

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. 82A - 10 a.m., Thursday, November 9, 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	Ind.
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Clifford	Emerson	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott	St. James	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
KLASSEN, Judy	Kewatinook	Lib.
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan	Selkirk	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Burrows	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MAYER, Colleen	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
PALLISTER, Brian, Hon.	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine, Hon.	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REYES, Jon	St. Norbert	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	Ind.
SCHULER, Ron, Hon.	St. Paul	PC
SELINGER, Greg	St. Boniface	NDP
SMITH, Andrew	Southdale	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	NDP
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WHARTON, Jeff, Hon.	Gimli	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, November 9, 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. Good morning, everybody.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, could you please canvass the House for leave to proceed to second reading debate on Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act?

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to move to second reading of Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act?
[Agreed]

**DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—
PUBLIC BILLS**

Bill 220—The Environmental Rights Act

Madam Speaker: Resuming debate on second reading of Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Southdale (Mr. Smith), who has nine minutes remaining—[interjection]

Do we—does it—can the bill remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Southdale?

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Speaker: No, leave has been denied. Debate is open.

Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River): I'd like to say, what the break coming up, Madam Speaker, and all of us MLAs going back to their constituencies, we'll have the opportunity in Saturday to attend a Remembrance Day service where we'll be able to honour our men and women who served our country. We'll never forget the courage, service and sacrifice they gave to us for the freedom and privileges that

we enjoy in this great country. Many paid the ultimate sacrifice and will forever be appreciated, and I take this time to urge all our members to attend and, you know, walk up to a vet, a veteran, and give him a big hug for the freedom that we now enjoy.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to put a few words on record on the member's Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act, from the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer). I know it's difficult for the member to sleep at night looking at the dismal NDP record and what they did not do.

Our province has such rich potential. There's wildlife, there's fish; a rich mosaic of wetlands have a diversity of species. Many of these treasures become very threatened under the NDP government's watch.

Yesterday, my son sent me a picture of the, you know, five woodland caribou that he seen just north of The Pas, and this is a—this is part of the—what they call the bog herd and it's very rare to see these. And the previous government did very little for—or to preserve this very threatened ungulate. Our government, our Sustainable Development Department is addressing these many concerns.

Our moose populations are in crisis like many other big-game populations. Basically, the moose are on their knees begging for help. All this was previously ignored by the previous government along with many other environmental issues.

We produced more results in 16 months in power than the NDP produced in 17 years. The member from Wolseley portrays himself as being concerned about the environment and will have seen what has happened, and we've seen what happened under their watch. Big-game populations falling into crisis, Lake Winnipeg fish-stocks depleting, Lake Winnipeg becoming the most endangered freshwater lake in the world. Invasive species like zebra mussels becoming a major threat to our pristine freshwater lakes.

Madam Speaker, we have some of the most robust environmental laws that are among the strongest in Canada. Our government will work to ensure these laws remain the strongest. We're practical environmentalists. We make decisions

based on scientific evidence that supports our actions. We're committed to reducing red tape, creating conditions for renewed investment in Manitoba while ensuring a healthy sustainable environment.

Madam Speaker, the NDP government had such a dismal record. I want to ensure the member from Wolseley that good news is on the horizon for our environment. What the NDP could not accomplish, our government will restore the confidence of Manitobans in our—*[interjection]* Excuse me—of our environmental stewardship legislation programs. We developed a made-in-Manitoba climate plan, which saw thousands of online responses.

Manitoba maintains some of Canada's most strongest livestock management requirements to protect environmental quality. The NDP's approach was one of blame. When they did not get the job done they pointed their fingers. They attacked the agricultural sector for their mismanagement of waste water and lack of action.

Madam Speaker, we'll continue to uphold protections because our government supports efforts to improve the quality of Manitoba water bodies, including Lake Winnipeg. We built our made-in-Manitoba climate green plan on the strategic pillars of climate, jobs, water and nature.

The member from Wolseley envies our plan and our effort, and it's difficult for him to accept what is holistic and good for Manitoba. If we say no, we get Trudeau. As our legal experts tell us, the federal government can impose a carbon tax. Doing nothing was not and is not an option.

Our choice is the made-in-Manitoba plan. Our plan was developed through the direct input of Manitobans drawing for more than a year of consultations with environmental business and expert stakeholders. With our plan, we'll have the second lowest carbon price in Canada, and we'll be at half of the made-in-Ottawa plan. Our plan is saving money for both families and businesses, and is better for the economy and better for the environment. The made-in-Manitoba plan will not rise; it'll cost less and it'll reduce more than the made-in-Ottawa carbon plan. The plan confirms exemptions for agricultural emissions, and the carbon levy will also not be applied to marked fields used by farmers for their farming operations.

Madam Speaker, our government is working on a plan for long-term water management in the province. Changes to our provincial water quality standards bring Manitoba up to date with other provincial and national health-based national drinking water quality guidelines.

We're now developing a framework that reflects the wishes of the vast majority of Manitobans as opposed to continuing the NDP practice of listening only to specific interest groups and lobbyists.

* (10:10)

We're re-examining upgrades to the North End sewage treatment plan to improve water quality, relying on scientific facts to inform our progress. We've made tremendous progress towards a solution to sustainability, reduced sewage overflows. We will continue to work with the City of Winnipeg on sewage treatment plants.

We have fully committed to the ALUS model, which is the alternate land-use services, to help reduce flooding and improve water quality and nutrient management.

We've introduced the new aquatic invasive species campaign aimed at targeting zebra mussels.

Madam Speaker, we're excited about the expanding recycling to strip malls, apartment buildings and legislative events.

Madam Speaker, it's no wonder the member from Wolseley finds it difficult to accept our government's success and what his previous government could not achieve. During a decade of debt, decay and decline, the NDP never made a difficult decision. Members opposite failed to meet a single target on their own, not one. They failed to meet emissions targets. They didn't have a plan on climate change. They cut millions from Conservation. Under their watch, many species of big game populations are now in crisis.

The NDP have been unable to properly manage our waterways and lakes while failing to meet their promises to implement necessary changes cited in the report of the 2011 flood. NDP mismanagement of the Shellmouth Dam in the spring of 2011 and '12—*[interjection]*—as my member—or as the member from Riding Mountain can attest, affected 40,000 acres of farmland.

Since 2006 the NDP shifted the blame of the state of Lake Winnipeg to agriculture. They refused

to release a report by the U of M on anaerobic digesters that didn't work.

Madam Speaker, the NDP report card on the environmental echoes one of failure. If we wanted to give them a letter grade, we would have to innovate to the G file, and that is not for good.

As quoted by our Premier (Mr. Pallister) on October 2017, our vision is to make Manitoba the cleanest, greenest and most climate-resilient province in Canada.

Madam Speaker, our government is going to make decisions based on scientific fact. We inherited a province that has many environmental challenges that were not addressed by the previous NDP government. But the member from Wolseley can assure his children and his grandchildren that the environment is now in better hands of a responsible government who will get the job done. So the future will be much, much brighter and better for the future stewards of our environment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Greg Selinger (St. Boniface): I'm pleased to speak to The Environmental Rights Act, Bill 220. It's another step forward in providing more tools for the citizens of Manitoba to be able to take action to protect their environment. Really, it's inspired by the Blue Dot program put forward by David Suzuki, where he says all Canadians—and we agree with him on this—should have access to clean water, fresh air and healthy food—the basics of a healthy lifestyle, the basics of what allows people to stay out of the health-care system, the basics of which allow people to live in a sustainable way for future generations.

And the purpose of the legislation is to provide more tools to Manitobans to do that, more legal tools, more ability to file a complaint, more ability to have that complaint adjudicated in a way that's independent from—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Selinger: —political interference. All of those things—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

It has just been drawn to my attention that the member has already spoken to this bill. So it will require another member to stand.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Thank you, Madam Speaker; that can only be because the member from St. Boniface did such a spectacular job

last time, it's worth repeating, worth reiterating the many good points he made last time.

But I think it was listening to our friend from Swan River that kind of motivated the former premier to get up and speak to the many errors of omission and commission, I might add, in the course of his remarks, which is putting it generously. Struck me as more of a comedy routine, but there you go.

In fact, Madam Speaker, this is very important—very important bill, Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act, and I'll just pick up on where the member for St. Boniface left off a few minutes ago.

It was a couple of years now, if memory serves, that we became the first province in Canada to sign on to David Suzuki's Blue Dot campaign. And, at that time, that was a unprecedented consensus between ourselves and the Suzuki Foundation, between the government of Manitoba and the Suzuki Foundation. And no other province in Canada had made that step. And, in fact, that was a suggestion that came to us from the grassroots of our communities. That suggestion, then, made its way through our caucus, into Cabinet, and so it was a perfect example of responding to the needs and desires and aspirations of our communities and our neighbourhoods, that said our province needs to be standing shoulder to shoulder with David Suzuki, David Suzuki Foundation, and to sign on to the Blue Dot campaign.

