



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable D. James Walding  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 162 - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 17 JANUARY, 1984.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Hon. Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	IND
<b>CORRIN, Q.C., Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virten	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Hon. Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, Hon. John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 17 January, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MS. M.B. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased today to table copies of a "Memorandum of Agreement for the Maintenance of Services That are Essential During Work Stoppages in Health Care Facilities".

This Memorandum of Agreement, Mr. Speaker, negotiated voluntarily through the Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee has been agreed to by the following:

The St. Boniface, Misericordia, Seven Oaks, Victoria, Grace and Concordia General Hospitals  
The Health Sciences Centre  
The Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals  
The Canadian Union of Public Employees  
Provincial Council of Health Care Local Unions  
The Manitoba Government Employees Association  
The Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers  
The International Union of Operating Engineers  
The Manitoba Paramedical Association  
The Service Employees International Union; and  
The Manitoba Organization of Nurses Association.

To my knowledge this is the first such agreement to be negotiated in Canada. Under the agreement the parties have agreed to maintain all services that, "if not performed would endanger life or limb." The agreement further recognizes that essentiality of a work function will vary between and within facilities. The determination of essentiality, therefore, shall be made by the individual bargaining agent and employer.

The agreement provides for flexibility and lays out clear avenues of appeal and adjudication should the need arise.

Reaching agreement on such a vital matter has not been easy. The first proposal was submitted to a subcommittee of the Labour Management Review Committee almost four years ago to the day. Indeed, discussions had begun long before that. All the parties involved in this agreement are to be commended for their hard work and their dedication. This government is proud of that work and of our involvement in the procedure. This agreement has been a high priority. It is a priority that reflects our commitment to the safety and health of Manitobans as primary in matters dealing with the province's health care system.

This agreement is also important in that it was negotiated in the spirit of free collective bargaining, a principle to which this government remains committed.

I am confident that the hospitals and unions involved share our concerns and I know that they will do everything in their power to see that this Memorandum of Agreement works to the benefit of all Manitobans.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for her very welcome statement and express the congratulations and the satisfaction of members on this side of the House with respect to the achievement that is noted in the remarks before us today.

I am familiar with the long and difficult process that lay behind the achievement here noted, Mr. Speaker. I think that members on both sides of this House, parties on both sides of this House, can share equally in the satisfaction that I feel, that I'm sure the government feels and that I would think all Manitobans would feel at this accomplishment.

I well remember the trailblazing work done in this connection by a former colleague of ours on this side and a former colleague of all members of this House, the former Minister of Labour, the then Honourable Ken MacMaster from Thompson Constituency, who did a great deal of the initial work in putting this kind of an initiative together.

The Chairman of the Labour Management Review Committee, Mr. Cam MacLean should be equally commended; and two governments, the government of the Honourable Sterling Lyon and the government of the Honourable Howard Pawley should be commended for this achievement, as should the various components and units of the health care community and the health professions field that are cited in the Minister's statement.

We take pleasure in having worked, as constructive Manitobans, in achieving this objective, Mr. Speaker, and look forward to the compatible and constructive resolution of difficulties in work stoppage situations, or work stoppage threat situations, in our health facilities in the future.

The one question mark that remains, of course, is that that has to do with the determination of essentiality which, I take it from the Minister's statement, is something that will be determined individually and perhaps even arbitrarily on individual health facility sites. That could continue to confront us with some difficulties but, in any event, Mr. Speaker, we have together gone a long way down the road towards guaranteeing the safety and security of our patients and our consumers of the hospital service system.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of members to the gallery. We

have 32 students of Grade 9 standing from the Acadia Junior High School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Bradley, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Constitutional Resolution

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister.

Can the First Minister indicate whether or not his government is indeed prepared to accept the subamendment to the constitutional resolution moved last Friday by the opposition? A resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I remind the First Minister, that was received with some elation and described as a major move by his House Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I remind the honourable member that the matter is under advisement and has not yet been accepted for debate by this House.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Honourable House Leader. It's reported that the Secretary of State, Serge Joyal, is currently reviewing the Constitution amendment before this House.

My question to him is, as it is quite proper for the other signatory of this proposed agreement should do, has he been forwarded the subamendment introduced into this Chamber last Friday?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I have not been in contact with Mr. Serge Joyal, or Mr. Mulroney, or Mr. Broadbent with regard to a Made-in-Manitoba solution since the proposal tabled by the government was introduced in this Legislature. It has been forwarded to the other parties in the case before the Supreme Court, but in no way has this government chosen to seek the approval or agreement of Mr. Serge Joyal or other in finding a Made-in-Manitoba solution.

