And it took the election to the Brian Mulroney government in 1984 and the Ronald Reagan government in the United States that the true negotiations started on the FTA, or Free Trade Agreement.

And what's significant about that is those trade agreements also involved trade agreements across Canada, but more importantly, between the United States and Canada; that was the main focus. And I had the opportunity to be part of a university group. It was Manitoba-wide, called Manitoba youth for free trade. And it was co-chaired between myself and Sabrina Henry, a hakka, a Chinese individual who came here from Rhodesia, now known as Zimbabwe. In fact, the family moved to Stony Mountain, had a grocery store there.

And we would travel universities in Manitoba and we would talk about trade, and certainly about free trade. And it was very contentious. Trade tends to become very contentious, and at that time, it was Conservatives who were the ones that were pushing free trade, and it was the members opposite, the New Democrats, who opposed it. In fact, in the ensuing election that re-elected the Mulroney government, the

entire election was predicated on free trade; it was a free trade election.

And I would suggest to the Legislature, the turning point in that election was a brochure that came out and it showed Brian Mulroney with green slime running down his face, and it turned the public away from the no side. And Brian Mulroney actually got re-elected on that free trade and the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States was signed.

And it just shows you how you have to be careful. This can become very divisive; trade can become very nasty and very ugly, and, thankfully, Canadians turned against that kind of negativity, that kind of ugliness, and they voted for the Brian Mulroney government. And the agreement was then signed between Canada and the United States. And as we know, the FTA then became NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement.

In fact, I would point out to this House about three years—four years ago, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney called me. He called me and, amongst other things, we talked about the Free Trade Agreement and about the Manitoba youth for free trade and the kind of work we did. It was very interesting. He was very passionate then about trade, and we touched upon interprovincial trade.

Mr. Tyler Blashko, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

And what's interesting is I was very much involved with free trade between Canada and the United States in my university years. And then we got elected in 2016. And we got elected on a platform, one of which was that we were going to join the New West Partnership.

And why is that significant? Because members opposite, the member for St. Johns (MLA Fontaine), the big hater of free trade, they were absolutely opposed to the New West Partnership. The Doer government, absolutely opposed. If you go back in Hansard, you can hear the kind of harsh, extreme, left-wing rhetoric on why Canada should not be trading with each other.

It was appalling. In fact, you would sit there and you would look at the New Democrats and you'd think, how foolish that we spent all this time and effort to get a free trade agreement between Canada and the United States. Later on, it was Canada, United States and Mexico. We spent all that effort on it, and the New Democrats in Manitoba would fight tooth and nail against the New West Partnership.

And I'll give you a little bit of a lesson what the New West Partnership was. I would like to point out that it was not just the Gary Doer government, but also the Greg Selinger government who said, absolutely not. The big—Gary Doer, the big ambassador to the United States, big internationalist, fought against trade within Canada. That is the record of the New Democrats. That is the record of these lazy socialists who do not want to put in the effort and the work to have proper trade within Canada.

So what happened was, within Canada—western Canada—was called the New West Partnership. Started with Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia. They started to negotiate certain sectors and they invited Manitoba, of which the member for St. Johns (MLA Fontaine)—the Kinew government; he was an adviser at that time—and all of these—the socialists across the way, they fought against it and said, absolutely not.

No free trade across Canada. Nothing. Voted against it. Had nothing to do with it. Wanted not to speak of it. Wouldn't be part of discussions. They wouldn't even send a representative to even see what was going on at the negotiations of the New West Partnership. Nothing. That is the record of these lazy socialists across the way. They wanted nothing to do with that.

And British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan signed on to the New West Partnership and left us out of the cold. And if anybody thinks that Manitoba's going to win against Quebec and Ontario, you're deluding yourself, because those are mighty big economies. We had far better chance to go in with the New West Partnership, start there.

So 2016, finally people had had it with that dysfunctional group of New Democrats that—was just a blood sport across the way. And we started the negotiating process. I was very fortunate to be part of executive government that time and we negotiated our way in.

And the—my colleague from Steinbach alluded to it; he didn't articulate it fully. We went into negotiations with the New West Partnership with the least amount of holdbacks, bar none. Bar none. We went into negotiating to get into the New West Partnership and we got into the New West Partnership with the least amount of holdbacks. Let that sink in for a minute: least amount and we got into the New West Partnership.

