

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

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

Vol. LXX No. 62A - 10 a.m., Thursday, June 1, 2017

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 1, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Please be seated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. Andrew Micklefield (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, I'd like to canvass the House, see if there's leave for the House leaders to have a 10-minute recess just to negotiate some things about this morning.

An Honourable Member: They recess too.

Mr. Micklefield: Yes, if they want a recess, yes.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to allow the House leaders to have a 10-minute recess with a one-minute warning bell that will call members back to the Chamber? *[Agreed]*

The House recessed at 10:03 a.m.

The House resumed at 10:13 a.m.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, could you canvass the House for leave to allow Bill 223 to go through all stages of the bill process today as follows: (1) second reading of Bill 223 immediately, with this one bill to count as two of the NDP's selected bills for this session under rule 24; (2) referral of Bill 223 to the Standing Committee on Private Bills at 11 o'clock this morning, concurrent with the House sitting; (3) concurrence and third reading of Bill 223 today at the start of Orders of the Day.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to allow Bill 223 to go through all of the stages of the bill process today as follows: (1) second reading of Bill 223 immediately, with this one bill to count as two of the NDP's selected bills for this session under rule 24; (2) referral of Bill 223 to the Standing Committee on Private Bills at 11 this morning, concurrent with the House sitting; and (3) concurrence and third reading of Bill 223 today at the start of Orders of the Day?

And just for clarification, that would be the start of Orders of the Day of this afternoon.

Is there leave? *[Agreed]*

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 223—The Orange Shirt Day Act

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Fort Rouge.

And I would just indicate that we are on second reading of Bill 223, The Orange Shirt Day Act.

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): I move, seconded by the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Lindsey), that Bill 223, The Orange Shirt Day Act; Loi sur la Journée du chandail orange, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Kinew: *Ojibwe spoken. Translation unavailable.*

I always like to start by speaking the language of my ancestors, the Ojibwe language, when I speak about residential schools. I like speaking in the language first to prove that the architects of the residential school era failed in their attempts to eradicate indigenous languages and culture.

And, though they may have failed in their attempts to eradicate indigenous languages and culture, they did succeed in harming many indigenous children, people and families, and that is the importance of the bill that we are here to talk about today.

In the 1970s, Phyllis Webstad, a member of the Stsweccem'c Xgat'tem First Nation in British Columbia, was given an orange shirt by her parents—her parents knowing that she was about to be taken away from them and sent to a residential school in

British Columbia. When she got to the residential school, the people there stripped her of all her clothing and thus was the beginning of her initiation into the Indian residential school system, which the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada has termed a period of cultural genocide.

She never got her orange shirt back. She was six years old at the time. The orange shirt for her came to represent her trauma.

I had the opportunity to meet Phyllis, and it was an important moment for me and also helped to create a symbolic point to rally around to honour, not just the trauma experience by residential school survivors, but the resilience and the hope that so many residential school survivors embody in their lived experience in their personal lives.

So we are blessed in this country to have had the Truth and Reconciliation Commission carry out its mandate for six years. It was begun under former Prime Minister Stephen Harper as a result of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement. Now, the reason residential school survivors asked for a TRC was because that they knew that in settling their class-action lawsuits against the government and the churches responsible for residential schools, that they would not have an opportunity to tell their stories in open court. However, they did want to preserve their experiences and their stories for posterity, believing that in so doing, they would help make our country better, make our country stronger by avoiding the mistakes of the past, and thus was the genesis of the TRC.

The TRC could have been very divisive, but instead, it became an amazing forum for reconciliation and brought people from all walks of life, indigenous people, people from church communities and other faith groups, non-indigenous Canadians, all together, asking the question: How might we make this great country even better by learning from the past?

*(10:20)

One of the expressed commitments of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, as articulated by former Chair, now Senator Murray Sinclair, was that after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, it ought never be possible in this country again to deny the trauma and severity of what happened during the residential school era. And we were reminded earlier this year of the importance of continuing to carry on the mission of the Truth and Reconciliation

Commission, to carry on the mandate of a National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, which is where the archive of the TRC lives, and, indeed, to carry on and continue honouring the stories of residential school survivors.

We were reminded because of the unfortunate comments of Senator Beyak, who attempted to diminish the severity of what occurred here. Essentially, those comments were, yes, this is cultural genocide, but what about the good times, which is an inappropriate comment. And, if we think about those residential school survivors who perhaps sometimes share that—well, first of all, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission tells us that over half of residential school survivors experienced abuse—physical or sexual abuse—in residential schools, but we talk about those other ones who said, no, I had an okay experience, or I had a good experience.

We ought to also remember that even those ones who do not say that they were abused still experienced—or still received the common experience payment from the settlement agreement, and they still received additional compensation for every year that they were taken away from their families.

And the rationale behind that, in the settlement agreement, first 'executed' under former Prime Minister Paul Martin but then carried through by former Prime Minister Stephen Harper, was a recognition that even if children were not abused, by the fact that they were removed by force from their parents, that in itself was wrong and was a mistake on the part of the federal government.

So we have to continue retelling these stories. We have to continue carrying out the mission of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation so that we never forget in this country what happened and that we use whatever feelings of anger or frustration or sadness at the stories of residential school survivors, use that as motivation to carry on work today to make our society fairer and one where everybody can reach their full potential.

I want to acknowledge the role of teachers in helping to make Orange Shirt Day a national event to commemorate residential schools. We have with us today some of members and representatives of the Manitoba Teachers' Society who are wearing the orange shirts that they share with their members, and, in so doing, help to spread the word to all the young children and young people that they are teaching in this province. So I want to say miigwech and thank you.

We also have many of the students who have been studying about residential schools and been studying about Orange Shirt Day, and I would like to acknowledge all of them, because it is they who will carry the stories and remembrance of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on in this country for generations to come.

So we have children here—or young people, rather, from Children of the Earth High School, in Winnipeg, and from Churchill High School, in Winnipeg. And I want to acknowledge all of them, and thank you all for being here.

We also have a representative from the National Centre of Truth and Reconciliation. The NCTR is located at the University of Manitoba, and it is a repository for the archive of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and it will be they who ensure that the stories of residential school survivors and the evidence of what happened during this era are preserved in this country forever. So I also want to say miigwech to the NCTR and to Stephanie Scott for being here today.

And, finally, I want to acknowledge a friend and inspiration and a role model for myself, Mr. Ted Fontaine, who is here and is a survivor of the Assiniboia residential school. So there was actually a residential school just a few kilometres west of where we are right now, on Academy and Route 90. And, in a few short months Ted will be leading—or, rather, in a few short weeks, Ted will be leading a reunion of the survivors of the Assiniboia Residential School, which includes other luminaries such as Phil Fontaine. And so we definitely highlight him and we lift him up and we raise him up.

If we want to learn more about his story, we can read his memoir called *Broken Circle: The Dark Legacy of Indian Residential Schools*. And though his title talks about the dark legacy, I prefer to remember the inspiration that I saw from Ted at the national event for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Edmonton. There is a bentwood box there, where artifacts could be placed in, that would be preserved for posterity at the national centre.

And Ted, that day, he brought a pair of pants that were part of his uniform in the Assiniboia residential school. He shared some of his pain and some of his heartbreak. But then, after putting the pants into the bentwood box and realizing that they would be preserved forever, he said: I am free—I am free.

And I'll always remember that, because I grew up with a residential school survivor, who fought for his whole life for freedom from the trauma and the emotional hardship that he had experienced. And, to see it happen in public on a stage being witnessed by tens of thousands of Canadians from every walk of life, I realized, yes, this country is changing. Yes, this country is getting better. And yes, we have—thanks to the opportunity given to us by residential schools like Ted Fontaine—a chance to do better for our children, for all young people in this country.