We had a very successful press conference in that, when we signed on to that, Dr. Suzuki, members of the Suzuki Foundation were here; certainly, a broad number of our caucus members were there. I had the honour of chairing that particular event. But what I also remember was a number of federal Liberals coming through the door as well. Jim Carr suddenly appeared out of nowhere, wanting to be part of it. Terry Duguid, if memory serves, was also there. And then, out of nowhere, there was our former mayor, Glen Murray, all the way from Ontario to try to be part of that particular event, because they understood, they recognized that this was a critically important innovation, in where Manitoba was going in relation to environmental protection, sustainability and, frankly, Madam Speaker, ecological sanity in a time of great ecological craziness.

Now, were it only that we'd signed on to the Blue Dot campaign and done nothing else, I think it would be fair to say: Well, you know, what do we get out of this great event and this great partnership

with Dr. Suzuki? But we didn't stop there. It wasn't, just as we're often criticized of, for some kind of photo op or anything like that. It was, in fact, a genuine attempt to move the environmental agenda forward, not 1mitment through, in relation to signing the-off on the Blue Dot campaign, which is, as I say, was unprecedented. No other province had done that at the point that we'd done it. And, I might add, just in saying that, it's not like the Suzuki Foundation says: Oh, you want to sign on; that's fine. We had to make some commitments about what we were prepared to do.

And so the environmental bill of rights was, I believe, on the Order Paper when we were last in government not so long ago. Of course, at the time, we got no co-operation with the then-opposition in moving forward on such a progressive and important piece of legislation, but-and so it died on the Order Paper, as we say in the Chamber. And, in my view and, I think, in the view of our colleagues, set back the environmental agenda quite significantly; hence, why my friend from Wolseley then brought this back into the House, because it's that important; it's that essential; it's that critical to making sure that we live in a healthy and sustainable environmental setting.

*(10:20)

So some might say: Well, yes, it's just the environmental bill of rights. It sounds good. What would it do? Well, I can think of two areas where this would be critically important right now. One relates to the member from St. Boniface's own constituency, where they're dealing with very critical industrial air pollution problems that need to be addressed. And had that community had the environmental bill of rights at their fingertips, I would suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that a more significant response from the government would have happened.

The community would have had the tools and the resources to be able to bring that battle right to the courts if it came to that, but to ensure and hold accountable all regulators, the government, whether it was us or the current government, accountable for making sure that there's clean air in our communities.

What a missed opportunity it is, Madam Speaker, and without the-in the absence of an environmental bill of rights that would have empowered and strengthened communities and neighbourhoods, we now have to rely on the words

of the Minister of Sustainable Development (Ms. Squires) that it's all cool. There's no problem there. Don't worry about it.

How often have we heard historically that from governments since current federation and, frankly, before, but don't worry about it; look the other way; nothing to see here. How different that might have been if they'd had an environmental bill of rights at their disposal in order to try to address very critical industrial air pollution issues in St. Boniface right now, but could very well happen in any neighbourhood and in any community, and we need to have the tools for neighbourhoods to fight back when those kinds of issues are on the table and need to be addressed.

And then I might say in my own community you've heard me speak about the Parker wetlands and the terrible travesty of this beautiful little green oasis in my community. You walk your dog, you're communing with nature, you meet your neighbours. It's all fabulous. I'm not saying it's, you know, it's the wet forest-rainforest or anything like that. I'm just saying it's a very small, beautiful little oasis that does serve an ecological value by serving as a wetland and it's-I've been told by members of the media, stop calling it a wetland, and I'm inclined to say back to that member of the media, tell my dog that when it comes out of the water soaking wet that it's not a wetland.

But, anyways, how important it might have been, how critical it might have been, if members of my community had an environmental bill of rights at their disposal to fight the terrible, devastating and quite unnecessary destruction of a very beautiful 50-acre oasis of green space in the middle of a concrete jungle.

So I just wanted to get up today, Madam Speaker, and put a few words on the record, not only to explain where this bill of rights act comes from and I compliment my friend from Wolseley as I always do, for being so progressive and getting this back on the agenda. I have a feeling it's going to keep coming back onto the agenda, but I wanted to talk a little bit about the context of where it came from that Manitoba was situated as a leader in this regard and then the very, very practical value that comes out of having an environmental bill of rights at your fingertips as a tool for communities to stand up for an environment that is strong and healthy and sustainable for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I implore members of the opposition to put away their hyper-partisanship, think about not only our generation, but generations to come. Support this resolution and stand up for a clean, healthy and productive environment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Brad Michaleski (Dauphin): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to stand up and speak about this very important subject for Manitobans—for all Manitobans regarding the environment.

Again, we have a lot of current systems in the province, a lot of great people that are working diligently in the economy and practising and evolving environmental stewardship practices that are improving conditions for all Manitobans and industries and to the benefit of all Manitobans.

But sometimes a legislation comes into this House that can get a bit off track, can get a bit extreme and perhaps ignore realities and the broad consequences of a particular piece of legislation. And The Environmental Rights Act, Bill 220, is, in my opinion, an act just like that.

I just—I'll start out with—on the second WHEREAS, on this where it talks about the protection of the environment is of special significance to indigenous people. And I don't know—I don't understand where the member is going with this WHEREAS, because the truth is—and, with all due respect to indigenous people, the protection of the environment is special significance to many Manitobans and especially our producers, you know, through time, our immigrants, our pioneers of this country, business and industry. They all have come from mixed backgrounds, mixed professions, different cultures, and they all have a interest in preserving the environment.

So the point is raised—is—in the WHEREAS, it makes a little reference to it. The point of the indigenous WHEREAS here is it doesn't really reference it again in the body of the act, so I'm not quite sure why it's in the beginning of the WHEREASes. So I'm a bit confused and a bit concerned on what the intent of this WHEREAS is.

As an aside, the Supreme Court has repeated—the Supreme Court ruled that where discussions or decisions affecting the interests of Aboriginal communities, the government's responsible to have a duty to consult with them and do their best to accommodate those interests. However, the Supreme

Court has also repeatedly made it clear that the duty to consult and accommodate is not a right of veto for Aboriginal communities, and the government, having properly consulted, retain the power to act on the national interests.

So, again, it goes back to the point I was trying to make is: Why is that WHEREAS in the bill? If the WHEREAS is referring to 'indition'—indigenous traditional knowledge, I would suggest all cultures have traditional knowledge, and Aboriginal tradition and knowledge is held and unique to Aboriginal people. But beliefs are not subject to the standards by which we judge scientific theory. No single culture, however, has a monopoly on knowledge that's unknowable by others, and this is true with the environment. There is no reason for any knowledge of our environment or anything else to be esoteric, secret knowledge. And belonging to a particular culture does not automatically imply that a person has scientific knowledge of reality.

Duty to consult should be respected; however, everyone should be treated as equals in this matter. No group should be singled out independently, because it is a matter for all Manitobans. So I would suggest the protection of the environment is special significance for all Manitobans.

The other thing that really concerns me about this act is the environmental principles, three—and it's three—section 3(1)1—and, Madam Speaker, this clause is really an activist's dream. and it gives, essentially, a green light to obstruct without proof. It can be interpreted as a wide open attack on the Manitoba economy with no consequences, responsibility or liabilities on the activists. In a resource province like Manitoba, this is a dangerous thing. This bill should be called economic suicide act or economic terrorism act, social terrorism act or caves and bugs planning act. This sort of power of activism over the industry without consequence stalls and hurts the Manitoba economy, and that hurts all Manitobans.

* (10:30)

So that's where I'd like to raise the point of our plan—our Green Plan that strikes the correct balance between the environment and the economy. Now we do know from the NDP actions over the last number of years—and this—essentially, it's supported in the Auditor General's report that they had a horrible record on the environment file. Really messed it up. The NDP had a terrible record of mismanagement, and they just—they're just plain scary when they're proposing this new Environmental Rights Act, where

they have taken the advice, opinion or maybe whatever in crafting legislation that puts the environment at the very, very top and ignores the economy.

So—and another couple of things we're learning from the Auditor General's report on the NDP's handling of the sustainable development and environment file is that—a suggestion that all cars and trucks be taken off the road to meet their targets. That is one of their solutions, and that still leaves my head shaking. And, of course, I don't know the 'techt'—their death tax has to play into this somehow, but it's really scary. So I just have to wonder what these people are thinking and—or, if they do it at all.

So—but our Climate and Green Plan released in—our Made-in-Manitoba Green Plan will be built on the strategic pillars of climate, jobs, water and nature. The Climate and Green Plan was developed through the direct input of Manitobans, drawing from more than a year of consultations in environmental, business and expert stakeholders.