And who voted against it? One guess. The former hater of the monarchy, now the big lover of the monarchy, the Families Minister, the member for St. Johns. And the

Kinew government, they all voted against getting into the New West Partnership. Every single one of them voted against free trade in Canada. Every one of them. All of them.

And they sit with their heads in shame and they should. Because now they want to talk about free trade in the country when they voted against it every time it came up in this House. Every time. That's the record of this bunch of—this group. That's their record.

So then started the negotiations with New West Partnership and Ontario and Quebec. Those of who were part of the executive government will know this, Conservatives—Progressive Conservative government under Brian Pallister.

Here is the shocking news: the least amount of holdbacks in the country, bar none—bar none—the least amount of holdbacks in the country when we started talking about free trade in the country, and who fought us on getting more free trade across the country between New West Partnership and Quebec and Ontario? Every one of those NDP members across the way, starting with the member for St. Johns who is now on the way to Damascus, had a conversion. Now she's the big free trader and the lover of the King.

This is a disgrace. This is a sham. Basically, it is what that is. It's a disgrace that we have now this group of people trying to talk about trade and trying to turn it that somehow the Conservatives aren't for free trade, although we fought for it and we brought it and we got it and we negotiated it and we have such a good record on interprovincial trade negotiations.

The reason why this lazy socialist government and this Premier (Mr. Kinew) has such an easy job is because of our heavy lifting. That's why. That's why things are so easy on that side.

* (15:50)

And you know what? Brian Pallister used to say, if this was an easy thing to do, the socialists would have done it a long time ago. They left all the hard lifting for the Conservatives, and we got the New West Partnership.

And the caucus chair from the NDP chirps but never gets up and speaks, doesn't put anything on the record—the whip, the NDP caucus whip, I apologize. Sits and chirps because she never has anything to say on the record. The only thing she can do is sit and chirp. She should get up and talk on this and talk about the abysmal record of this pack of lazy socialists who voted against everything free trade provincially across

this country every opportunity they got. That's this group of NDP.

It was our government that went forward. I remember there was a time—it was under the Doer-Selinger government. If you brought a heavy load in from Vancouver and you hit the Alberta border and you hit all new signs, all new chase vehicles, all new everything, then you got across Alberta to Saskatchewan, you needed, again, a whole new set of signs, all new chase vehicles, all the rest of it. Then you got to Manitoba; you had to do a whole new set.

Well, you know what? We got rid of all that. Now that we have a standardized—you have one set of signs and chase vehicles, one set of rules. You can move a heavy item from Vancouver to Manitoba uninhibited and further on into the country. That takes heavy lifting.

And we have an NDP government that can't even get a bill in front of this House in time. They have time for everything else—everything else—except for getting something done. You know what? The biggest Trump lovers are across the way because they're the ones who sit and shout at everybody else that they're not. They absolutely are doing the work of Donald Trump by—instead of doing their job. Instead of doing their job and putting forward timely legislation, they had—Trump got elected in November.

They had December, no bill; January, no bill; February, no bill; March, no bill. They had month after month after month to get a bill forward. Those lazy socialists can barely get themselves up in the morning and get breakfast on the table. That bill should have been in front of this Chamber when we came back in March. That bill should have been ready to go.

And now they want to put a bill forward, the one that they actually stole from the member for Midland (Mrs. Stone). Now I'd like to say to the member for Midland, there is a saying and it says, imitation is the greatest form of flattery. So I guess you should be flattered. But you know what? That's not what running a province and a country is all about and the Premier (Mr. Kinew) who is now already running his federal campaign—[interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Schuler: —with build Canada—[interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Schuler: —build Canada, build Canada, build Canada. How about build a trade agreement with—[interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

We all appreciate spirited debate in this Chamber, but myself and the clerks need to be able to hear what's being said, so I'd ask that we have spirited debate quieter.

Mr. Schuler: Well, and they have all kinds of opportunity to speak to this bill instead of chirping from their seats because that's actually cowardly. What they should do is get up and have a speech and put words on the record. That would show some leadership, but they're never going to do that because they don't have the kind of leadership that we need to move this province forward and the kind of trade agreements we need to get our trade going across this country.