So, with that, I say miigwech to the residential school survivors for delivering us to this point, and thank you to all my colleagues today for allowing me to speak on this issue.

Questions

Madam Speaker: A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Questions may be addressed to the sponsoring member by any member in the following sequence: first question to be asked by a member from another party; this is to be followed by a rotation between the parties; each independent member may ask one question; and no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

Are there any questions?

Ms. Janice Morley-Lecomte (Seine River): Can the member for Fort Rouge please explain why, in this spirit of reconciliation, the NDP caucus couldn't reconcile their own differences to have this bill called for debate last week as originally indicated?

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): The term reconciliation, Madam Speaker, is not just a political, a social or a cultural process. It is a spiritual journey. Reconciliation asks: since all of us are fallible human beings, what process can we undertake so that when we do do wrong in our own lives, that we might be able to work together to make ourselves whole? That is a process that I have learned from people like Ted Fontaine, like my late father, my uncles. It is one that I'm committed to walking every day in my life, and, hopefully, we will be able to inspire these young people to go on journeys of reconciliation, be they in the indigenous context or any other, for the rest of their lives as well.

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): My question is—this is very important to me as well—why is it important to educate Manitobans on the legacy of residential schools?

Mr. Kinew: The reason that's it's important to educate all Manitobans, all Canadians about reconciliation, about residential schools is (1) because we want to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. Some of these policy decisions by past governments were instituted because discrimination was accepted in public discourse in our country at the time. We ought never repeat those mistakes.

But, again, it's about more than just highlighting the trauma; it's also about celebrating the resilience.

When I look at somebody like Ted Fontaine, I see a hero. I see somebody who has overcome tremendous odds and become a great person and who has accomplished many things, be they in politics or sports. And, when I think about these stories of inspiration and hope that we can find in our own backyard, I think we should share those things.

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): I want to go back; my colleague from Seine River asked a question that I don't really believe got an answer to it.

Last week, we had the opportunity to bring this bill forward to the floor. We were prepared to debate and even possibly unanimously support it.

I'm just wondering if the member finds it disheartening that his own caucus didn't allow that to happen.

Mr. Kinew: Well, I was pleased to be in Brandon on the weekend to dance at the Brandon University Students' Union graduation powwow. I was pleased to meet with the Bear Clan members that the member from Brandon East honoured yesterday. I was pleased to hear all the support that they have for the initiatives that we're undertaking here in the House.

* (10:30)

So, for me, it's about positivity. It's about looking forward. It's about sharing the pride of indigenous culture, in a way which was not possible in past eras in this country, so that we can celebrate Canada's 150th birthday in the most fulsome, honest and inspiring manner possible.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I just want to congratulate my brother colleague, the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew), for bringing forward this really, really important and timely and really historic bill here to Manitoba.

I would ask my colleague: What are some of the recommendations of the TRC's report, and how does this bill align with those recommendations?

Mr. Kinew: Madam Speaker, Truth and Reconciliation Commission calls to action 62, 63, 64, 65 all have to do with educating Canadians, Manitobans, so that, again, we never forget the trauma that happened in residential schools in the past. We can work to counteract some of the intergenerational impacts that we see, but also that we can celebrate the resilience and the stories of hope. Specifically, residential school—or Truth and Reconciliation Commission call to action 80 calls on us to have a national statutory holiday in honour of residential school survivors.

I'm very proud—I will be very proud of the House today if we can actually act before the federal government does and have a day to honour residential school survivors here in Manitoba, the centre of the country, and perhaps spur on our federal colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): Can the member from Fort Rouge indicate his thoughts on this bill being somewhat of a duplication of the existing messaging of the Truth and Reconciliation recovery?

Mr. Kinew: Madam Speaker, I am very proud to be an honorary witness for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

At the very same national event that I spoke about Ted Fontaine making his contribution to the Bentwood Box, I was inducted as an honorary witness, and I was told to carry on the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission even after its mandate expired in 2015.

So what the member from St. James really wishes to know, and what I will tell him today is that this is a direct continuation of the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. They made the calls to action. Here comes the action.

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): My question is: How many recognized residential schools are there in Manitoba alone? And how many unrecognized residential schools are in Manitoba?

Mr. Kinew: I would like to thank our sister from Kewatinook for the question.

There are several residential schools, which were part of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement

Agreement here in Manitoba. There's the Fort Alexander residential school. There's the Assiniboia residential school. There's the Birtle residential school. There's the Norway House residential school. There are, of course, too many to name, unfortunately, each of them enveloping in them a great many stories of residential school survivors.

In terms of the unrecognized residential schools, it's difficult to say because one might also talk about the day-school experience, which many children also experienced in communities, as well as the experience of Metis survivors, which were not directly included in the settlement agreement.

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Leader of the Official Opposition): I'd like to ask my colleague: What kinds of concrete efforts should be made to reconnect indigenous youth with their culture and heritage, whether it be through the education system or other community-based programs?

Mr. Kinew: The most important work that needs to happen is the work within indigenous families ourselves, the work that I carry out every day in trying to be a more nurturing, supportive and compassionate father, and I welcome every other indigenous parent out there to do the same work and embark on that same journey of self-improvement as I am currently on, because that's how we truly defeat the intergenerational legacy of residential schools.

There are, of course, systemic things which should be undertaken. Again, the TRC calls to action 62, 63, 64, 65 should be implemented by every government at every level. And, of course, everybody who works in the public sphere or the private sector should take a formal course on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Executive Summary, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): I want to ask the sponsor of this bill: As an immigrant, I'm wondering what I can do in order to enhance this reconciliation journey.

Mr. Kinew: Yes, I think it's a very important question, because newcomers are coming to our country for many reasons—in search of opportunities to create a better life—and yet, in joining the Canadian family, also learn about the history of these lands and the history of the people. It's not just limited to residential schools—also going back to time immemorial.

But, beyond that, I believe that there are many affinities and parallels between the experience of newcomers and indigenous communities, and what I get most excited by is not just talking about the past and the trauma but talking about how can we share our cultures with each other and really build a great multicultural, pluralistic society right here on these lands. And so that's the work that I would like to—

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kinew: That's the work that I'd like to carry out, and there is also a Truth and Reconciliation call to action, talking about changing the oath of citizenship to include the indigenous reality as newcomers join the Canadian family as well.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yes, my question relates to those who went to day schools and others in similar circumstances. I'd like to get on record from you that people who attended day school should be included in this day of recognition as well as those who went to residential schools.

Mr. Kinew: Yes, I thank the member from River Heights for the question. I do support having the experience of day school survivors included in the honouring of Orange Shirt Day, because though they may not have been taken away from their families, the same intent underlied the day school system as underlied the residential school system, which was to kill the Indian in the child. That was the term used by government officials at the time: kill the Indian in the child. And, though they were not forced to stay in a residence at a residential school, we know that the attacks on language, culture and the demonization of those children's parents occurred in a very similar way. And so I would like them to be a part of this as well.

Madam Speaker: The time for questions has expired.

Debate is open.

Debate

Ms. Janice Morley-Lecomte (Seine River): I want to thank the House for permitting me to speak to Bill 223, Orange Shirt Day. Orange Shirt Day began, in 2013, and is a legacy to the St. Joseph Mission residential school commemoration event in Williams Lake, BC. It is a day to recognize and acknowledge the harm of the residential school system on children's self-esteem and well-being and the cultural genocide that First Nations people in Canada experienced.