We've made progress. Our plan—but our plan also sets out a vast array of new initiatives to protect wetlands and watersheds, water quality, wild species and habitats. And it has—low-carbon economy jobs will be encouraged through green infrastructure, green technology, innovation financing, and skills and training.

So our government is working to restore the confidence of Manitobans in our environmental stewardship, legislation and programs. And that's necessary because Manitobans have totally lost confidence in the previous government handling of the environmental file. We're working on a plan for long-term water management in the province. We're developing a framework that reflects the wishes and the vast majority of Manitobans, as opposed to continuing the NDP practice of listening only to specific interests groups and lobbyists, which has been dangerous to the Manitoba economy.

So, in closing, Madam Speaker, it's been a great privilege to share a few words, but I'd like to share the few words—a quote from Minister Squires, Minister of Sustainable Development: When it comes to addressing the challenge of the—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

I would indicate that, when making reference to a minister, it needs to be by the name of the department, and not the individual's name.

The honourable member for Riding Mountain. Sorry, the honourable member for Dauphin.

Mr. Michaleski: I am sorry, Madam Speaker.

When it comes—from the Minister of Sustainable Development (Ms. Squires), when it comes to addressing the challenges of climate change—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I'm pleased to be able to put on a couple of words in respect of Bill 220, which I didn't have the opportunity to do last time.

I always enjoy getting up to speak after the member for Dauphin (Mr. Michaleski), because, again, I think it is quite adorable some of the things that he puts on the record. And so, for the last five minutes, the member for Dauphin has reiterated, as have other members in the House, that the public has lost confidence or had lost confidence in the NDP and an environmental record. That's wholly not true, Madam Speaker.

Again, in—it is the MO of the members opposite to kind of put these erroneous facts on the record. That's not true, and, in fact, we've done a lot of amazing projects and legislation to protect the environment. And, certainly, this environmental rights bill would cement some of those really key pieces in—pieces it—pieces in respect of protecting the environment.

I'm pretty sure, Madam Speaker, I've shared in the House before that my first degree is from the University of Winnipeg, and it is an—a bachelor of arts specializing in environment studies and international development. And so I specialized, and my research was in respect of developing countries and the environmental issues and really critical issues that a lot of developing countries are facing across the globe. And, certainly, I think that in the time since I did my degree or got my degree, I think there's been more recognition and, certainly, you know, evidence in respect of where we are on a global manner in respect of protecting the environment and what really Mother Earth is telling us. And that is that she is not healthy.

And so, you know, a lot of the analysis that I have in respect of the environment also comes from so—my degree but also the teachings that we get as indigenous people. And, if folks know anything in respect of indigenous ways of knowing, or indigenous ways of being, or indigenous ways of

understanding our relationship to the earth, people will understand or know that indigenous people don't see themselves as any different or any better than the environment, including those of our relatives that we share the environment with, i.e., animals, the waterways. It is something we understand as fundamentally a part of ourselves. We cannot be healthy—we cannot be spiritually, culturally, emotionally, physically whole when our environment is sick. It is—you know, the environment doesn't need us; we certainly need the environment. And those are teachings that we're given as indigenous people from as early on as we can remember. And a lot of our ceremonies are embedded in this understanding of our connection to the environment.

A lot of our economies, our cultures our traditions are predicated upon us understanding each other in relationship to the environment, and it is to do no damage. It is to take only what you need. And, when you take anything, it is the whole of it, that it is to be used in its totality and that it is not wasted. And, certainly, I think that there's a lot to be learned from indigenous people, from our teachings, from our understandings and from our ways of being.

And, certainly, I would suggest as well is that if we look across the country here in Canada—but, actually, certainly, across the world, and some really good examples of that are in South America when we look at the roles that indigenous people have been playing in protecting the environment. And, actually—more importantly, actually, the role that indigenous women, not only in North America but certainly South America and Central America and, really, all across the globe, women are playing and have played such a fundamental and fierce role in protecting the environment.

* (10:40)

I remember, Madam Speaker, that when I was doing my first degree, I was doing some research on—I can't remember what it was—but I came across an article on a woman from South America. I believe she was either from Peru or from Colombia, and she was—or maybe Brazil—I'll have to figure that out—but she was doing—she was on the front lines in respect of mining, so a lot of the multinational corporations that come into what is indigenous territory and really just ransack the environment, and actually, in the process of doing that, often these international or multinational corporations come in and actually wipe out the local population as well, and she was on the front lines fighting against that.

And she was actually kidnapped and tortured, and she was pregnant and she ended up losing her baby. And, somehow, she was released, and she still went on the front lines to protect her territory, protect her lands and to protect her people, and I always—I've never forgotten that story that I read because I thought that it was such a quintessential example of the strength of women. And she was one, and she was so strong and so courageous that students were learning her story.

And, you know, I really do want to lift up the work that indigenous women across the world, actually, are doing. Certainly, we know here there are a variety of different indigenous women that have been on the front lines. I can speak to a Manitoban. She is from Roseau River First Nation. Her name is Jo Seenie. Jo Seenie is on the front lines of every major issue or conflict in protecting the environment, not only here in Manitoba but she actually travels across Canada, offering support to First Nation communities that have set up blockades or, you know, whatever the means that they're looking at in respect of protecting the environment.

And, actually, Jo Seenie is another woman who I remember there were some issues going on out east several years back, and she was on the front lines. There were blockades; there were all kinds of things going on, and she was pregnant, and she has repeatedly been on the front lines protecting the environment, and a couple of those times she was pregnant with different pregnancies.

And I share those stories because that, again, is a testament to indigenous women's understanding of our role as protectors, not only for our children or our communities but certainly for the environment.

So, in that respect, I'm very honoured to be a part of that community, that sisterhood of indigenous women, in fighting for the health of Mother Earth, and I know that oftentimes, when we look at what needs to be done in respect of protecting the environment, profits supersede the health of the environment. And, certainly, I think that that is a really—a backwards way of looking at the work that needs to be done to ensure that, you know, that we are here, that our children are here, that they have an environment that they will be able to thrive and to live in, that our grandchildren are here and our grandchildren's grandchildren.

And, certainly, I know that I don't need to share or explain to everyone that indigenous people come from this place of thinking seven generations ahead

and that means that we make those sacrifices now, and certainly I know that on this side of the House, we will certainly stand up for our Mother Earth as we continue for her protection and her safety and her overall health.

Miigwech.

Mr. Blair Yakimoski (Transcona): *[interjection]* Thank you. That was a slow build from my colleagues, but I truly appreciate it.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for giving me the opportunity. I, like the member previous, think the member from Dauphin is adorable, but I never think that he says is adorable.

But he makes some very, very strong and good points when it comes to the environment. And I want to begin by stating what he tried to state as he ran out of time. When it comes to addressing the challenges of climate change, we must understand just how unique we are as a province. Our carbon plan sets out a made-in-Manitoba solution to climate change that respects our clean energy investments, supports our economy and reduces emissions. It will protect the environment while also building a prosperous, low carbon economy in Manitoba. And that quote he took is from the Minister of Sustainable Development (Ms. Squires).

It's kind of tradition when a member brings forth a bill that we thank the member for bringing forth that bill so that we can discuss it, but I shall not be thanking the previous member. I guess the thanks would be due to the previous member from the Interlake, Tom Nevakshonoff, who actually brought this bill pretty much in its entirety at the end of the previous, failed government's mandate.

An Honourable Member: Dying days.

Mr. Yakimoski: It was in the dying days of it. They brought it forward. They knew that things were not looking very rosy for them. They had 17 years to bring it forth, to protect the environment. So I guess thanks would be due to him to bring it force, so that we may discuss this.

I do know that the member who has brought it forth now considers himself an environmental activist. He has a newsletter that goes out called the activist. He is always very, very—what's the word I'm looking for? *[interjection]* Very—he's very active, yes, of course. But he's very passionate when he asks his questions here in the House, and we all—*[interjection]*—and we always appreciate that. And I

know as an—in the Wolseley area, he's probably a good environmentalist.

We all care about the environment, Madam Speaker. I'm—I won't say for sure, but I assume that the member from Wolseley recycles. I assume that he fills up his blue box, and he may even compost. But I think, in this Chamber, the member from Wolseley finds it very, very easy to simply recycle old NDP legislation brought forth that failed.

An Honourable Member: Seventeen years.

Mr. Yakimoski: The member from Point Douglas just reminded me. I almost forgot. Seventeen years, Madam Speaker—17 years—they were in power and—but the member from Wolseley continues. This is the second time he's brought forth legislation that the previous NDP government brought forth that never came to a vote. They knew that some of their ideas—so I would—I like that he's an environmentalist, that he knows the environment is important. But I would like the member from Wolseley—to quote the member from Wolseley at—from the other day: Do your job. Do your job. Come up with some new ideas. Work with the government in power to come up with better ideas for the environment. Better ideas, like our Climate and Green Plan. New ideas, our climate and green pan—we have a new idea, a made-in-Manitoba idea.