I would like to suggest to Manitobans that, although it was flattery to the member for Midland to copy her bill—in fact, I think the leader—Leader of the Opposition even said they're going to copy the bill. They want to defeat the bill; they're going to copy the bill and bring it back, and they did exactly that almost two weeks after he said that.

The member for Midland, I would suggest to members opposite, probably would have been fine if they would have wanted to move and second her bill a second time. I mean, it—this isn't about, oh, the member for Midland has to move it or whatever. It's about what's best for the province of Manitoba and for the people that we represent, and I know the member for Midland would have absolutely been agreeable that if the government wanted to take over and move it forward, she would have been fine with that. But no.

Then they had to kill that bill yet, stall another couple of weeks and then, all of a sudden, it becomes a crisis. Becomes a crisis evidently when the King is off to Ottawa, and now he's become the big royalty lover and the patriarchy and he just—he—you know, all that kind of stuff

It was wonderful to see, even now, the member for St. Johns (MLA Fontaine) quoting the King and what the King all said, and she had to put that into her answers in question period, how she loves the monarchy and the King.

You know what? I would suggest to members opposite: stop all this foolishness. Be serious about what you want to do for this province. Talk about the free trade that we need interprovincially in this province. The New West Partnership is already a building block on which you can build. We signed that. You wouldn't do that. You fought us on it. You didn't want it. You voted against it, but we did it.

Okay, so now you've had a conversion; now you're all about free trade, certainly across the country. Now you want all this free trade. Okay. Build on the New West Partnership and use that to do further negotiations across the country.

And, again, you have all the documents at your disposal; you're now executive government. You can go and see what kind of holdbacks the Pallister government had, and you will notice that we had the least amount of holdbacks back then, back in 2016, '17, '18, '19; you will find that we had the least amount of holdbacks. Go back and look at that list and maybe even use it, because it probably still is the least amount of holdbacks in this country, and use that to negotiate an interprovincial Canada-wide trade agreement.

We have a premier on the east coast who is pushing for this. We even have the Premier of Ontario who is pushing this. I would suggest—I would definitely negotiate with Quebec and Ontario with my back against the wall. I mean, I—we are a very small player. We have to be very careful, careful we don't sell ourselves out. But, you know, there are smart negotiators in this province that can give good advice, would be my advice.

But go back and look at the list of holdbacks. The least amount of holdbacks in the country. It is important.

We, as Manitobans, and many of us represent a rural—mine happens to be more suburban—but I drive on the way to Oakbank and there are beautiful fields, and they're starting already; they're starting to get that green carpet look, and soon they will be full of crops. And the wind waves through the beautiful fields. It's absolutely exquisite.

An Honourable Member: Relevance.

Mr. Schuler: And we realize that 80 per cent—and you know what, the member for St. Boniface (MLA Loiselle) shouts relevance. You know what? He's so irrelevant, he should actually get up one time and put some words on the record and we'll see relevance.

Because—you know what? Eighty per cent of what we produce in this province we have to trade. That's the relevance to the member for St. Boniface. He should maybe get out of his city once in a while and go drive some of the rural areas and see what's being done in the rural areas, for manufacturing, for grain, for all the things that are being done in the rural areas. He should—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Schuler: —get out of his seat once in a while and go and look what's going on in the rest of the country—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Schuler: Yes, the lazy socialist from St. Boniface should get out of his constituency once in a while and go see what the rest of the province is all about. Eighty per cent of what we produce we have to sell to somebody else.

And you know what? There are people, children in India and all across the world, who get up in the morning and want what every other child wants and that's some food on the table, and it's because of agriculture in Manitoba, because of hard-working Manitobans who produce such good crops that we can export it to other countries and other places and children get to have breakfast. And that is a blessing of this province; that is the blessing of this country.

And, yes, we should be trading it to other places, and yes, we should be looking for other markets, but not the way that the member for St. Boniface and others want to do it. Just vote against free trade; vote against free trade and then, all of a sudden, conversion on the way to Damascus. And all of a sudden now, they've discovered free trade, and they throw a bill in front of the House in the last minute.

And you know what? Maybe some of them should get up first and do some debating on it. We should have this conversation in the House instead of Conservatives getting up and talking about free trade—*[interjection]*

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Schuler: —and the legacy of what this province has done for interprovincial trade and the member for St. Boniface and St. Johns (MLA Fontaine) and the others—*[interjection]*

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Schuler: —just sit and chirp from their seats because they have nothing to say on these bills. The lazy socialists should go out and go across this province—

* (16:00)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 11 minutes left.