The story behind the orange shirt comes from an indigenous woman named Phyllis Webstad, who went to St. Joseph Mission residential school in 1973. Phyllis was six years old and lived with her grandmother on the Dog Creek reserve, in British Columbia, when she went to St. Joseph Mission. In anticipation of attending a new school, Phyllis's grandmother saved enough money to buy her a new bright orange shirt for her first day. However, when she got to the school, she was stripped and put into a uniform. Her clothes were taken away, including the orange shirt, and never returned to her. Since then, the colour orange has reminded Phyllis of the incident and how she was made to feel worthless. The orange shirt that had originally represented all of the joy and nervous excitement of going to a new school now represents the overwhelming feelings of worthlessness and oppression that she felt at St. Joseph Mission school.

Unfortunately, these experiences are common among residential school survivors. Many indigenous children were taken from their homes and families and made to attend residential schools. In 1931, at the peak of the residential school system, there were about 80 schools operating in Canada. In all, about 150,000 First Nation, Inuit and Metis children were removed from their communities and forced to attend the residential school—to attend the schools.

*(10:40)

Residential schools were established with the assumption that indigenous culture was unable to adapt to a rapidly modernizing society. It was believed that indigenous children could only be successful if they assimilated into mainstream Canadian society and spoke only English or French. Students were discouraged from speaking their first language or practising their traditions. If they were caught, they would experience severe punishment. Throughout the year, students lived in substandard conditions and endured physical and emotional abuse. There have also been convictions of sexual abuse.

Most were in school 10 months a year, away from their parents; some stayed all year round. All correspondence from the children was written in English, which many parents couldn't read. Brothers and sisters at the same school rarely saw each other, as all activities were segregated by gender. When students returned to the reserve, they often felt as if they didn't belong. They didn't have the skills to help

their parents and communities. The skills taught at the schools were generally substandard. Many found it hard to function in an urban setting. It is in this way, and many more, that residential schools had detrimental effects amongst indigenous communities.

These schools had lasting effects on many indigenous people, including Phyllis Webstad. At the age of 27, she went to a treatment centre for healing and has been continuing that journey ever since. Today, Phyllis is married, has one son, a stepson and three grandsons. Since then, the colour orange has reminded Phyllis of the incident and the need to drive a conversation surrounding reconciliation across Canada.

Madam Speaker, Orange Shirt Day happens annually on September 30th across Canada. This date was chosen because it's the time of year children were taken from their homes to residential schools and because it is an opportunity to set the stage for anti-racism and antibullying policies for the coming school year.

Orange Shirt Day is also an opportunity for First Nations, local governments, schools and communities to come together in the spirit of reconciliation and hope for generations of children to come. It is also an opportunity to encourage teachers to educate their students and foster a respectful and welcoming atmosphere in their classrooms.

The campaign slogan, Every Child Matters, reflects a message of inclusion and education about the legacy and impact of residential schools. This slogan also serves as a reminder of emotional damage caused by residential schools and our constant drive for inclusivity in our future.

Orange Shirt Day has seen participation from numerous groups in Manitoba, including the Manitoba Teachers' Society, schools across the province, the University of Manitoba's nursing association. Widespread support is truly a testament in our path to inclusivity. To this group, we proudly add the government of Manitoba now.

Recommendations from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission include educating Canadians about what happened to indigenous children when they were sent to residential schools. The government of Manitoba was the first jurisdiction in Canada to officially recognize indigenous languages and pass reconciliation legislation under The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act and Path to Reconciliation Act.

Our government has also put initiatives in our budget to assist with truth and reconciliation: northern success, Heart Medicine Lodge, Operation Return Home and urban Aboriginal Economic Development zones. This government is working hard to address the gaps between indigenous and non-indigenous achievements.

In addition, The Path to Reconciliation Act of 2015 empowers the Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations (Ms. Clarke) to lead the government's participation in the reconciliation process by developing a reconciliation strategy.

Madam Speaker, as people learn and appreciate the uniqueness of the individual, which makes for a great country, will we then embrace the differences that exist in our society? Orange Shirt Day will honour individuals like Phyllis Webstad through awareness and offering support.

We are an inclusive and transparent government, which will support all individuals. Thank you.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I'm pleased to put a couple of words, briefly, on the record. But first, again, let me reiterate that I say miigwech to my brother colleague, the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew). I just want to acknowledge his dad as well.

You know, as you can see, Madam Speaker, you know, Bill 223 represents perhaps something that many of us wouldn't have thought we would have seen, and, certainly, many of our grandfathers and our parents, that we would be debating in this House the need to recognize and honour residential school survivors.

So today is a really good day and, as I've said often in this House speaking about a variety of different issues, today wouldn't have happened if it hadn't been for individuals like Ted Fontaine. So I do want to acknowledge my relative who's in the House today who also went to residential school with my cousin, Phil Fontaine, who really brought all of Canada, all of Canadians on this journey of healing and recognition and reconciliation. So I really do want to just put on the records officially the courageous work of residential school survivors in bringing us to where we are today. None of that would have happened if it wasn't for our individuals like my relatives.

So, certainly, today, you know, while I recognize the member for Fort Rouge, I think that the member for Fort Rouge would agree with me that the honour

and recognition goes to our fellow residential school survivors, and I say miigwech.

Speaker's Statement

Madam Speaker: I have a statement for the House.

I am advising the House that I have received a letter from the Opposition House Leader indicating that the government caucus has identified bill two twenty-oh, pardon me—that the opposition caucus has identified Bill 223, The Orange Shirt Day Act, as the first and second of their three selected bills for this session.

As a reminder to the House, rule 24 permits each recognized party to select up to three private members' bills per session to proceed to a second reading vote and requires the House leader to provide written notice as to the date and time of the vote.

The Opposition House Leader has therefore advised that the question will be put on second reading of Bill 223 today, June 1st, 2017, at 10:58 a.m.

Debate (Continued)

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): The history of our residential school system persists to this day. Many of the challenges our indigenous people face can be attributed to the harsh reality that indigenous youth had to endure.

Both my parents are residential school survivors. My dad went to Assiniboia for one year and then Guy Hill for two. My mom went to the Camperville one and I, myself, went to the unrecognized schools in Thompson and the one in Teulon, Manitoba. And I attended as well as everybody in the Island Lake community's day school in St. Theresa Point First Nation.

Attempts to systematically strip away our history, culture and languages went on for over 100 years, targeting thousands of children who were removed from their homes. There are a multitude of stories of physiological, physical and spiritual abuse at the hands of those who were supposed to take care of the children.

One such story is that of Phyllis Jack Webstad from the BC's First Nation—one of the—one of BC's First Nation communities. Phyllis shared her story of how her new orange shirt was taken away on her first day of school, and I join with my colleagues today in

wearing an orange shirt to commemorate what happened to this young person.

This story is common, though; many children were stripped of anything that would remind them of home or of their indigenous culture, including the long hair that held significant cultural meaning. The schools did this for a purpose. They wanted the children in these schools to be ashamed of their indigenous culture and heritage. Doing this, many children developed feelings of worthlessness, insignificance and of inferiority.

Nowadays, we use the—Phyllis's orange shirt as a symbol of remembrance for residential school survivors.

But while we remember those who survived, we must also remember the children who did not. Many children never got the chance to go back home to be reconnected with their parents, never to see their parents' smiles.

A national day recognizing and remembering the impact of the Indian residential school that had—on survivors is one of the recommendations made by the TRC.

*(10:50)

Here's homework for everyone here today. IRS is being studied in every school across Manitoba. Gather your young ones this weekend and tell them that Indians kids, Native kids, were stolen, that someone simply came to their homes and just took all the children. The parents could not say one word to stop it without getting punished. Parents were later villainized. Memorize the look of the shock of the face—on the faces of your young ones. Your young ones know that taking away children is horribly wrong. Help them learn to cope and deal with this. I know my kids in Steinbach are reading Broken Circle, and I'm deeply honoured to have met the author, Mr. Ted Fontaine.