I was recently—at the University of Winnipeg convocation, I was fortunate to speak to the director of sustainable development there. She's won an award for her—the work, and the University of Winnipeg, where the member from Wolseley often references a former professor there, Dr. Pip—they set the standard. They do a great job when it comes to being sustainable. Their climate emissions are lower than they were, I believe, back in 1990. And, when I spoke to her, she was very, very excited about seeing our Climate and Green Plan. I cannot remember her name off the top of my head, but what she did say to me was this—

An Honourable Member: Eva.

Mr. Yakimoski: No, it wasn't Eva. It was someone else.

* (10:50)

What she did say is: Well, I'm really glad you've got David McLaughlin working on it. He's the right guy. He knows—he knows—what to do, and I'm looking forward to it.

I look forward to talking to her in the next little while to see what she thinks about our Climate and Green Plan. *[interjection]*

It is made in Manitoba. It's nice that the member from Point Douglas is—I think she's on board.

The previous government, we know that their environmental record was—

An Honourable Member: The worst.

Mr. Yakimoski: —lacking. I'm going to say lacking—

An Honourable Member: The worst environmental record of any province in Canada.

Mr. Yakimoski: The worst environmental record of any province? Perhaps. Is it a fact?

I would like to know from the member from Wolseley what his opinion is on the Auditor General's report, the recent Auditor General's report on managing climate change. It was a damning report, I believe. The previous government set targets, failed to meet targets, and then said, let's not worry about those targets and ignore it for a while.

I encourage the member of the opposition, and I encourage the member from Concordia—the member from 'cordia', please, work with the member from Brandon West, please. I would love to be able to discuss this report in—the Auditor General's report in a PAC meeting, Public Accounts Committee.

In Fredericton, earlier on this year, we were there, and we discussed about how we can be less partisan PAC. It's about finding value. It's about doing better for the taxpayers. I believe everybody in this Chamber wants to do the best for the taxpayers of Manitoba.

And if we can sit down and go over this, and if the previous government, the members, can bite their tongue and say, yes, there were things we missed—and I encourage them to continue to hold our government accountable to make improvements. We are going to do that. We are going to make those improvements.

I know nobody in this Chamber—well, I hope nobody in this Chamber, shall I say—agrees with, perhaps, climate-change deniers. I don't think members of the opposition are real supportive of the present US president and how he handles climate change, but the way they handled it previously, you almost might think that they worked together. They

missed the targets; they didn't care about the targets, and they ignored the targets.

Farmers—the member from St. Johns talked about how indigenous people are custodians of the land, how they know the land and the land is part of their life. It's true. It's also true for farmers. Farmers are custodians of the land. Farmers want their farming, and they want that land to be sustainable, not for them, but for the next generation and for the next generation after that.

And I know the member from Wolseley constantly refers to his friend from the University of Winnipeg, but he seems to love that science but ignore the science from the University of Manitoba, the science that says that hog processing really doesn't contribute that much phosphorus to Lake Winnipeg. But yet they still targeted hog farmers, saying, you have to stop this. It's—they didn't like the farmers. They didn't like the economic development of the farmers. They targeted the farmers because it was really easy.

We are working to improve Manitoba for the farmers, for the farmers' families, for all Manitobans. We are working on a plan for long-term water management. We've committed to the ALUS, alternative land use system. I've talked to a friend of mine, the Red River Basin Commission, Steve Strang, about ALUS, and he continues to inform me and teach me about things that we can do here in Manitoba to make it a better province environmentally.

I thank you, Madam Speaker. I see my time is running short. And I just want to say I'm very proud to stand up for the environment and to stand up for our government's decisions and our government's made-in-Manitoba climate plan, and I look forward to continuing to make Manitoba better and make Manitoba's environment better for all Manitobans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Alan Lagimodiere (Selkirk): It's a pleasure for me to arise to be able to put a few words on the record regarding Bill 220, The Environmental Rights Act, brought forward by the member from Wolseley.

I am indigenous. I am also—I also have a farming background, a bachelor of science in agriculture. I have scientific degrees, and interesting to hear the comments from members opposite about their being leaders in environmental protection, when not only

had Manitobans lost confidence in the NDP's belief to protect the environment, but also our Auditor General in the October 2017 report has found significant fault with the previous government's ability to protect our environment.

Being indigenous, I want to acknowledge today that we are on Treaty 1 territory and—the homeland of the Cree, the Oji-Cree, the Dene, the Dakota people and the homeland of the Metis nation.

When I was growing up I learned how to hunt; I learned how to fish; I learned how to trap. I learned how to make a living off of the land. With that, I also learned that in order to survive I needed to have essential skills. I needed to know about my environment. I needed to know what my environment had to offer me in order to survive. What would I do if I went into the wilderness on my own? What would I do if I went with somebody else? If you go with somebody else into the wilderness you want somebody who knows the environment.

And I look at the members opposite and I—in all honesty, if I had to choose one person from there that could help me survive in the environment, I would have to say not one of them would be an asset to have with me. They would be a detriment to my survival.

You know, surviving in the wilderness you need food, you need water, you need shelter and you need good quality food and water, and being able to find those are important. And with that, the NDP have done a terrible job in protecting any of those for us, Madam Speaker.

When I—I live along the Red River right now, and over the years I used to swim in the water. Yes, I did. I used to swim in the water. Three years ago, I went down to my dock—my children learned to swim in the Red River—three years ago we went down to the dock; what did we find? A brown smelly scum in front of the dock.

An Honourable Member: From where?

Mr. Lagimodiere: Exactly, from where? From the environmental protection that the NDP had in place. I called the environment people. They came down. They took samples. They told me nothing to worry about; it's organic.

I took samples I sent them to the lab: incredibly high levels of E. coli; high levels of fats; a scum from the water. When I took my docks out in the

fall—another example of their ability to protect our environment. I pulled my docks out in the fall, I look, there's something on my docks. I have a closer look; I take it off; it's a zebra mussel—a zebra mussel in Selkirk. We knew we had them in Lake Winnipeg. How did they get to Selkirk?

I called the environment people again. They came; they looked at it; yes, confirmed it's a zebra mussel. Not only did they find that one, they found five other zebra mussels. They couldn't explain to me how the zebra mussel got onto my dock. The filaria from the zebra mussels are not known to travel upstream, and yet here they are upstream from the lake that's contaminated.

What did they do to fail to protect the river? Nothing at all. They did absolutely nothing to protect—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

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

DEBATE ON RESOLUTIONS

Res. 11—Provincial Government's Plan to Shutter Three Winnipeg Emergency Rooms will Undermine Patient Care and Hurt Families and Seniors

Madam Speaker: The hour being 11 p.m. and time for private member's resolution.

The resolution before us this morning is the resolution on Provincial Government's Plan to Shutter Three Winnipeg Emergency Rooms will Undermine Patient Care and Hurt Families and Seniors, brought forward by the honourable member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino).

* (11:00)

The honourable—standing in the name of the honourable member for Dauphin—Riding Mountain—standing in the name of the honourable member for Riding Mountain, who has nine minutes remaining.

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): It's unfortunate that my friend the member for Tyndall Park can't see that our government is taking action to make changes to health care to provide for quicker access and better results for patients.

Under the former government, which, I may add, he was a part of, Manitobans waited too long for care, stayed too long in hospitals and often needed to

visit multiple locations to access the care they needed. It's access to the care that Manitobans need that I would like to comment on today.

In my constituency of Riding Mountain, we have—I'm sorry, we've had—hospitals offering acute-care services in Minnedosa, Russell and Shoal Lake that theoretically offered 24-hour, round-the-clock emergency room care to residents in their catchment area.

Mr. Doyle Piwniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

However, the tremendous deterioration in health care in Riding Mountain, well, actually, the entire province of Manitoba under 17 years of the NDP, has been deplorable and the most talked about at issues—talked about issue at dinner tables, coffee shops and in letters and stories in community newspapers.

Solving the issue of doctors, nurses and health-care aides to keep acute-care facilities operating and emergency rooms open was not a priority for the previous government. Front-line services suffered and patients suffered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, under 17 years of the NDP, more than 2,300 doctors left Manitoba to practise in other provinces, and I have examples of that in my own backyard. Russell, Minnedosa and Shoal Lake have all lost physicians and struggle to find a full complement of doctors.

Let's take my hometown of Shoal Lake, for example. We had two doctors for much of the past 20 years. Both announced they were leaving in the summer of 2015. One decided to move to Ontario, and the other retired. Both publicly expressed their dissatisfaction with everything from a shortage of nurses on the floor to no support from the regional health authority. But, more than that, they had no sense of optimism that the situation would get better in this province, given the track record of the NDP government.

The former NDP administration did more to divide professionals than any government in Manitoba's history. Our new government has made teamwork and team building a priority, finally giving front-line workers the voice they deserve with no fear of repercussions.

