



PRAYERS

1:30 O'CLOCK P.M.

Following Oral Questions, Mr. Speaker made the following ruling:

During Oral Questions on December 3, 2002, the Honourable Official Opposition House Leader raised a point of order concerning the number of questions that had been asked in Question Period at that point, in conjunction with the rotation followed for the asking of questions. At the time of the raising of the point of order, both the Honourable Member for Dauphin-Roblin and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose were standing to ask a question. The Honourable Official Opposition House Leader noted that the Question Period rotation was at the eighth question at that point, and he contended that the Honourable Member for Dauphin had missed his opportunity to ask a question. The Honourable Government House Leader also spoke to the point of order. The Deputy Speaker took the matter under advisement for further study.

I thank the Honourable Members for their contributions to this point of order.

The issue of when government backbenchers can pose a question during Question Period has been raised in the House before. As I have advised the House on previous occasions, the rotation and number of questions asked per caucus was discussed between the House Leaders and the Speaker at the start of this Legislature. The agreement that was reached, was that the first five questions and corresponding supplementaries would be allocated to the Official Opposition Party, the sixth question and corresponding supplementaries would go to the Member for River Heights, and if a government backbencher rose to ask a question, he or she would be recognized to ask the seventh question with corresponding supplementaries. After question seven, or if no government backbenchers rose, the rotation of questions would then revert to the Official Opposition Party.

In perusing the Hansard of December 3, the sequence of events indicated that the Official Opposition Party asked questions one through seven prior to the point of order being raised. The Honourable Member for Russell did ask a new question instead of asking a supplementary after question three, and the Honourable Member for River Heights did not ask question six. The issue is then should the Honourable Member for Dauphin be recognized to ask a question during the question eight slot for Question Period because of these actions. I must respectfully rule that the answer is no, because this is contrary to the rotation that was negotiated between the House Leaders. This is also in conformity with a ruling that I made on June 28, 2001, when the Honourable Member for Radisson attempted to be recognized to ask a question when the House was on question thirteen. On that occasion, I ruled that I would not allow the question because of adhering to the rotation negotiated by House Leaders, and that if a Member on the government side has a question, it should be asked during the question seven slot.

I must therefore rule that the Honourable Official Opposition House Leader does have a point of order.

Pursuant to Rule 23(1), Ms. ASPER, Mr. MURRAY, Ms. KORZENIOWSKI, Messrs. HELWER and AGLUGUB made Members' Statements.

The House resumed the Interrupted Debate on the Proposed Motion of Mr. DEWAR:

THAT the following address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor:

We, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba thank your Honour for the gracious speech addressed to us at this Fourth Session of the Thirty-Seventh Legislature of Manitoba.

And the proposed amendment moved by Mr. MURRAY as follows:

That the Motion be amended by adding at the end of the sentence the following words:

But this House regrets

(a) the government's inability to fulfill the promises outlined in its Throne Speech of November 13, 2001, including the following failures: not ending hallway medicine; not addressing the province-wide shortage of health care professionals; not reducing waiting lists for health care services; and

(b) the government's failure to address Manitoba's growing court backlogs through such measures as contracting with private law firms; and

(c) the government's failure to make a commitment for further provincial income tax reductions; and

(d) the government's failure to institute mandatory standards testing in grades 6 and Senior 1 despite the fact that our students score lower on national testing than the Canadian average; and

(e) the government's failure to make a firm commitment to relocating Assiniboine Community College to the former Brandon Mental Health Centre site; and

(f) the government's failure to ensure a viable future for the family farm in Manitoba through measures such as providing the provincial government's share of the transition funding set out in the Agricultural Policy Framework, thereby not addressing the pressing challenges facing Manitoba producers and treating them as 40 per cent less valuable than their counterparts in Alberta and Ontario; and

(g) the government's failure to adequately promote rural economic diversification; and

(h) the government's failure to prevent Manitoba parks from being carved up and protected for future generations, in spite of the fact that the Member for Concordia told a Winnipeg radio station that "the designation (of a provincial park) means the public owns the park and it can't be sold or bartered away..."; and

(i) the government's failure to set out a meaningful plan to protect the province's fish stocks from illegal fishing; and

(j) the government's failure to set out a plan to prevent future spills of sewage into the Red River; and

(k) the government's failure to provide a cost-benefit analysis of the impact of ratifying the Kyoto Protocol on Manitoba's economy; and

(l) the government's failure to stem the outflow of Manitobans to other provinces; and

(m) the government's failure to recognize the important role private sector involvement has in growing Manitoba's economy.

AND has thereby lost the trust and confidence of the people of Manitoba and this House.

And the debate continuing on the amendment,

And Messrs. GILLESHAMMER and AGLUGUB, Mrs. SMITH (Fort Garry), Ms. KORZENIOWSKI, Mr. ROCAN, Ms. CERILLI, Mr. DYCK, Hon. Ms. MIHYCHUK and Mr. PENNER (Steinbach) having spoken,

And the Question being put on the amendment. It was negatived on the following division:

YEA

CUMMINGS	MAGUIRE
DERKACH	MITCHELSON
DRIEDGER	MURRAY
DYCK	PENNER (Emerson)
ENNS	PENNER (Steinbach)
FAURSCHOU	PITURA
GERRARD	REIMER
GILLESHAMMER	ROCAN
HAWRANIK	SCHULER
HELWER	SMITH (Fort Garry)
LAURENDEAU	STEFANSON
LOEWEN	TWEED 24

NAY

AGLUGUB	MALOWAY
ALLAN	MARTINDALE
ASHTON	MCGIFFORD
ASPER	MIHYCHUK
BARRETT	NEVAKSHONOFF
CALDWELL	REID
CERILLI	ROBINSON
CHOMIAK	RONDEAU
DEWAR	SALE
DOER	SANTOS
FRIESEN	SCHELLENBERG
JENNISSEN	SELINGER
KORZENIOWSKI	SMITH (Brandon West)
LATHLIN	STRUTHERS
LEMIEUX	WOWCHUK..... 31
MACKINTOSH	

And the debate continuing on the main motion,

The debate was allowed to remain open.

The House then adjourned at 5:35 p.m. until 1:30 p.m. Tuesday, December 10, 2002.

Hon. George HICKES,
Speaker.