Thank you, and I want to thank the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) for bringing this Bill 223 forward.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): Again, it's a absolute honour to put a few words and support my brother's Bill 223 to recognize September 30th as Orange Shirt Day Act—Orange Shirt Day.

It's important that this bill goes through, because this bill declares and also honours our residential

school survivors, and also to educate Manitobans on the legacy of residential schools.

I just wanted to share a few words. While I was part of chief and council for Opaskwayak Cree Nation, I had the honour to work with Swampy Cree Tribal Council, and what we did—we worked with residential school survivors when we were working under the Aboriginal Healing Foundation. It came to our attention that that funding was going to end, which means there would be no more support systems for our residential school survivors. So, with that, I approached my Member of Parliament, Niki Ashton, and asked for her support and for her advocacy to basically lobby the federal government to extend this Aboriginal Healing Foundation funding. So, with that, we produced a petition that went nationwide, with many people supporting, to urge the federal government to extend this funding.

And, with that—during that path, I also had the honour, while I was working with the residential school survivors in my communities, I also had the honour to cross paths with Mr. Ted Fontaine, which was an honour to meet him.

And, with that, too, while I was working with Niki Ashton regarding this call to extend the funding, I also met my brother, member for Fort Rouge, for the first time, when he worked for CBC. We were at the Canad Inns Polo Park, and we were basically having a press conference to educate why it was very important. So I remember I was asked a question by him and—I don't know if you remember that, but I sure do—so. And also that—with that, even though we had a petition going, educating Canadians about the importance of our residential school survivors, we also had—the House of Commons even had an emergency debate. And I remember that. And it was very significant that they actually listened—had an emergency debate. However, it wasn't passed. But the point is that we got our point out there.

So I just wanted to say that, you know, with residential schools, it's very important to have that in our education system. Like, for example, at the UCN summer camp, we had the honour to listen to Justice Murray Sinclair. And I just wanted to share that not one person moved at all; nobody wanted to miss one word of what he had to say with his findings, with his experience across Canada listening to our residential school survivors. And there was this one quote I'll always remember. He said—one thing he said was, it's not an Aboriginal problem; in fact, it's a Canadian problem. So that always stuck with me.

So my great-grandmother, my grandmother, my mother were all residential school survivors. And just like with my brother from Fort Rouge said, you know, I'm the product of intergenerational effects.

And I just also wanted to recognize in my community, at the Guy Hill Residential School, every August long weekend, former survivors and their families gather there every long weekend to honour those who have passed and who—and those who did not live to see the work of the general—to reconcile the general—I mean, the cultural genocide of residential schools.

So, with that I just want to dedicate these words then, today, as well, to my great grandmother, my grandmother and my mother who, again, who did not live to see the work to reconcile that cultural genocide of residential schools, and also to all the families who were out there who have been affected by this experience.

So, with that—it's an honour. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further speakers on debate? Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 223, The Orange Shirt Day Act.

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

Hon. Andrew Micklefield (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, I'd like to see if there's leave of the House to call this vote as—or to record this vote as unanimous.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to record the vote as unanimous? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Micklefield: Madam Speaker, I'd like to see if there's leave of the House to call it 11 o'clock—*[interjection]* Oh, after I read this important committee announcement.

House Business

Mr. Micklefield: On House business, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Private Bills will meet on Thursday, June 1st, 2017, at 11 p.m., to consider the following: Bill 223—

An Honourable Member: a.m.

Mr. Micklefield: Sorry, that's a typo. No, I didn't mean to scare anybody. I'll start again.

Madam Speaker, on House business, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Private Bills will meet on Thursday, June 1st, 2017, at 11 a.m., to consider the following: Bill 223, The Orange Shirt Day Act.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Private Bills will meet on Thursday, June 1st, 2017, at 11 p.m.—11 a.m., to consider the following: Bill 223, The Orange Shirt Day Act.

Mr. Micklefield: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if you could canvass the House to see if there is leave to call it 11 a.m.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave of the House to call it 11 a.m. *[Agreed]*

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 19—Committing to an East-West Power Grid for Manitoba

Madam Speaker: The hour is now 11 a.m. and time for private members' resolutions. The resolution before us this morning is the resolution Committing to an East-West Power Grid for Manitoba, brought forward by the honourable member for Elmwood.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I move, seconded by the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino), that

WHEREAS the Manitoba New Democratic Party (NDP) has long been an advocate for an east-west power grid in Canada; and

WHEREAS the construction of an east-west electrical transmission connection in Manitoba would allow for the flow of new, clean hydroelectric power to other provincial markets; and

WHEREAS the former NDP Provincial Government was actively promoting the export of electricity, and engaging in discussions with the Federal and other Provincial Governments to encourage interprovincial sale of electricity; and

WHEREAS an east-west power grid would reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Manitoba and Canada and would help Manitoba contribute to national emissions reduction targets; and

WHEREAS the existing north-south power grid means Manitoba primarily exports surplus power to

the U.S., while other provinces like Saskatchewan continue to burn coal to generate power; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government's national climate change plan will require innovative solutions and provides the opportunity for new initiatives which will meet the Canadian energy needs of the future.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the provincial government to commit to partnering with the federal and other provincial governments to create an east-west power grid and to continue to pursue export opportunities for Manitoba–Manitoba's hydroelectric power.

Motion presented.

* (11:00)

Mr. Maloway: I'm very pleased to speak today to this private member's resolution, Committing to an East-West Power Grid for Manitoba.

Now, this is an idea that has been discussed for quite a number of years. I would say too many years, actually, because I would have thought that we would've had action on the east-west power grid way back a number of years ago.

And I just want to, you know—before the members have—start too much heckling, I just want to give a bit of history on the discussion surrounding the proposed power grid. And, you know, when I was a MP back in 2008, I did have occasion to make a speech about a power grid and how it was we had all these Conservative MPs in Ottawa and giving some ideas as to what they could be doing with their time and promoting the idea of it—of an east-west power grid would be a very good idea.

And that, in fact, it was on the same level of John A. Macdonald's campaign to build a railway across the country, the CPR, which in effect united Canada—made Canada a country, actually, at a time when there was a lot of pressure to have parts of Canada gobbled up by the United States. It was a time of US expansionism.

At the time of the Napoleonic wars the Americans had expanded by buying Louisiana and they were looking north to take parts of British North America. And so at the time John A. Macdonald had a campaign where he campaigned on building a railway across the country to unite the colonies and form a separate country known as Canada.

And so my argument was that, well, if you could do it with a railway, that today, all these years later, that this was the equivalent, that an east-west power grid would be the equivalent of a railway.

And so, when I was making probably my second or third speech on this topic, the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher), who was a member of Parliament at the time and part of the federal Cabinet, came on over to listen to my speech and he said, you know, you and I should talk about this because I have a deep interest in this and, you know, you have connections with the provincial government, the NDP government at the time, and he was in the federal Cabinet and he was involved in the infrastructure program, which involved several billion dollars. And, while Denis Lebel was the head of the entire program, he was more responsible for the eastern portions of the fund.

And so I did meet with the member for Assiniboia several times and he had some interesting charts on his walls, and he's quite an expert in the hydro field because his background was engineering. And, you know, one of his plans was a DC line. He wanted to build a DC line from Thompson area all the way to the—to Fort McMurray in Alberta, you know, to provide a clean power to the Fort McMurray area.