In Shoal Lake, we became one of the NDP's statistics with vacancies for doctors in rural Manitoba. Our emergency room was closed, and

there was no acute-care admissions, as we relied on locums to offer medical service when available.

Only recently has the situation become stable, thanks to the work of our government. A new doctor, one of the 22 recruited for the Prairie Mountain Health region, starts work this month, joining the other doctor who arrived last year. The next step will be hiring nurses and hopefully reopening our acute-care facility.

Every time I hear members opposite talk about two-tier health care, I have to wonder if they don't realize that when they were in government, Manitobans were forced to live under a system that differentiated between those who had access to timely services and those who did not. Is that not two-tiered health care?

Because Shoal Lake's emergency room has been shuttered, when an ambulance arrives at an area home, it's the luck of the draw where a patient will be taken. It could be to a facility 20 minutes away, 40, 50 or 70 minutes away. That is because there was no guarantee emergency rooms in the three of the four closest hospitals will be open.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP claims driving 20 minutes to a fully equipped and staffed, 24-7 emergency room in Winnipeg is a hardship. In rural Manitoba, it's rare that an emergency room is open in a 20-mile radius, and it certainly does not have the 'staffik'—staffing and diagnostic abilities of a Winnipeg facility.

Under the 17 years of the NDP, over 25 rural ERs were closed, suspending emergency services to hard-working people who pay their share of taxes, just like anyone in the City of Winnipeg. How can members opposite continuously chastise our government for acting on the recommendations of an expert report when their record in health care is so abysmal? They spent billions of dollars on bureaucracy and programs that didn't work, while front-line services continued to erode in Winnipeg and rural Manitoba.

The ramifications of lack of health care in rural Manitoba goes beyond health. Retirees are contemplating whether they should stay in small communities. Businesses feel the impact of a population decline. Communities suffer. There is no doubt in my mind that members opposite find themselves in the position they are right now because they lost the trust and confidence of Manitobans. Their policies and lack of action negatively affected

hard-working families in many aspects of life, but particularly so in health care.

Our government has Manitoba on a road to recovery, a road that will lead to better services, lower taxes and a strong economy for all Manitobans. I am pleased that our Health Minister has implemented a new provincial strategy to attract and retain doctors in Manitoba, a plan that doesn't see regional health authorities competing against each other for doctors. We listened to what doesn't work in recruiting doctors and know that money is rarely the problem. We want doctors to feel appreciated, have the ability to work with other specialists, and to be able to use their skills and training to the full scope of their practice.

Under the NDP, Manitobans paid more and got less, and nowhere was that more evident than in health care. Manitobans deserve consistent, predictable health care. Our government is taking the steps necessary to improve health-care outcomes, despite the constant negativity that comes from the opposition bench.

I would urge the member representing Tyndall Park and his colleagues across the way to consider becoming part of the solution and embrace changes for the benefits of all Manitobans.

Thank you.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): It is a real honour and a real pleasure to rise this morning on this, the last day of session, to discuss this issue that's so very, very, very important to not only my constituents, but all Manitobans.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, it's a disappointing start to this debate where members opposite are simply reading from prepared notes, I guess, created in the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) office. You know, written up and read verbatim here in this House.

And this comes on the heels of some really good debate, I have to say, debate where I heard members from every side of this House talking about personal experiences when it comes to assisted death, when it comes to end-of-life care, when I heard personal stories and personal comparisons about—or stories that talked about how important it is to have strong health care. And I believe that does push the debate further. I do believe that that actually does accomplish something in this House. But when we hear canned talking points, political talking points, it gets us nowhere.

And I would imagine that every member of this House has a story, a personal story about the health-care system in this province and about a particular institution or a particular hospital or a particular service that they received and the difference that it made in their lives or in their family's lives. I've certainly heard those stories, Mr. Speaker, as we've gone out and talked to constituents, talked to individuals affected by the cuts brought forward by this government. And they were touching stories.

*(11:10)

They were stories about people who were saved by health-care professionals, sometimes just within minutes of more serious outcomes. And that's what sort of really put it in perspective for me. You know, everybody had a story, it seemed, to share of a family member who was rushed to hospital and didn't know how serious maybe the chest pains they were experiencing were, or didn't realize that the pain in their stomach actually was an indicator of something more serious. And, again, minutes made the difference—minutes made the difference—in these people's lives.

Many members opposite will know that I have a similar experience. I carry around a scar about three inches long on my wrist where, as a just little three year old, I cut my wrist in an accident at home with a window, and I was cut by glass. You know, and, as a three year old, I was—and my parents had just left the house. They, luckily—we—my brother and sister who were there at the time managed to flag them down before they drove out of the driveway. I was rushed to Concordia Hospital, which was about I guess, well, I would say maybe it's a 15-minute drive from the house I grew up in. I think that day we probably made it there in five. And it was the doctors there that saved my life—saved my life—no question about it.

I cut the main artery in my wrist. The blood was squirting to the ceiling, and, if you can imagine a three-year-old boy—you know, I got to say, it wasn't until I had a three-year-old child and thought about that experience and what I would do in that circumstance, that it put it in perspective. But I was—my life was saved at Concordia Hospital. Concordia Hospital saved my life.

And it's deeper than that even, Mr. Speaker, because it's my community that created Concordia Hospital, and I've talked about this in this House before. How the Mennonite people—this was long

before Medicare was a standard here in Canada or had even been tried in other provinces—the Mennonite people in Manitoba were giving care to one another and realized that they could expand this. They collected a little bit of money from all the members in the Winnipeg Mennonite community, and that was their hospital, that was their Medicare. And, when you were sick, you went to Concordia Hospital. And then they saw that there was value to that and that they could expand that; they expanded it to outside the Mennonite community. And, when universal health care came to this country, it was that model that fit right into the vision that Tommy Douglas had. And the Mennonite people were able to continue to give that service to everyone.

And that hospital has grown and been part of our community now for so many years, and there was a time when its future was in jeopardy and, surprise, surprise, it was under a Conservative government. And, I mean, this is unbelievable to me, that we would be in the exact same boat we were in when the Filmon government came in. And the Filmon government came in and there were, at that times, plans to expand and to formalize the emergency room at Concordia Hospital. And all of a sudden, the Filmon government comes in and the plans were scrapped. And believe it or not, and I'll say this absolutely, unequivocally, it was the member for River East—it was Bonnie Mitchelson who stood up to her premier at the time and said: No, this hospital has value. I think she has a nursing background. She stood up. I don't think she was a minister; I think she was just a backbencher. I think she just had—she was strong enough to stand up to her premier.

Now, I look across the way and I just—I wonder where that strength is. I wonder where that strength is these days. You understand the implications. These members opposite—I know for a fact the members opposite have been knocking on doors and they've been hearing the exact same thing I've been hearing. There is no question about it: People in the community are frightened; they're worried. Health professionals are telling us this is not the right direction to go in. And members opposite are hearing this from their constituents and what are they saying back to those constituents? Are they saying, I'm strong—like members in Conservative governments in previous years have been? Are they saying that? Or are they saying nothing?

And I think, Mr. Speaker, they are saying nothing, because the time is ticking and the clock is

running out on Concordia Hospital. And the clock is running out on our health-care system in this province.

Now I hear the members, you know, I mean, I hope we hear from—I'll just say I hope we hear from the member from River East. I hope we hear from the member from Rossmere, the member from Transcona. I hope that they put their words on the record, how they think this is a great idea, and I hope we hear from all members in this city who represent people who are going to be affected by these cuts most acutely, but I did hear this morning a member from Riding Mountain. You know, he knows I was in his community this summer and I spent some time with his constituents because he wouldn't, and he stands up and puts on the record the challenges in the health-care system in his constituency.

And, again, I heard those loud and clear from his constituents and from so many others this summer as we travelled around in rural Manitoba, the challenges that they're facing. And yet the solution that has been presented by this member and by all members opposite is cut instead of invest, and cuts, the biggest cuts in a generation, are not going to present the solutions that this member is saying this morning that they will.

He claims that experts have told them this is the only path forward. The only path forward is to cut. Well, I can tell you I have read the Peachey report. I have read the reports that are available. We haven't seen the KPMG report. What I will say is there's no value in picking and choosing only those solutions that result in cost savings when the investment isn't put in on the other side. And that's just obvious. I know that's obvious to every member opposite but, again, they're not willing yet to stand up.

Now there's still time. The next election is a few years away. There's still time for these members to stand up, stand up for health care in this province, stand up to this Premier (Mr. Pallister) who has his own agenda of austerity and cuts, and stand up for every Manitoban who relies on these services and—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is an honour to stand up in this Chamber this morning and put some words on record for the PMR brought forward by the member from Logan. And to answer the member from Concordia's

comment, yes, I will be presenting a personal story in my speech. It is something that's—*[interjection]*

An Honourable Member: It's Tyndall Park's resolution.