The time being 4 p.m., in accordance with subrule 2(17) I'm interrupting the debate to put the question on the remaining report stage amendments, without further debate on amendment—or, without further debate or amendment on the following specified bills: Bill 5, Bill 11, Bill 21, Bill 24, Bill 39 and Bill 44.

The House will now adjourn until all of the—the House will not adjourn until all of the applicable questions have been put; and in accordance with our rules, all matters of privilege and points of order are deferred until after these actions have been concluded.

If there are any applicable report stage amendments that have yet to be moved, the member bringing the report stage amendment forward will move the motion but with no debate.

For each report stage amendment, the sponsor will move the report stage amendment and send the motion up to the Speaker, who will start reading the report stage amendment back to the House.

The Speaker will then rule on the orderliness of the report stage amendment, then the question will be put on the report stage amendment without further debate or amendment.

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 5—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Measures)

The Deputy Speaker: We shall now consider the report stage amendment to Bill 5, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Measures); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (mesures en cas d'infractions de conduite avec facultés affaiblies).

Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West): I move, seconded by the honourable member for La Vérendrye (Mr. Narth),

THAT Bill 5 be amended by replacing Clause 7(3) with the following:

7(3) The following is added after subsection 264(1.2.2):

30 years suspension for certain impaired driving offences
264(1.2.3) despite subsection (1.1), when a person is convicted of an offence referred to in clause (a) or subclause (a)(2)(i) of the definition "Category B offence", the person's licence and right to have a licence is suspended and the person is disqualified from driving a motor vehicle for a 30-year period.

Lifetime suspension for multiple impaired offences

264(1.2.4): Despite subsection (1.1), when a person is convicted of a second offence referred to in clause (a) or subclause (a.2)(i) of the definition "Category B offence", the person's licence and right to have a licence is permanently suspended and the person is disqualified from driving a motor vehicle for the rest of their life.

The Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Brandon West, that Bill 5 be amended by replacing—seconded by the member for La Vérendrye,

THAT Bill 5 be amended by replacing clause 7(3)—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order, and is there leave for the amendment to be considered as printed rather than as read, because there was a tiny error in the reading? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

THAT Bill 5 be amended by replacing Clause 7(3) with the following:

7(3) The following is added after subsection 264(1.2.2):

30-year suspension for certain impaired offences

264(1.2.3) Despite subsection (1.1), when a person is convicted of an offence referred to in clause (a) or subclause (a.2)(i) of the definition "Category B offence", the person's licence and right to have a licence is suspended and the person is disqualified from driving a motor vehicle for a 30-year period.

Lifetime suspension for multiple impaired offences

264(1.2.4) Despite subsection (1.1), when a person is convicted of a second offence referred to in clause (a) or subclause (a.2)(i) of the definition "Category B offence", the person's licence and right to have a licence is permanently suspended and the person is disqualified from driving a motor vehicle for the rest of their life.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly passed—or, the honourable Opposition House Leader.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, please.

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested, call in the members.

The question before the House are the amendments made to clause 7(3)—sorry, report stage amendments to clause 7(3) of report—or sorry, of Bill 5, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, moved by the honourable member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen).

Division

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

Ayes

Balcaen, Bereza, Byram, Cook, Ewasko, Goertzen, Guenter, Hiebert, Johnson, Khan, King, Lagassé, Lamoureux, Narth, Nesbitt, Piwniuk, Schuler, Wowchuk.

Nays

Brar, Bushie, Chen, Compton, Corbett, Cross, Dela Cruz, Devgan, Fontaine, Kennedy, Kostyshyn, Lathlin, Loiselle, Maloway, Marcelino, Moroz, Moses, Moyes, Naylor, Oxenham, Pankratz, Sala, Sandhu, Schmidt, Schott, Smith, Wiebe.

Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Ayes 18, Nays 27.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion is accordingly defeated.

* * *

* (17:00)

The Deputy Speaker: We shall now consider the report stage amendment to Bill 5, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Measures).