He had other ideas where he thought we could build an AC line to the Ring of Fire, which is outside of Thunder Bay, north of Thunder Bay, which is going to be a huge developing area in the next number of years for mining activity, and there would be big need for power in that area.

So what we did was we convened some communications with the Minister Chomiak, who was the minister here in Manitoba, with the honourable member for Assiniboia, and discussions were being made to somehow look at promoting this power grid across the country. And, of course, at that time, shortly thereafter, the honourable member was demoted from the federal Cabinet and the conversation seemed to somewhat drop after that point.

But the reality is that there's a lot of good arguments for this and some of them are, you know, just basically security issues. Our power lines, historically, and our contracts, are with the Americans in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and when you look at Quebec power, it's the same with them. The power goes south and there's nothing wrong with that because those power contracts are very—

they're very high price. There's a lot of money coming from those contracts so we don't want to stop that.

But, on the other hand, if you think of the grid security, that if something were to happen to the United States grid, we would be in big trouble because we don't have an east-west power grid. So we're basically at the mercy of their grid, and I know that the Americans have, you know, military considerations, as well, and, you know, they, too, would like to see an east-west power grid in Canada for those security reasons because if something were to happen with their grid, it would be nice for them to be able to rely on our power grid up here.

And so there's—it's the same argument, Madam Speaker, that we make when we're talking about the construction of Bipole III. I mean, today it's Bipole III, but a number of years from now, when the members opposite are much older than they are right now, we'll be discussing bipole IV and V. I mean, so there is a security issue involved in these, and the age of the bipoles were such that a third one have to be built, and there's security in building where it is, because if we had gone down the east side, we would have had all our bipoles within too close an area. So, if there was an ice storm similar to what happened in Quebec a number of years ago, we could take down our whole capacity on one ice storm. So the likelihood of one ice storm taking out a third bipole that is away around by the Saskatchewan border is more remote.

So, in any event, you know, at a certain point, we know that, you know, it's just common sense. The economics are—have, I guess, not been there in some ways because a number of years ago there was a plan to build—when Bob Rae was the premier of Ontario—to build a power line through northern Ontario on to southern Ontario. Many of us think that would have been a good move at the time, and, lately, there have been power contracts signed with Saskatchewan.

Madam Speaker, part of the member for Assiniboia's (Mr. Fletcher) idea with the DC line was to have a drop-off of power in Saskatchewan. So power would be going to Alberta, but there would also be a plan to drop power into Saskatchewan, as well, which, you know, Saskatchewan does need electrical power. It's been—had coal-fired plants. And so you'll notice that the government, when they did announce the Bipole III towards Saskatchewan, they were in the midst of negotiating, and they did sign onto some contracts with Saskatchewan.

And one of the other ideas—and I'm sure that Hydro is looking at this; I'm sure the—this is right up the Conservatives' alley—we did have interest from a government, like the government of Alberta, to actually build one of our plants. So, you know, if we were looking at worrying about financing like the next Hydro plant, we had willing listeners in other provincial governments. In other words, the government of Alberta of the day would be interested in financial involvement in the ownership of one or—well, I—yes, I guess a contribution. It would be a financial arrangement, anyway, where they would certainly buy the power but they would help finance the plan. So there's all sorts of different, you know, interesting ideas being discussed and it really takes some vision, and the member for Assiniboia was showing it.

But we don't see that vision being accepted by the other members of this government. They seem to be more interested in basically heading towards a privatization of the Hydro system and firing the employees and raising the rates through the roof. That seems to be where they—what they are working on, and which is not right.

* (11:10)

Questions

Madam Speaker: A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held, and questions may be addressed in the following sequence: the first question may be asked by a member from another party; any subsequent questions must follow a rotation between parties; each independent member may ask one question; and no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake): Madam Speaker, I know the NDP flip-flops on many issues—here on this, there on that.

So, if this is a major concern or initiative for the NDP, can the member of Elmwood please explain why his government did not implement this when they were in power for the past 17 years?

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Well, actually, I just explained that. If he had listened to the 10 minutes that I was speaking, I was trying to explain to him. And all he had to do was talk to his member from Assiniboia to know that work was being done where the member for Assiniboia wanted to connect with the Manitoba government while he was Infrastructure minister with the view to doing exactly

what we're talking about, working on the east-west power grid.

I don't know why they don't get with the program and start doing things productive rather than just being negative all the time. And they end up firing employees and getting the corporation ready for privatization—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Madam Speaker, I want to compliment my friend from Elmwood for bringing this forward this morning.

How would—I would like to ask him, how would Canada benefit from an east-west hydroelectric power grid?

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank the member for the question, and it's a very good question.

And there are huge benefits to Canada, not the least of which was, for example, all you have to do is take a look at the Ring of Fire north of Thunder Bay to realize that they're going to have to provide power to that area. And electrical power is clean and that is a ready market for us if we want to take it.

It takes the government to show some initiative in the area, and it takes more than just the Manitoba government. We have to look at the federal government, too, and the federal government is—I mean, have they approached the federal government in any way, shape or form to build power lines anywhere? I'd just like to ask that question. We've had it—

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): Manitoba Hydro's debt is expected to nearly double to \$25 billion within the next three or four years.

Can the member for Elmwood please explain to the House why his resolution ignores this?

Mr. Maloway: You know, I—the Conservatives are constantly talking about the debt load of Manitoba Hydro, and never do I ever hear them talk of—they obviously don't understand what a balance sheet is, but they—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Maloway: What they do is they talk about the debt. Well, if you've got a debt on a house through a mortgage, right, you have to consider that the house—that the mortgage is 100,000, the house is worth 200,000 on the market; you have an equity there of \$100,000. So you have to value—you don't just look at the debt of the government or debt of Hydro without looking the—at the value of the assets and the replacement costs of those assets. And they should start—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, could the member from Elmwood explain to us—
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lindsey: —how the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) 'polititization' of Manitoba Hydro is harmful for Manitoba families?

Mr. Maloway: Well, I think the Conservatives have taken the wrong approach. If they were looking at expanding Hydro and building an east-west power grid and expanding the market and improving the situation in Manitoba in terms of hydro, if they would do that, that would be fine.

But what they're doing is they're appointing their buddies to the board with the idea that the—privatization is a long-range goal. It's the same pattern that the Conservatives developed with the Manitoba Telephone System, you know. It was, you know—put their friends in control in the board, and then start working towards the eventual privatization. I mean, it's the same pattern that we're seeing develop there that we saw with the Manitoba Telephone System.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk (Arthur-Virden): The NDP promised Manitobans that Bipole III wouldn't cost them a nickel. Can the member of Elmwood please tell Manitobans how much more debt the NDP expects them to take?

Mr. Maloway: Well, I mean, the fact of the matter is that the grid—or, the system that we have, like anything else, ages over time, and things have to be replaced. And we have said—I mean, the bipoles are a security issue. The other bipoles are aging. We had to build a third bipole.

The question was not—you know, whether it had to be done, it was just, like, when it had to be done. And the other question was the route that it should take. And, at the end of the day, in the course of 100 years, we're going to be building another bipole. So for those people who wanted one on the east side, well, you'll have your opportunity to argue that next, when we do build bipole IV.

Mr. Allum: What is Manitoba's role in the expansion in clean, renewable energy for Canada?

Mr. Maloway: Well, I'd like to thank the member for another excellent question. And what we have to say that Manitoba is one of, I guess, three jurisdictions in Canada that has a really big capacity for clean electrical power.