Mr. Smook: Oh, sorry. Tyndall Park, my apologies. The PMR brought forward by the member from Tyndall Park.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, health care is important to all of us. It is one of the issues that is always on the minds of Manitobans. Manitobans want a health-care system that meets their needs, but they also want one that is sustainable. We need to make sure health care works today and into the future.

During the last decade of debt, decay and decline, the NDP government never made any difficult decisions in health care. They just kept throwing money at things and hoping they would fix themselves.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that did not work. Under the previous government Manitoba spent more per capita on health care than other provinces and received the worst outcomes and wait times in the country.

Health care is the largest spending item of the provincial government, and high-spending levels have not meant better results for patients, seniors and families. Under the NDP government, the only thing Manitobans got were higher taxes and poorer services.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this resolution talks about ERs. I would like to speak a little bit about what the previous NDP government did with rural ERs.

* (11:20)

In answer to the member for Concordia's (Mr. Wiebe) question about talking about personal stories, well, here is one from me, especially where I come from, in Vita, Manitoba, on October the 17th, 2012, the ER at the Vita & District Health Centre closed. At first, it was only going to be a short time, no more than 30 days, said the NDP Health minister at the time. Three different NDP Health ministers all kept making promises that the Vita ER would open soon. They even promised to use the Vita & District Health Centre for a pilot project, a collaborative emergency centre. But they also promised that—the same project to other communities whose ERs they closed.

What kind of deal is that? How many pilot projects can you have? Promising that pilot project to more than one area where they closed their ER. They did nothing but make empty promises. They had no plan. They did not sit down with local residents to find out what could work. They just kept making promises that they did not keep.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, good governments make difficult decisions, necessary—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order. I just want to remind the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) that that's considered a display of a exhibit, the newspaper that you're holding. Yes, it says Concordia Hospital should be open. So I would like to warn the member from Tyndall Park to keep that exhibit down.

Mr. Smook: I guess I must have upset him when I got the—mixed up the member from Logan as to his from Tyndall Park for the person who brought forward this resolution.

The previous government did none of this. They made politically motivated decisions that resulted in unsustainable spending growth and massive debt. They were more concerned about getting re-elected than they were in the well-being of Manitobans.

Our government has begun the hard work required to repair the damage done by the previous government. For 17 years, Manitobans' hard-earned tax dollars were recklessly used to prop up a health-care system that failed to provide the quality of care Manitobans deserve. Manitobans know that our health-care system is not sustainable in its current state, and tough decisions need to be made about the future of health care in Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government is working with Manitobans, consulting with them to make our health-care system sustainable. We are doing the things that the opposition never did when they were in power. They never listened to Manitobans.

Just a few weeks ago, I held a town hall meeting in my constituency. The topic that generated the most interest was health care. As Manitobans age, health care becomes more important. They all want a sustainable health-care system for themselves and for future generations. We cannot forget about our children and grandchildren. We cannot spend so much today that there will be nothing left for them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, change is difficult. Many people have a hard time with change. So what the

opposition is doing is fear mongering. They try to scare people into believing that they have the answers, but they don't have the answers. The last 17 years proved that.

The members of the opposition had 17 years to fix our health care, and failed. All they do today is advocate to spend more money on health care without a new plan, the same old plan that they've had for years: spend and tax without any concern for results. Results are what Manitobans want.

Under the previous NDP government, Winnipeg emergency rooms were the longest in all of Canada. Doctor recruitment and retention was certainly not able to keep up what Manitoba needed. We lost many doctors to other provinces. Under the opposition, ambulance fees were the highest in the country. Manitobans went from hallway medicine to highway medicine. Manitobans had to travel elsewhere to get the health care they needed, even though, at that time, the minister of Health said Manitobans deserve health care in a timely order, close to home. Well, that never happened under the previous government.

This resolution talks about broken promises. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite are experts on that. Before the 2011 election, they went door to door, promising not to raise taxes. And yet, they raised 13—they raised taxes 13 different times and hiked 46 different fees. Those broken promises cost Manitobans \$1.189 billion.

Even with all that extra money—extra revenue, they still managed to spend more than they took in, constantly going into deficit, spending \$3 million a day more than they took in. Manitobans' debt grew to over \$37 billion. Today, Manitobans are paying nearly \$1 billion to service our debt—money going out of the province to money-lenders in Toronto, New York and wherever. But that money is not staying here in Manitoba to help Manitobans. Can you imagine what good we could do with \$1 billion? Whether it be in health care or education? Shame on the opposition for putting us into a position where we are paying nearly \$1 billion in interest that could be used in many other different areas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government will take no lessons from the opposition on health care. They should join with us to repair the damages they caused. It is our priority as a government to create a health-care system that provides the high quality of care all Manitobans deserve while at the same time

being sustainable for generations to come. Our government is working hard to fix the health-care system. We started by reducing the ambulance fees. We will cut ambulance fees in half in our first mandate. We already have gone from \$500 to \$425. We've gone with record amounts of money for health care, raising the Department of Health, Seniors and Active living budget to over \$6 billion.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not about how much money you spend, it's about how you spend it. And the previous government didn't have a clue on proper spending. All they knew was to spend, but they did not consult the people, they did not look at what the best plans are. They spent millions of dollars getting plans, but yet they never put any of those plans into—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): It's my pleasure to rise on this last day in support of this private member's resolution that my colleague from Tyndall part-Park brings forth.

These closures are an attack on our Manitobans and our health-care system. As I've been doing outreach in my community and other people have reach—been sending emails about what this government is doing to our health-care system, I've been hearing stories of people waiting up to 10 hours in—one, in fact, just yesterday emailed me while I was here. They went to the Health Sciences Centre at 10 in the morning. They didn't leave there 'til 8 o'clock last night. And now they have to go for an MRI. And now they don't know how long that's even going to take to get it.

So we know that one of those MRI machines are missing here in Manitoba somewhere. We don't know whose garage it is, or who's housing it, or, you know, if they've sold it, because that seems to be what this government does is they put money over people. You know, we need to start thinking about patients. Patient care, putting patients first.

* (11:30)

And I spoke yesterday about my mother working in the health-care field. My mother is so stressed right now because what they've done is they've laid off nurses that provide services. Now these health-care providers are having to do more work, which the nurses used to do, but now they're short-staffed. They now have to pull up the slack, and they're working, you know, 12-hour shifts, going

home like zombies. And some of them, you know, don't feel like they're able to provide the care that these people need in the hospitals, because they're so dead on their feet. They're so tired. The quality of care has gone down.

We know that nurses are continuing to be laid off under this government, when this government said: We will protect front-line services. We won't lay off any front-line workers. Well, this government continues to prove itself wrong by laying off a number of nurses, by—you know, they're now privatizing home care. My sister works in home care, and the level of service that the home-care providers give to these people that they go and see is phenomenal. We don't know—and people don't even know, these clients don't even know if they're going to get the same services.

We hear that Meals on Wheels, they went from delivering meals to seniors where they were getting 500 mls of milk, to now getting 250 mls of milk, to now not even getting a piece of bread on their tray. What are we saying to our seniors when we're taking away the health-care supports that they get?

They went from 20 minutes of health-care support in their home to 15 minutes. Now there's a new check-off list of things that they can't do that they used to do before. We are just continuing to regress under this Pallister government, in our health care. Our seniors have been the backbone of creating Manitoba, and we're providing less services to them under this Pallister government.

They continue to, you know, close our ERs. I live close to Seven Oaks hospital. Now I'm going to have to travel—even the people that live in Concordia. So all of the people in the northwest and northeast corner of the city of Winnipeg are being affected; they're going to have to travel. And I heard one of my members opposite talk about travelling 15, 20 minutes when they're in the rural. Well, that's going to be right here in an urban setting: people travelling 15, 20 minutes to get to a hospital. Who knows if they're going to be alive? Seniors are worried that by the time they get to the hospital, they're—they might die. And this is what this Pallister government is creating.

Our Manitobans are—they're upset. They are not happy with this Pallister government. They've been telling all of us that they do not want this, our ERs to be closed, but yet this Pallister government does not listen. They don't consult. We've heard time after time after time in committees, they are not listening.

They need to take out their earplugs and start to listen to Manitobans. Manitobans deserve the care that these ERs provide.

He's demanding over \$800 million in cuts—again, putting money over patients, putting money over care that's needed for our Manitobans. But do they care? No. They're not standing up for their constituents. They're taking orders and they're voting—be a Bonnie Mitchel [*phonetic*]. Stand up for your constituents. Say to your Premier (Mr. Pallister): This is wrong. My constituents are telling me this is what—not what they want. We need to keep these ERs open. But, no—they don't listen.