The Speaker in the Chair

Mr. Balcaen: I move, seconded by the member for La Vérendrye (Mr. Narth),

THAT Bill 5 be amended in Clause 8

(a) by replacing the proposed subsection 264.1(1) with the following:

Lifetime alcohol prohibition

264.1(1) A person who is convicted of an offence referred to in subsection 264(1.2.3) must not, for the rest of their life, operate or have care or control of a motor vehicle, off-road vehicle, agricultural equipment or infrastructure equipment while the person has any alcohol in their blood.

(b) by striking out the proposed subsections 264.1(2) and (3);

(c) in the proposed subsection 264.1(5), by striking out "a designated impaired offence" and—submitting—"an offence referred to in subsection 264(1.2.3)";

(d) in the proposed subsection 264.1(6), by striking out "or (2)"; and

(e) in the proposed subsection 264.1(9), by striking out "a designated impaired offence" and substituting "an offence referred to in subsection 264(1.2.3)".

The Speaker: So it has been moved by the honourable member for Brandon West, seconded by the honourable member for La Vérendrye,

THAT—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Perfect. Dispensed.

I will just point out that there was a mistake, so we have to ask for leave to—for it to be considered as written, as opposed to what was said. *[Agreed]*

THAT Bill 5 be amended in Clause 8

(a) by replacing the proposed subsection 264.1(1) with the following:

Lifetime alcohol prohibition

264.1(1) A person who is convicted of an offence referred to in subsection 264(1.2.3) must not, for the rest of their life, operate or have care or control of a motor vehicle, off-road vehicle, agricultural equipment or infrastructure equipment while the person has any alcohol in their blood.

(b) by striking out the proposed subsections 264.1(2) and (3);

(c) in the proposed subsection 264.1(5), by striking out "a designated impaired offence" and substituting "an offence referred to in subsection 264(1.2.3)";

(d) in the proposed subsection 264.1(6), by striking out "or (2)"; and

(e) in the proposed subsection 264.1(9), by striking out "a designated impaired offence" and substituting "an offence referred to in subsection 264(1.2.3)".

The Speaker: The amendment therefore is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Speaker: All those in the House in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

The Speaker: I do believe the Nays have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Johnson: I request a recorded vote, please.

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

* (18:00)

Time for the ringing of the bells—okay, sorry I missed that. Got a couple of things on my mind this evening, so.

So the question before the House then is the report stage amendment No. 2 to clause 8 of The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Measures) brought forward by the honourable member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen).

All those in the House in favour of the motion, please rise.

Division

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

Ayes

Balcaen, Bereza, Byram, Cook, Ewasko, Goertzen, Guenter, Hiebert, Johnson, Khan, King, Lagassé, Lamoureux, Narth, Nesbitt, Piwniuk, Schuler, Wowchuk.

Nays

Asagwara, Blashko, Brar, Bushie, Chen, Compton, Corbett, Cross, Dela Cruz, Devgan, Fontaine, Kennedy, Kostyshyn, Lathlin, Loiselle, Maloway, Marcelino, Moroz, Moses, Moyes, Naylor, Oxenham, Pankratz, Sala, Sandhu, Schmidt, Schott, Wiebe.

Clerk: Ayes 18, Nays 28.

The Speaker: The motion is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Obby Khan (Leader of the Official Opposition): I rise on a point of order. Oh, sorry—point of order.

The Speaker: Don't mean to interrupt you, but we do not deal with points of order. They're all deferred until a later time.

An Honourable Member: Is there leave?

The Speaker: Is there leave to allow the Leader of the Official Opposition to rise on a point of order?

We'll just take a moment while we work this out.

Mr. Johnson: I seek leave for the Leader of the Opposition to make a quick statement or a point of order.

The Speaker: Is there leave for the Leader of the Opposition to rise on a point of order, contrary to our rules? *[Agreed]*

Point of Order

Mr. Khan: I rise on a point of order.

Members know a provincial state of emergency has been declared. All of our thoughts and prayers are to all of those being evacuated and all the personnel working so hard to ensure safety of everyone.

While this remains a state of emergency in the state of—in Manitoba tonight, we were prepared to sit for hours—amendments and potentially hours of voting late into the evening. Given the very serious state of 'emergen' that's been called, and the provincial situation, we are prepared to remove the remaining matters as quickly as possible and to ask the assistance of all members to move this as quickly as possible, so that ministers, MLAs can do what they need to do.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to all Manitobans affected by this. Please, follow local instructions and be safe.