We have, I think, the potential of about, I think it's 10,000 megawatts, and so far I think we've developed only about half of that. A little more than half of that—around 5,690, evidently. So there's more—we can practically double the capacity have 'wight'—right now, and given that the—you know, the history of climate change and the desire to get off fossil fuels—I mean, hydro is just a natural source of power and we should be taking—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Johnson: The member talks about running transmission lines to the ring of fire with minimal market. With that in mind, the Manitoba ratepayers are now paying for mistakes of the NDP—what's known as the NDP bipole-Keeyask levy.

Is this another debt legacy that they expect Manitoban taxpayers to pay for?

Mr. Maloway: Well, it seems to me that the Conservative plan would be, you know, have gas-fired plants.

I'm sure that if you dug deep into where they would like to go, they would—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maloway: —get out of the hydro business completely and go back to coal-fired plants. That is where they—the fact of the matter is that they have really no vision if they are going to ignore a natural resource like Manitoba Hydro, that is only built at this point with 50 per cent of its capacity. If they're failed to see the opportunities there for export sales and selling to other markets, then—I mean, this government is going to be short-lived.

Mr. Lindsey: Could the member from Elmwood explain the Conservative government—what they need to do to make Manitoba's hydro supply reliable, protected and affordable?

Mr. Maloway: Well, they're certainly not headed in the right direction.

First of all, they politicized the board. Number 2, they've laid off 900 people, and probably more to come. The concentration here will be privatizing the—well, for—raising the rates, which they're currently doing by huge amounts—leaps and bounds. And making the utility in—a more attractive take-over target for privatization.

Well, that's what they're doing. What they should be doing is, once again, listen to the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Fletcher), start consulting with the federal government, start trying to sell—get hydro contracts from Saskatchewan, from the province—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

* (11:20)

Mr. Smook: It's no secret that Manitoba Hydro is facing serious financial problems as a result of 17 years of politically motivated decisions by the NDP government.

Can the member explain why he thinks this is okay?

Mr. Maloway: The member should know that before Manitoba Hydro embarks on building a hydro plant they get presigned sales contracts, very lucrative contracts, signed with users in Minnesota, signed with users in Wisconsin. That's what fuels the plants. When people are building, for example, condo projects or any kind of construction, there's a—they presell the units. They don't go and start building projects unless they have a certain amount of units sold.

It's the same idea here. We sell power contracts and then we start constructing. They should just be selling more to Saskatchewan, more to Alberta, more—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

The time for questions has expired.

Debate

Madam Speaker: Debate is open.

Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake): I guess the question period kind of explains why we ended up in

a debt of—a decade of debt, a decade of decay, and a decade of decline. I don't think we'll be taking advice from the NDP on Hydro. It's a little bit ironic—*[interjection]*

Oh, sorry about that—little bit ironic, for the lack of a better word.

An Honourable Member: Start again.

Mr. Johnson: Better start again—could everybody hear me? I'll just keep going. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Johnson: So who's going to pay for these hydro lines? Are we going to pay for these hydro lines in all the other provinces? You know, are we going to—are we, as Manitoba Hydro, going to put all the lines across Canada? There's not much thought behind this, put lines to the ring of fire and just leave them dangling and hope that mineral prices are going to come up and somebody's going to start buying power there at some point. There's got to be a little more thought to it than the member's put into it, for sure.

We once again—we see that the NDP is not concerned at all with the Manitoban taxpayer. This is really typical NDP style, and as we've seen them, how they rushed the bipole and the Keeyask projects, they were politically forced through and they weren't weighed with the problems that they could potentially have. So the benefits to the consumer cannot be—cannot outweigh benefits to the Manitoba taxpayer.

They take, you know, multiple things. They take East Side Road Authority—you know, there's another example of another NDP debacle. You know, \$150 million spent on community benefit agreements just mere weeks before the election; you know, that's a little underhanded.

So, you know, under the NDP, the hydro rates have doubled at more than the rate of inflation. Rate increases we now—we see now are a direct result of mismanagement and political interference, as well, we can't forget that, of the—of Manitoba Hydro, our crown jewel.

So Manitoba families are now being asked to pay for more of that NDP recklessness. So you—he mentioned mortgages earlier; think of your personal finances. If you owe \$200,000 on a \$220,000 house, you're not going to mortgage it to \$300,000 when you have an asset of \$220,000. That's a little bit ridiculous.

So we all know that Manitoba Hydro's debt is doubling. It's doubling to \$25 billion—and that's billion with a B—within the next three to four years, and this is just due to the NDP rushed decisions on the bipole transmission line, not to mention the Keeyask dam. And I must add, they did not send it the Public Utilities Board. They just pushed it through.

So the major reason for Hydro's deterioration, for lack of a better term, their deteriorating financial position, is because of the recklessness of the politically motivated decisions from the previous NDP government. And now who's left on the hook? Who's left on the hook with this?

An Honourable Member: Manitobans.

Mr. Johnson: Exactly. Manitobans, ratepayers, are now left paying the bill. They are paying the bill for the NDP's poor decision in marketing.

When Manitobans see their hydro bill, they need to know where—that they're paying for the 'russ' decisions to build Bipole III and Keeyask. That's very, very simple. It's the bipole-Keeyask levy, is what it should actually be called. It should even have a separate spot on the hydro bill for this debacle.

The previous NDP government refused to implement a stand-alone demand-side management, even after recommendations from the Public Utilities Board in 2014. So I don't know if much of you recall, but in 2004—I believe that's the year; I'd have to check my notes—but in 2004, we went through a drought and Manitoba Hydro actually lost \$400 million that year—\$400 million for a drought. They had to buy the power. So the demand-side management that they're thinking is such a poor idea, if we can reduce our consumption in Manitoba, we will not have to purchase as much power. So, if demand-side management was a stand-alone, and if they would've managed that properly and brought on in the past, we might've lost no money that year with Manitoba Hydro. Four hundred million dollars down the drain that we had to purchase from other provinces and states.

So our government has already taken action to follow through with the Public Utilities Board's recommendation. So that's something that is very positive coming forward.

The previous government refused to tell the truth about the cost of the bipole and Keeyask as well. The, you know, how could they—if they told the truth, how could they sell that to the taxpayer and

never mind the ratepayer? Who would buy that line? And the bipole line will not cost taxpayers a single cent. That's out there in print. That's put out there. They sent that as a mailer and sent that across Manitoba. That's ridiculous to think that people would believe that.

So Bipole III is now expected to cost nearly \$400 million more than originally estimated, and the Keeyask price tag has skyrocketed just over budget by another \$2.2 billion. They refused to tell the truth then; I don't think they'll start doing that today. So two hundred and—\$2.2 billion, and they say it will not cost a single cent. Well, they're right. It did not cost a single cent; it cost 220 billion cents, almost a quarter trillion cents, just on that one thing alone.

So the Public Utilities Board is recommending, in a 2014 review of Manitoba Hydro's major capital plan standings, there is an inherent conflict of interest when a utility, as both a seller of electricity and trying to save electricity—so the NDP has refused to act on this.

So I can see my time is going very quickly here. So I just want to say a few quotes here.

Here's something. We've always said we're putting in place a separate demand-side agency. Who would've said that? Who would've said that? That was Dave Chomiak, the former NDP minister. Now, NDP is in opposition, opposition of this demand-side management.

* (11:30)

So I want to get to some more points here. So just rerouting the Bipole III transmission line down the west side of the province was obviously a wrong decision. So this is a quote, by the way: So rerouting the Bipole III transmission line down the west side of the province was obviously a wrong decision, one forced on Hydro by the previous government, and it has cost Manitobans an additional \$900 million. However, the review concluded that if construction is not completed, Keeyask exports contracts will not be filled, making the new 'generashing' station an asset incapable of generating revenues for many years.