The closures came without a plan for rollout, including how the thousands of nurses—so we see the shuffle. We see lots of confusion. You know, people from Victoria were told they were going to have a job. We heard a nurse speak out and say, you know, I was supposed to have a job. Now she doesn't have a job. Forty nurses laid off—like, where are these nurses going?

We're supposed to have a health-care system that supports the patients that are going to the hospital. Ten hours to wait in the hospital at Health Sciences Centre yesterday; that's unacceptable—unacceptable. And this is only going to get longer if we continue to do what they're doing.

So their plans to cut—close Seven Oaks, Concordia, that's going to put even more pressure on the Health Sciences Centre. We're seeing 10 hours now. Who knows how long it's going to be for their wait? Shame.

You know, they have no problem freezing wages, you know. Every—all of the sectors got their wages frozen. So what did this Pallister government do? They gave themselves a 20 per cent raise—20 per cent. That raise would've kept the North Point Douglas Women's Centre open. It could've meant that they had their counselling services to support the women that go there. Eight people were laid off at the North Point Douglas Women's Centre—eight people.

We've had someone who was stabbed in that community. We've had some—and died. We had another person who perished in a fire. Like, these are services that were provided to that community to ensure that there was safety, that there were places for people to go and speak with someone. They provided education services. They helped them with resumes, and they helped them get on the right track.

But this is what this government is doing. They continue to cut services that impact people's lives in a positive way. They are back—They were going back.

We are going to have to, you know, be talking about this when we're in government about all of the—they talk about us breaking the system, they're breaking the system. In four years they're crushing it. And you know what's going to happen when we come back? We're going to be talking about the last four years that you've been in government that you stood by, that you did not listen to Manitobans, that you broke our system, our youth and our future.

And you continue to not invest in them. You continue to not invest in our families. You continue to not invest in our seniors. That is horrible. You are going to have to—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Smith: In 18 months, this government has done nothing but cuts. They've not put any services. We were promised 500—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Point of Order

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Deputy House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Deputy Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, everybody in this House, I believe, understands when we speak in this House we speak through the Chair. I believe it's inappropriate for any member to say you are going to, you are going to, such as we've just heard. There is a well-established procedure.

The member opposite shows disregard for these well-established rules, and I would ask that you rein her in and ask her to respect the established rules, please.

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

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I was actually watching the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) and I was observing her looking directly at you as she was speaking, and I appreciate with the amount of heckling that's coming from the members opposite it is difficult for members on our side to be able to put our points across.

So not only is it not a point of order, I would ask that you call members opposite to order and allow

the members of the opposition to speak in this House to raise issues that are important to Manitobans without having to withstand the amounts of verbal haranguing that the member for Point Douglas has been dealing with this morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the point of order, I just want to call that it is a point of order that the person should be directing everything through the Chair and—of the House. But at the same time I—everybody needs to have a decorum that we should be listening to and respecting everybody who speaks in this House.

So, on the point of order, we'll have the honourable member for Point Douglas continue her presentation—her speech.

* * *

Mrs. Smith: So just want to get back on all of the cuts that this current Pallister government has continued to do. They've continued to affect our youth, you know, our youth are our future. They continue to make cuts to tuition. We had students here yesterday that, you know, were told to leave the building. Our caucus came together and were able to keep them in the building and they were able to come for question period.

* (11:40)

This government is cutting health care, which is affecting all of Manitobans. We've heard so many Manitobans come to us and say, we want Seven Oaks to stay open. We want Concordia to stay open. But they are not listening. They have this idea that they're, you know, this health-care system is broken, but it's not. They're the ones that are breaking it. They're going to have wait times—[interjection]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Smith: —and put more pressure on the health-care system and the Health Sciences Centre while they continue to lay off nurses—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mr. Kelly Bindle (Thompson): It's my pleasure to rise in the House today to speak to this adorable but misguided private member's resolution.

There are no lessons to be taken from this resolution or from the members opposite's miserable failure in delivering health care to Manitobans when they were in government, except that it needs to be changed. Everyone knows our government inherited

a broken system, not just in health care but in many other areas of government, and Manitobans elected our government to fix it. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, despite efforts by the former government members to monkey wrench our plans every step of the way, including this vague and misguided stall-tactic resolution, we are fixing the finances of this province, we are repairing the services they broke, we're rebuilding the economy they destroyed and we will continue to fix it with or without their support.

This isn't hyper-partisanship and it's not partisanship; it's not left or right; it's just plain facts. The previous NDP government is responsible for an unsustainably expensive health-care system with the longest emergency wait times in the country. They vowed to fix hallway medicine and turned it into highway medicine where patients would have to travel elsewhere to get treatment; that's if they didn't die in the waiting room first.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just to give you an idea, Canada is known to have the longest wait times when it comes to emergency care in the developed world, and under the NDP, Manitoba had the longest wait times in Canada. That means our government inherited a system in Manitoba with the longest hospital wait times in the developed world, with some of the highest costs in Canada, thanks to the NDP.

The previous government knew they had a problem in delivering health care to Manitobans. They knew full well, and that's why they commissioned a report by Dr. Peachey to study the system and make recommendations on how to fix it. After they received the report, what did they do? Did they make the tough decisions to improve the system? No, they chose to ignore it and hoped the problem would just go away.

Our government knows that the longer it takes to address a problem, the long—the larger it will be when you find that you cannot ignore it anymore. Problems are like debt; they grow if they're not addressed.

Now, it's human to make mistakes, and people are meant to learn from their mistakes. The NDP had an opportunity to admit their mistakes in health-care delivery and they had recommendations available to fix them and they had to—the opportunity to fix their mistakes, but they chose not to.

When you know you've made a mistake, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the NDP clearly knew, and

you choose not to fix it, then it's a problem of ego. And that's where I have a problem. Because of the previous NDP members' egos, members had to—Manitobans had to wait and suffer and suffer and wait and suffer. My dad was right when he was alive. He said the NDP had no guts. The NDP didn't have guts then and they don't have guts now. They don't have the guts to get on board and help fix their mess.

Before the 2011 election, the NDP promised not to raise taxes, yet they raised taxes 13 different times and hiked 46 different fees. The NDP's broken promises cost Manitobans \$1.2 billion from both broadening the PST and the subsequent 1 per cent increase.

During the NDP's decade of decline, Manitoba's debt grew to over \$37 billion, with every resident owing 28,000 bucks each. The NDP's decade of debt forced the average family in Manitoba to pay over \$4,000 more in income taxes and PST than the same family next door in Saskatchewan.

Some people say they were helping their friends. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP don't have friends. They have business associates that they buy with public money in exchange for votes and donations. They channel public money to their handlers, public union bosses, and those bosses buy them advertisements, distribute their war propaganda to their members and try to coerce their members to vote NDP. Their handlers used to control the NDP Manitoba government; now they just control the NDP.

When the NDP was in government, they even passed a law called the vote 'tubsies'—subsidy tax, where they took public money straight from taxpayers and gave it to their party to cover election costs. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely pathetic. And, on top of that, they said it isn't about the money. Well, Manitobans know it sure as heck wasn't about the people.

Fortunately, Manitobans aren't stupid enough to fall for NDP manipulation. Manitobans know when they are being duped. They know when their tax money is being wasted, and they know when they aren't getting the services they deserve. And that's why they were fed up with the NDP government in April 2016 and elected a new record number of PC members to fix the finances, repair services and rebuild the economy of our province.

Since our election victory 18 months ago, I'm so proud of the tremendous work that our talented team

of PC MLAs has done to build an even brighter future for our province. We set a goal to be the most-improved province in Canada, and we are well on our way to accomplishing that objective. We are fixing the finances, repairing our services and rebuilding our economy. We are lowering the deficit and we're doing it without raising taxes. We've taken thousands of low-income Manitobans off the tax rolls, and we've led the country in job creation. We brought Manitoba into the New West Partnership, and we're eliminating regulatory red tape and barriers to interprovincial trade. We have led the national dialogue on the Canada Pension Plan, health-care funding, marijuana decriminalization, and the Trudeau government's plan to change the way small businesses are taxed.

Manitoba has come a long way in the past 18 months, but there's much more work to be done. We're fixing the health-care system so that Manitobans can count on receiving the right care at the right time. We're taking steps to protect children and improve education outcomes in schools, colleges and universities. We're working to create sustainable economic growth in northern Manitoba, and that includes working with indigenous Manitobans to make full partners in our society and our economy. We're implementing a return-on-investment strategy that will be used on infrastructure projects and throughout government that will ensure Manitobans get maximum value for their tax dollars.

It takes a great team to achieve such worthy goals, and I'm proud to be part of that team. We're listening to Manitobans more than any government before because we know that Manitobans know what is best for them. Manitobans have told us their No. 1 issue by far is health care, and we are listening. Manitobans want access to the right care in the right place at the right time, and our goal is to provide better care sooner. Patients have been waiting too long in emergency rooms and too long for tests. Hospital emergency rooms in Winnipeg suffer the longest wait times in the country, and patients are forced to move around the health-care system too much to get the care they need. This is because health-care services and resources were not aligned when and where they should be.