The Speaker: While I thank the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition for his sentiments, and I'm sure people appreciate it, it is not a point of order.

Bill 11—The Oil and Gas Amendment Act

The Speaker: So now we will proceed to the report stage amendments for Bill 11, The Oil and Gas Amendment Act.

The honourable member for Riding Mountain to—the honourable member for Riding Mountain.

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): Honourable Speaker, I want to withdraw my two amendments to Bill 11—not proceed, sorry.

The Speaker: The honourable member for Riding Mountain wishes to not proceed with the two amendments he has to Bill 11.

So then we'll move to the honourable Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation who has amendment No. 3 to clause 8(1).

Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kostyshyn),

THAT Bill 11 be amended by replacing Clause 8(1) with the following:

8(1) Subsection 64.1 is replaced with the following:

* (18:10)

Abandonment of well or facility

64(1) The lessee of oil and gas rights that are subject to a lease from freehold owner of oil and gas rights or the holder of a disposition must abandon, in accordance with this Part, any well or oil and gas facility within the lease area or reservation area

(a) within 180 days after the lease or disposition expires or is cancelled or surrendered; or

(b) on the expiration of such longer period as the director may authorize in writing, if the lessee or holder

(i) applies to the director before the abandonment is otherwise required, in the form and manner approved by the director, and provides the information requested by the director,

(ii) satisfies the director that the extension does not unreasonably impair any other person's interests or pose an unreasonable risk to the environment, and

(iii) complies with any terms and conditions as the director considers appropriate.

The director may extend the time period for abandonment more than once.

The Speaker: So it has been moved by the honourable Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture,

THAT the—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispense. I'm good with that.

So the amendment is in order.

So is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? *[Agreed]*

The amendment is accordingly passed.

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): Is there will of the House to call it unanimous?

The Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it unanimous? *[Agreed]*

The vote is accordingly recorded as unanimous.

So now, we will move on to report stage amendment No. 4 to clauses 7, 11, 12, 14(2), 15 to 19, 20(2) to 36 of The Oil and Gas Amendment Act, brought forward by the honourable Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation.

The honourable—Bill 11.

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

THAT Bill 11 be amended by striking out Clauses 7, 11, 12, 14(2), 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20(2) and 23.

The Speaker: So it's been moved by the honourable Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: The motion is in order.

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

The motion is accordingly carried.

Mr. Johnson: Is there will of the House to call it unanimous?

The Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it unanimous? *[Agreed]*

The motion is accordingly recorded as passing unanimously.

Bill 21—The Protecting Youth in Sports Act

The Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 21, The Protecting Youth in Sports Act.

Report stage amendment No. 1 to clause 15, brought forward by the honourable member for Dawson Trail.

MLA Bob Lagassé (Dawson Trail): I move, seconded by the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Piwniuk),

THAT Bill 21 be amended by replacing Clause 15 with the following:

Duty to report

15(1) If, after conducting a preliminary review under section 9 or any other time during an investigation or hearing under section 10, the independent adjudicator or any of their staff reasonably believe that a criminal offence has been committed against a young athlete, they must immediately report the belief and the information on which it is based to the police.

Other reporting obligations remain

15(2) Nothing in this Act affects any other obligations or duty to report behaviour that is prohibited under the *Criminal Code* (Canada) or other enactment.

The Speaker: Just before I proceed, there was a couple of mistakes that the member made when he was reading it.

So is it the will of the House to adopt it as written as opposed to as said? *[Agreed]*

So it was moved by the honourable member for Dawson Trail, seconded by the honourable member for Turtle Mountain,

THAT—the—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispensed.

THAT Bill 21 be amended by replacing Clause 15 with the following:

Duty to report

15(1) If, after conducting a preliminary review under section 9 or at any other time during an investigation or hearing under section 10, the independent adjudicator or any of their staff reasonably believes that a criminal offence has been committed against a young athlete, they must immediately report the belief and the information on which it is based to the police.

Other reporting obligations remain

15(2) Nothing in this Act affects any other obligation or duty to report behaviour that is prohibited under the *Criminal Code* (Canada) or another enactment.

The Speaker: Is—the motion is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Speaker: All those in the House in favour of the motion, please rise—no. All those in favour, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): On division, please.