So I don't know if the member's suggesting that we just build lines and leave them dangle over the Ontario border, or maybe even if we pay for it to go all the way to the Ring of Fire and cost Manitoba taxpayers a pile of money and not even have anybody plug into them.

The Ontario infrastructure is not ready for us. This—that's just some simple facts. So Manitobans have elected a Progressive Conservative government committed to fixing our finances, repairing our services and rebuilding our economy. That's what we're here to do, and I don't feel taking advice from a government that has put through so many poor projects—that this is here to help the taxpayer or the ratepayer.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): I am utterly and completely delighted to stand up today and put my full support behind this sensational resolution put forward by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

Mrs. Sarah Guillemard, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

I want to say, just to government members, this is what innovation looks like. This is what inspiration looks like. This is what vision looks like.

And if you would just read the therefore be it resolved of this particular resolution, it wouldn't be hard to get on board. We already know that the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade (Mr. Cullen) is on the public record as supporting this idea. We already know that the member from Assiniboia has written extensively about this idea, and he's already on board. If you don't believe the NDP, then listen to your own minister; listen to your own government member, because it's a good idea. It's a good idea for this province; it's a good idea for this country.

And so I simply wanted to be on record today to say if you believe in building this province, if you believe in building this nation, if you really want to be a global citizen, get on board, build this line. Let's build this country and let's fight climate change together. It's not that hard.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): Madam Speaker, people are very passionate today here in the House.

I'd like to thank the member from Elmwood for bringing forward this resolution.

Hydroelectricity is important to the well-being and prosperity of our province. Through partnerships and co-operation and having all three levels of government work together, Manitoba can be the prosperous province that we all aspire for it to be.

An east-west transmission connection will increase exports of Manitoba energy. Madam Deputy Speaker, encouraging trade is an idea I'm pretty sure

that we can all get behind. Currently, our energy exports are largely being sent to the US. However, Manitoba-generated energy is Canadian energy, and we should encourage the sale and distribution of excess power supply to other provinces.

And while the generation of hydroelectricity does come with its own issues, we must do our part to reduce the impacts of burning non-renewable energy sources.

You know, 30 per cent of Saskatchewan's energy production is done through burning coal and, Madam Deputy Speaker, the federal government has mandated that all coal-fired units built before 1975 must close by 2020.

There are things being done, and an east-west energy grid is a way we can capitalize on the higher demand for renewable energy sources. The case for creating an east-west power grid in Canada has both environmental and economic benefits. While many provinces are looking to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to meet the federal government's climate change plans, we can fill that need and better utilize our excess hydroelectric power.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Sarah Guillemard): The honourable member for Tyndall—oh, sorry—the honourable member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): I rise today to put some words on record in regards to the resolution brought forward by the member from Elmwood. I actually thank him for bringing this resolution forward because the other day the member from Morris had brought a resolution forward and it spoke about the previous government's mismanagement of Hydro, and this gives me the opportunity to put a few more words on record.

Committing to an East-West Power Grid for Manitoba: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think that an east-west power grid for Manitoba is a good idea, but where have the NDP been for the last 17 years? In the last six and a half years that I've been in this Legislature, I can't recall it being one of their major priorities. I agree we should be looking to partner with other provinces and the federal government to share ideas and look for new ones—ones that benefit all parties.

One such partnership is the New West Partnership. The member from Elmwood talks about Fort McMurray with our provinces to the west. For

as long as I have been in this Legislature our PC team has been advocating to join this partnership, but year after year the NDP kept speaking out our bills.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

Now that our PC team has a mandate from the people of Manitoba, we will be joining the New West Partnership, and we will be working with our neighbours to the west to come up with innovative solutions to address our future power needs.

Madam Speaker, we can see that the previous NDP government was not concerned about the Manitoba taxpayer when it came to the operation of Manitoba Hydro. They made politically motivated decisions and rushed the building of Bipole III and Keeyask. They did everything they could to put the projects past the point of no return so the projects could not be stopped.

One such example is the use of untendered contracts—hundreds of millions of dollars' worth. We all know that when you give someone an open chequebook it is hard to know whether you're receiving value for your dollar.

The NDP could have waited another 15 years to build instead of putting—adding to Hydro's debt load. Now we don't know where this is going to go with our future generations.

It is anticipated that Hydro rates are going to double over the next 20 years, and why? Because of the last decade of NDP political interference and mismanagement of Manitoba Hydro, Madam Speaker. And who is going to pay for this? Manitobans are going to pay for this. Even in 2011, before the election, in an NDP mailer and the Winnipeg Sun, it was stated the bipole line will not cost taxpayers a single cent.

Well, Madam Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Manitobans will be paying for every cent of Bipole III. One must wonder whether that statement was not politically motivated. I would think that that would probably be a fair assumption, that it was a total political motivation just before an election. How could someone make such a huge mistake to be so far out from costing nothing to costing billions?

Madam Speaker, Manitoba's hydro debt will double to \$25 billion within the next three to four years due to NDP rush decisions to build the bipole transmission line and Keeyask dam, and without prior Public Utilities Board scrutiny. This has led to

Hydro's deteriorating financial position. Ratepayers are now left to pay this bill for the NDP's poor decision.

The member talks about sending hydro west. Madam Speaker, if the NDP would have not been in such a rush to build the bipole line, there may have been opportunity to send hydro west to Saskatchewan and Alberta, as the member says, for Fort McMurray, and, also, to the Ring of Fire that he talks about in Ontario. But they had—they were in such a hurry to rush that they did not look at any different routes. They would not take a—look at anything.

* (11:40)

Fort McMurray and other places, yes, they're going to need power. So will the Ring of Fire. So why did the NDP rush in to building the bipole and the Keeyask when they never looked at any of the considerations for anything else?

Madam Speaker, the NDP have had a hard time listening to recommendations. They have shown that time and time again, whether it be health care or Hydro, they just don't listen. They just don't listen to recommendations. They would not even give the PUB the ability to look at all options for Bipole III.

They were in—they were afraid of what the PUB comments would be. They would not listen to anybody. They had a politically motivated decision, and that's what they made. The previous government refused to tell the truth about the cost of bipole and Keeyask. We've had nothing but cost overruns, continually cost overruns, cost overruns. And who's going to pay for this? The Manitoba taxpayer and the Manitoba ratepayer. Bipole III is now expected to cost nearly \$400 million more than originally estimated, and Keeyask's price tag has skyrocketed by \$2.2 billion. But yet the NDP refused to tell Manitobans what it was.

Again, going back to the will not cost Manitobans one cent. Well, Madam Speaker, one cent and several billion dollars—there is quite a difference. So I just really wonder about that. *[interjection]* No, I'm not done, I was just thirsty.

Manitoba ratepayers are now paying for the mistakes of the NDP bipole-Keeyask levy, as it will be known for generations, will be another NDP debt legacy our children and your children, our grandchildren and your grandchildren, our great grandchildren and your great grandchildren will be paying for this for generations to come. And I—and

that goes for a lot of the decisions that were made by the NDP government.

I know many Manitobans are tired of the debt that the NDP left our future generations. In 2016, Manitobans elected a Progressive Conservative government committed to fixing the finances, repairing our services and rebuilding our economy. And that is just what we were—what we are going to do. So I wish that the previous government—the opposition would get on board, support some of the initiatives we're taking to make Manitoba a better place. A better place for everybody, not just for them or us, but for everybody in Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): The resolution that's being put forward by the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) makes more sense if we are to compare it to the style of the current government that advocates only a short-sighted look at the future. The future of Manitoba rests entirely on the use of resources that we have. And the resources that we have, first of all, are our people. And then our natural resources that come as God's gift to Manitoba.