We know Manitobans' families deserve better. It's for this reason that the government of Manitoba has embarked on a plan to improve health-care results for patients. We are putting patients first by

ensuring that every Manitoban receives the right care in the right place at the right time. Manitobans need a health-care system that is sustainable and reflects on the need for innovation that will strengthen our health-care system. The plan to heal our health-care system is focused on the need for fundamental change to reduce wait times, improve access to services and ensure overall sustainability.

The recommendations that led to the plan came from health-care-system expert Dr. David Peachey, who was commissioned by the previous NDP government to develop a comprehensive plan for patient standard care in Manitoba. In an editorial written shortly after the plan was announced, Mr. Peachey noted Manitobans have every reason today to feel positively about the plan. The plan involves the consolidation of emergency and acute-care services at three hospitals in Winnipeg, with the remainder becoming specialty centres focused on elder care, mental health, day surgery and other services. The plan will result in enhanced home-care services, more mental health beds, more geriatric rehab supports and increased after-hours diagnostic testing capacity, among other service enhancements. It uses resources better and builds on the key strengths of each Winnipeg health-care institution.

I would also note that the work being undertaken to improve health—improve patient care in Manitoba is not unique to our province. Vancouver, Calgary and Ottawa have fewer emergency departments per capita and have shorter wait times than Winnipeg. Mr. Peachey noted in his report that we should distance ourselves from the concept that more is better, and Manitoba's emergency wait 'tooms'—wait times prove this point. Despite the fact Manitoba has more emergency rooms per capita than our neighbouring provinces to the east and west, we also have the longest emergency room wait times in Canada. With the election of a new government in 2016, Manitobans overwhelmingly supported the notion that a better plan for a better Manitoba was needed.

* (11:50)

And I'd like to share a short—a personal story, like I was asked to by the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe). My mother went to emergency care. She was taking chemo and she had an uncontrollable nosebleed. They treated her right away, packed it and she went home. They packed it with an inflatable ball that was super painful. Two days

later, when she went back to get it taken out, she had to wait eight hours before they saw her. It wasn't an emergency when they were taking it out.

We remain focused every day on the fact we need a better plan for delivery of health-care services because Manitobans deserve better than the standard they came to expect under the previous government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before we continue, I just want to warn the members of the Chamber here that, you know, some of the words that were used may not necessarily be unparliamentary, but a little crass and not nice, so, if we can be respectful for each other's side I would—I just want to give a warning here.

Okay, we'll continue.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll attempt to avoid those words, which I won't ask you to repeat here. I think we all know what the member previous said that was getting close to crossing the line, but it does speak volumes to the need for private members' hours, the chance for all of us to get to hear some of the backbenchers from the government side. They have a chance to sound off for a few minutes, and whether they intended to or not, on this resolution and on the previous one that I had brought forward, The Environmental Rights Act bill, they're actually proving our point, time and time again, that these measures are, in fact, needed, given the remarkable opinions—I won't say facts, but opinions being espoused by members opposite. It does speak volumes to explain why their government is headed in the direction that it is and why Manitobans don't like it.

On this particular resolution I really want to thank my colleague, the hardworking MLA for Tyndall Park, for bringing it forward, an excellent job by him, as always. And, I mean, how anyone could be surprised at the reaction, not just of Winnipeggers, but of Manitobans as a whole, to this government's reckless approach to dismantling health care, is beyond me. No one should be surprised at this.

When you concoct your little plans in secret and spring them on the public, spring them on health-care professionals, spring them on even the CEOs of health facilities without giving them any more than a few hours advance notice, lo and behold, people are going to feel like they've been disrespected. People are going to feel like they did not have a chance to make their views known, and when government is

stealing services out of their community, they're not going to like it.

There's a reason why Henderson Highway, once you cross the Disraeli Freeway, is now the Yellow Brick Road, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All of those signs calling attention to the closure of the emergency rooms in north Winnipeg speaks volumes all by itself, and an MLA, who happens to represent that segment of the city or an MLA who happens to be on the government side, should take note that that sentiment exists across the entire province, and they would be wise to start listening to that sentiment that Manitobans are bringing forward.

And the government just made the situation worse for themselves, both from a policy point of view and from the politics of it, by continuing to be secretive about what they were doing. It's not as if there was ever a news release that went out saying we are firing lactation consultants. That was people in the system, patients, health professionals, bravely coming forward and saying, hey, you, the general public, deserve to know what's actually happening. These cuts just took place. This is a bad idea. It will actually not just reduce the level of care available for maternal health, for newborn health, for women and their babies, their newborn babies, this is going to lead to increased costs in the health-care system. There was no news release about that. Government hoped to get away with it in secret.

Lo and behold, it didn't work then—backfired, blew up, and just adds to the public's accurate perception that this government is not on their side.

Exact same situation with the mature women's clinic. Where's the news release from the Health Minister, from the Premier (Mr. Pallister), from the WRHA, from anybody, saying, hey, we're going to cut the mature women's care clinic in the south end of Winnipeg—didn't happen.

Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was brave individuals, patients, health-care professionals, coming public, telling the truth, exposing the truth, and the government then playing—going turtle and saying, oh, well, we had to do this.

And nobody is believing that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, nor should they believe that. You always have options in health care. This government has dug its grave on this file, and we'll wait to see what the repercussions are for them in the years ahead.

In my own local constituency, of course, the single biggest negative impact that this government has brought is, of course, its heavy-handed closure of the Misericordia Urgent Care Centre. Here's a centre that saw tens of thousands of patients every single year, from every different region in the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority. Every sub-region sent nearly, at a minimum, 1,000 patients to Misericordia urgent care every single year.

And, of course, a lot of those patients came from my constituency, from Fort Rouge, from River Heights and neighbouring areas, but it helped divert people from emergency rooms across the city. And, for a government to step forward and say, we want people to use urgent care more and use ERs less, so what we're going to do is we're going to shut down half the ERs and at the same time close the only urgent-care centre that we have.

No kidding people think that's a dumb idea. Yet, again, the people are correct; it was a dumb idea. And, to add insult to injury, this was a facility that had the highest patient rating—satisfaction rating across any of the ERs in the city. It had the highest staff satisfaction rating across any of the ERs in Winnipeg, and it was serving a remarkable role as the first of its kind in the country.

And yet this government has the temerity to say that it's the first thing to go as they try and have more people use urgent care, which they now cannot access as well because the only urgent-care centre is now way in the south end of Winnipeg, and so many people in my constituency and elsewhere do not have their own private vehicle. It's not as if urgent-care incidents only occur during business hours, and the bus doesn't run 24-7, and, of course, as I have noted previously, this government also cut funding to transit, not just in Winnipeg, but across Manitoba.

All in all, a horrible decision already having very negative impacts, as has been documented multiple times in multiple media stories in my area and elsewhere, and yet it is a perfect symbol of

the callous disregard that this government has for the welfare of its citizens and for the health of its health-care system.

And the fact that they didn't even talk to the CEO, Rosie Jacuzzi, in advance of their decision speaks volumes—volumes—Mr. Deputy Speaker, on how highly they regard themselves and how little regard they have for anyone who might object to what they're doing. There could be political repercussions for this. I certainly hope there should be, and we will for sure, in the years ahead, hold this government's feet to the fire on health file issues and all others.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Bob Lagassé (Dawson Trail): Good morning, Madam Speaker—Mr. Deputy Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly. Today I rise to speak to the private member's resolution brought forward by the member for Tyndall Park.

We all know how, during the decade of debt, decay and decline, the NDP never made a difficult decision. Our government has taken a different approach, one that has begun the hard work that is required to repair the damage left us, one that will correct the course and move us towards a balanced and sustainable health-care system.

As it has been said many times in this House, our PC government is making difficult decisions necessary to ensure the protection of a sustainable system and quality services for all Manitobans.

Under the previous government, Winnipeg's emergency room wait times were the longest in all—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order.

When this matter's again before the House, the honourable member for Dawson Trail has nine minutes remaining.

The hour being 12 p.m., the House is recessed and stands recessed 'til 1:30 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, November 9, 2017

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Debate on Second Readings– Public Bills

Bill 220–The Environmental Rights Act	
Wowchuk	3585
Selinger	3587
Allum	3587
Michaleski	3589
Fontaine	3590
Yakimoski	3592
Lagimodiere	3593

Debate on Resolutions

Res. 11–Provincial Government's Plan to Shutter
Three Winnipeg Emergency Rooms will
Undermine Patient Care and Hurt Families and
Seniors

Nesbitt	3594
Wiebe	3596
Smook	3597
B. Smith	3599
Bindle	3601
Altemeyer	3604
Lagassé	3605

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>