The Speaker: The motion is accordingly defeated on division.

Bill 24—The Workers Compensation Amendment Act

The Speaker: So now we will move on to the report stage amendment No. 1 to clause 3 of Bill 24, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act, brought forward by the honourable Minister of Labour and Immigration.

Hon. Malaya Marcelino (Minister of Labour and Immigration): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (MLA Sala),

THAT Bill 24 be amended in Clause 3

(a) in the proposed section 30.1, by striking out "the day this section comes into force" and substituting "May 31, 2021"; and

(b) by renumbering the proposed section 30.1 as subsection 30.1(1) and adding the following as subsection 30.1(2):

Regulations

30.1(2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations respecting payments under subsection (1) in relation to deaths that occurred between May 31, 2021, and the coming into force of this section.

The Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable Minister of Labour and Immigration (MLA Marcelino), seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (MLA Sala), that The Workers Compensation Amendment Act, Bill 24—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispensed.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion—the motion is in order.

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

**Bill 39—The Public Schools Amendment Act
(Campaign Financing for School Trustees)**

The Speaker: So now we'll move to Bill 39, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Campaign Financing for School Trustees), brought forward by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, to move his 'resport'—report stage amendment number 1 to clause 3(27.5)1.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): I move, seconded by the MLA for Riding Mountain,

THAT Bill 39 be amended in Clause 3, in the proposed subsection 27.5(1),

(a) in the section heading, by striking out "\$1,500" and substituting "\$750"; and

(b) by striking out "\$1,500" and substituting "\$750".

The Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, seconded by the honourable member for Riding Mountain (Mr. Nesbitt)—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Speaker: All those in the House in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): On division, please.

The Speaker: On division. The motion is defeated on division.

* * *

The Speaker: We will now move to the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet second report stage amendment to clause 3(27.6) of Bill 39, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Campaign Financing for School Trustees).

Mr. Ewasko: I move, seconded by the MLA for Lakeside,

THAT Bill 39 be amended in Clause 3, in the proposed section 27.6, by striking out "\$7,500" and substituting "\$6,000".

* (18:20)

The Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, seconded by the honourable member for Lakeside (Mr. King), that—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispense.

The motion is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Speaker: All those in the House in favour, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

The Speaker: The Nays have it.

Mr. Johnson: On division, please.

The Speaker: The motion is accordingly defeated on division.

* * *

The Speaker: We will now move on to report stage amendment No. 3, to Bill 39, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Campaign Financing for School Trustees), brought forward by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko).

Mr. Ewasko: I move, seconded by the MLA for Agassiz, *THAT Bill 39 be amended in Clause 3 by adding the following after the proposed section 27.6:*

Campaign account

27.6.1(1) A registered candidate must establish a separate campaign account at a—blank—at a bank, credit union or other financial institution. This account may be used only for the purpose of the candidate's election campaign.

Obligations re campaign account

27.6.1(2) A registered candidate must ensure that

(a) all monetary contributions to the candidate are deposited into the campaign account by the candidate or a person acting on behalf of the candidate; and

(b) all payments relating to or arising out of the campaign are made only by cheque or e-transfer drawn from the campaign account.

The Speaker: So just before we move on, I'll point out that there was one mistake.

Is it the will of the House to adopt it as—to consider it as written as opposed to as spoken? *[Agreed]*

So it's been moved by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko), seconded by the honourable member for Agassiz (Ms. Byram),

THAT—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispense.

THAT Bill 39 be amended in Clause 3 by adding the following after the proposed section 27.6:

Campaign account

27.6.1(1) A registered candidate must establish a separate campaign account at a bank, credit union or other financial institution. This account may be used only for the purpose of the candidate's election campaign.

Obligations re campaign account

27.6.1(2) A registered candidate must ensure that

(a) all monetary contributions to the candidate are deposited into the campaign account by the candidate or a person acting on behalf of the candidate; and

(b) all payments relating to or arising out of the campaign are made only by cheque or e-transfer drawn from the campaign account.

The Speaker: The motion is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Speaker: All those in the House in favour, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Johnson: On division, please.

The Speaker: I'm sorry, I missed that. *[interjection]*

The motion is accordingly defeated on division.