One of those are the potential for generation of power through Manitoba Hydro. And, when Manitoba Hydro was started, and—it was initiated to explore and exploit the use of water. That, we have in abundance. The Winnipeg River was an excellent example of perfect use of water, meaning without wasting anything, we generate power from the power of water.

And the short focus and attention span of the Conservative government, the current government, seems to be focused entirely and concentrated on the bottom line. And the outlook that the Conservative government now has is always the future for them is only 10 years from now. What we need is leadership, a leadership that will paint a picture of the dreams that we have and not really overlooking the needs of generations to come. What we need are people who will come into leadership and invest in our future.

Now, the difference between the outlook of the Conservative government, the current government of the day, is always the bottom line. From the former government's point of view, we are investing in our future. And what better time to invest in our infrastructure than now, when interest rates are low?

And the crisis that's being manufactured in the imagination of the Conservative government and its

policy makers and its analysts is that there's a crisis. The—even the Minister for Crown Services, the one who's in charge of Hydro, calls it bankrupt, and there is a—it is an emotionally loaded word. Bankrupt means insolvent and when we call a Crown corporation that, it reflects entirely on the attitude of the current government. The current government says bankrupt—the Crown corporation is bankrupt, even when it's not, and even the CEO of Hydro said that it's 'furthest' from the truth. There's no crisis in Manitoba Hydro. We owe money, it's true, but it is not bankrupt.

And the east-west grid that's the subject of this resolution is meant to dovetail on the work—on the excellent work of somebody from the Conservative caucus who happens to be the member from Assiniboia. And he's one who has made a name for himself in doing what is good and I applaud him for it, sincerely and emphatically, no partisan colour.

* (11:50)

It speaks volumes that the member from Assiniboia can propose something like that east-west grid as a vision for Manitoba Hydro, and it dovetails, too, with what we have now which is the Bipole III.

And I think it will serve us good if we listen to the member from Assiniboia and the member from Elmwood who are our elders—almost elders in this Chamber. And I thank the member from Assiniboia and the member from Elmwood for bringing forward an idea—not this resolution—an idea that needs to be spoken about, debated and maybe done.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Doyle Piwniuk (Arthur-Virden): It's been a while since I've been up here, and I'm honoured to put some words on the record for the—this private member's resolution, brought forward by the member from Elmwood.

Madam Speaker, over the years as the NDP had, sort of, basically control of Manitoba Hydro, you know, back in 1999, when they came in power, you know, Manitoba Hydro was in a very financially secure Crown corporation. It was very successful, and it's amazing in 17 years what they have done to this corporation. They've—they basically broke it. And, you know, with the NDP's mismanagement of the decay—decay of debt, decay and decline, it's not only put the whole Manitoba finances in shambles, but it's even—has put our Crown corporations in jeopardy. This legacy that this government has—that

previous government had created—there's a lot of fixing.

And, you know, it's—and you know, coming from the business world, you know, one thing you—we always did was we always listened to our customers. We always—my clients, we always listened to. You can't grow a business unless you actually listen. And with this government, what they'd done in that period of time is they didn't even listen to the people that ran Manitoba Hydro.

Just not that long ago when I was—had a chance to go visit north—you know, growing up on a dairy farm, I basically couldn't leave that—very far from the farm, and the furthest north I'd been to was the town of Swan River to go to the Northwest Roundup. And that was—I could—even after I, you know, left the farm and got educated and became a professional in investments, I was able to travel a lot, and I travelled around the world, but since I became an MLA, I've never had a chance to go up north and I did. And I remember going up to The Pas and Flin Flon and going up to Churchill with yourself, Madam Speaker, when you organized that trip, and it was very memorable.

But one thing—when we went up to Flin Flon and The Pas, one thing I couldn't believe was that once we got to Swan River, and between Swan River and The Pas, there was a line going there, and I was wondering, what is that line so close to the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border.

And, of course, it was the Bipole III line. And they used—the excuse that this previous government had was they didn't want to go in the boreal forests on the east side of the Lake Winnipeg, and an amazing part was they went through just as much boreal forest that they did going through that—through this close to the Saskatchewan border.

And then it came down and the amount of farmland that it's going to be occupying—this Bipole III—it's created a little havoc with a whole bunch of farmers in the southern part—a lot of them go through not necessarily my constituency but through a lot of my colleagues' constituencies who have call—who have created a—not a very good relationship with the Manitoba government and with the Manitoba Hydro. It's going to be a legacy that this NDP—previous NDP government has created for us and for many years to come.

That also created over a billion-dollar extra cost by having the Bipole III going the west side. And it

also created a—and even now the Bipole III is over \$400 million more than was even estimated. And this is why this government has been—so neglected to listen to the people who ran Manitoba Hydro.

And looking on their side, there wasn't very many people who have any business experience. And they were—had the power to change—the abilities to make Manitoba executives make the decisions.

They also—we look at our Crown corporations with liquors and lotteries, you know, going downtown and creating a big retail store for liquor. There's not a lot of thought that—how are we going to—how is this going to be economically, you know?

And my biggest concern is what this legacy of this government has—previous government has done with—for my own children and my grandchildren, my future grandchildren, as they put us into such huge debt. You know, when came—now with Manitoba Hydro, we're over \$25 billion in debt and that's going to be a big impact for future Hydro rates, attracting businesses that come into Manitoba.

This previous government actually had agreement for sending electricity down to the state of Wisconsin, and with the state of Wisconsin now in—actually getting cheaper hydro than we can produce here, is amazing. Now, that state of Wisconsin can attract big corporations to come and set up business now, with their cheaper electrical rates. We could have been that jurisdiction that attracted that business instead of Wisconsin. And so this is what they've created.

The legacy for Manitoba is a disadvantage to our people from the legislature in Wisconsin. Now they can attract those businesses and continue economic growth by saying that they have cheap hydro. This is the way that this previous NDP government has created Americanization to our Manitoba Hydro, and we should have been the ones that created the cheap hydro, cheap hydro for our residents and cheap hydro for business. This could have created more jobs in this province of Manitoba, but we, again, this government failed to look at the better—the bigger picture and they destroyed the advantage of having business locate here.

In my own constituency of Arthur-Virden, we had a company called Alcan, who actually produces—we have a salt formation in our—we're part of that potash salt formation that goes from Virden all the way to Edmonton. And Alcan actually does—what they do is, they have—it's a mine. They push water down to the salt formation and it creates this—a liquid, salt liquid, and then they put it through hydro. And that company actually produces a lot of—uses a lot of hydro to create sodium chloride and they're probably one of the top 10 users of—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have three minutes remaining.

As the one hour for private members' resolutions is up, this House is recessed and stands recessed until 1:30 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 1, 2017

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Debate	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		(Continued)	
Second Readings—Public Bills		Klassen	2675
Bill 223—The Orange Shirt Day Act		Lathlin	2676
Kinew	2669		
Questions		Resolutions	
Morley-Lecomte	2671	Res. 19—Committing to an East-West	
Kinew	2671	Power Grid for Manitoba	
Lathlin	2671	Maloway	2677
Isleifson	2672	Questions	
Fontaine	2672	Johnson	2679
Johnston	2672	Maloway	2679
Klassen	2672	Allum	2680
F. Marcelino	2673	Smook	2680
T. Marcelino	2673	Lindsey	2680
Gerrard	2673	Piwniuk	2680
Debate		Debate	
Morley-Lecomte	2673	Johnson	2681
Fontaine	2675	Allum	2683
Speaker's Statement		Lamoureux	2683
Driedger	2675	Smook	2684
		T. Marcelino	2685
		Piwniuk	2686

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

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>