Bill 44—The Matriarch Circle Act and Amendments to The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Ribbon Skirt Day)

The Speaker: Now we'll move on to Bill 44, The Matriarch Circle Act and Amendments to The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Ribbon Skirt Day), brought forward by the honourable member for Agassiz, report stage amendment No. 1 to Schedule A, clause 10.

Ms. Jodie Byram (Agassiz): Proposed amendment to Bill 44, the matriarch circle act and amendments to the commemoration of days—I move, seconded by the member from Portage la Prairie,

THAT Bill 44 be amended in Schedule A (The Matriarch Circle Act) by adding the following after Clause 10:

Report to minister

10—clause—10.1(1) Within six months after the end of each year, the Matriarch Circle must prepare and submit to the minister a report on its activities during that year.

Tabling report in the Assembly

Clause—10.1(2) The minister must table a copy of the report—to the—in the Assembly on any of the first 15 days on which the Assembly is sitting after the minister receives it.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Point out to members that there were a couple of mistakes in the amendment that the member just read.

Is it the will of the House to consider the motion as written as opposed to as said? [*Agreed*]

So the motion is in order.

So bill-to-the report stage amendment is been brought forward by the honourable member for Agassiz (Ms. Byram), seconded by the honourable member for Portage la Prairie (MLA Bereza),

THAT Bill 44, The Matriarch—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispense.

THAT Bill 44 be amended in Schedule A (The Matriarch Circle Act) by adding the following after Clause 10:

Report to minister

10.1(1) *Within six months after the end of each year, the Matriarch Circle must prepare and submit to the minister a report on its activities during that year.*

Tabling report in the Assembly

10.1(2) *The minister must table a copy of the report in the Assembly on any of the first 15 days on which the Assembly is sitting after the minister receives it.*

The Speaker: The motion is in order.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

The Speaker: All those in the House in favour, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

The Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader): On division, please, Honourable Speaker.

The Speaker: The motion is accordingly passed on division—defeated on division.

* * *

The Speaker: So that concludes the business before the House.

The hour being past 5 o'clock, this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Introduction of Bills		Safe Consumption Site	
Bill 236—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Stalking-Related Measures)		Hiebert	2468
Perchotte	2460	Kinew	2468
		Smith	2469
Ministerial Statements		Manitoba's Homeless Population	
Wildfire Update		Cook	2469
Bushie	2460	Smith	2469
Wowchuk	2461	Kinew	2470
Rendez-vous Canada		West Hawk Lake Residents	
Kennedy	2461	Ewasko	2470
Perchotte	2462	Moyes	2470
Members' Statements		Manitoba's Wildfire Response	
Ethelbert Echo		Wowchuk	2471
Kostyshyn	2462	Bushie	2471
Activities in Midland this Summer		Tyndall Park Students	
Stone	2463	Lamoureux	2472
		Kinew	2472
Prairie Rose Students' Visit to the Legislature		Moses	2473
Lamoureux	2463	Moyes	2473
Headingley Community Events		Fair Trade in Canada Act	
Cook	2464	Pankratz	2473
Government Record on Health Care and Affordability		Kinew	2473
Wasyliw	2464	Construction of Pipeline to Churchill	
		Wasyliw	2474
Oral Questions		Moyes	2474
Fair Trade in Canada Act		Kinew	2474
Khan	2466	Petitions	
Kinew	2466	Location of Safe Injection Sites	
Safe Consumption Site		Hiebert	2474
Khan	2467	Khan	2475
2467	Kinew	Grievances	
		2476	Hiebert

ORDERS OF THE DAY
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Debate on Second Readings

Bill 47—The Fair Trade in Canada (Internal Trade Mutual Recognition) Act and Amendments to The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Buy Manitoba, Buy Canadian Day)	
Ewasko	2478
Goertzen	2478
Schuler	2484

Report Stage Amendments

Bill 5—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impaired Driving Measures)	
Balcaen	2488
Bill 11—The Oil and Gas Amendment Act	
Moses	2491
Bill 21—The Protecting Youth in Sports Act	
Lagassé	2492
Bill 24—The Workers Compensation Amendment Act	
Marcelino	2492
Bill 39—The Public Schools Amendment Act (Campaign Financing for School Trustees)	
Ewasko	2493
Bill 44—The Matriarch Circle Act and Amendments to The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months Act (Ribbon Skirt Day)	
Byram	2494

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

<http://www.manitoba.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>