With regard to the amendment proposed by the Member for River Heights last week, I would comment only, Mr. Speaker, on the question the member has raised, because I do not want to enter in any way into a discussion of the substance of that amendment. I would comment, Sir, that it was not us who moved the amendment, the Member for Lakeside or the Member for River Heights feels that Mr. Joyal should be apprised of it. I strongly recommend that he use his Legislative Assembly mailing privileges to provide for same.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Today's Free Press reports that Secretary of State, Serge Joyal, is currently and at the present time reviewing the resolution before this Chamber, can the First Minister or the Minister in charge of this resolution confirm that?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, certainly the question of asking government Ministers to confirm the correctness of newspaper accounts is out of order, but obviously my statement, in answer to the previous question, that I have had absolutely no contact with Serge Joyal since assuming responsibility for this matter, nor have I ever had contact with him before that time - in fact, I've never met the man or talked to him on the phone - obviously indicates I have no way of answering the correctness of the document even if the question were in order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to either the First Minister or to the Minister responsible for this constitutional resolution.

Will the subamendment that was introduced in this Chamber last Friday be discussed with the SFM at their meeting tonight?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** . . . I'm not sure that the SFM . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to make sure it is enquiring about a subject within the administrative competence of the government?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I direct a straightforward question to the Honourable Minister, is he meeting with the representatives of the SFM tonight to discuss the constitutional amendment?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

### Health Care System - deficits

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was asked a question by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry last week and I promised that I would get these answers and these are some of the answers.

The member had asked how many hospitals and personal care homes had a deficit for 1982-83. Now I want to say that there is what we call a reported deficit - the member understands this - and this is anything over the guidelines announced in that year; and then, during the course of the year there are commitments and advances made on something that might happen, some emergency or whatever, and then what is left after that is the deficit, the true deficit, and there are further adjustments and appeals to these also.

Now in the urban hospitals, in 1982-83, there was a reported deficit of \$8.5 million and after the commitments were paid and the advances, that left \$1.1 million and that is also being appealed and I suspect a good portion of it will also be accepted.

I would want to say here that I'm including only the deficit over \$25,000.00. The other would not be reported.

In the rural hospitals, in total, there was a surplus, although 29 rural hospitals had some deficits and after

the commitments and the advances were paid, there were four remaining with a total deficit of \$270,000.00.

The personal care homes - when you look at the overall - the slight surplus, with 22 reporting a deficit; but again when the commitments and the advances were paid, there was a \$69,000 deficit remaining that is under appeal.

Now what is left for the total of the urban and rural hospitals and the personal care homes is a total deficit of \$1.468 million and I suspect that quite a bit of that will be paid.

The second question was that the honourable member asked if I could confirm the projected deficit of \$2.6 million for the Health Sciences Centre. Of course he knew that, he was given the information and, yes, I can confirm that that is the projected deficit.

As of November, 1983, the Health Sciences Centre reported a deficit of \$1.3 million and they are reporting that their projected deficit will be \$2.6 million. The major portion of this deficit will be as a result of the one percent reduction in their global budget as well as some increase in supply items. The hospital now has their staffing within the approved levels. At this point they have not appealed their 1983-84 revised budget in which we reduced their global budget by 1 percent.

### HSC - pension benefits

Another question that the member wanted to know was, what the cost was to the Health Sciences Centre if they would accept the pension as the result of the change in pension legislation that was approved recently; and the very maximum, that is, if every single person would choose to go with the pension — (Interjection) — What are the rules?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Would the Honourable Minister of Health complete . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I've gone three lines for an answer. I was asked five questions. Do you want the answers? If not, the hell with it. If you don't want them, you won't get them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

### Meeting with S.F.M.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the First Minister. Can the Minister indicate whether any government representatives, either members of the government or staff, will be meeting with the SFM tonight?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister responsible for the subject matter the member has raised, I wish to confirm that no member of my staff, or the staff of any other Minister to my knowledge, or member of this government, will be meeting with the SFM tonight. The meeting to which the member refers is a meeting of the membership of the SFM. If any

members of government staff or civil servants happen to be members of the SFM, they will be attending in that capacity, not as representatives of the government.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question. Is the government's position with respect to our subamendment contingent on gaining approval from the SFM as to what their decision will be?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I think the honourable member knows that is not in order.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

### Meeting with Interlake constituents

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member for Interlake. Did the Minister of Agriculture and the Member for Interlake meet with a large group of people from his constituency and surrounding area this morning in his office, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, certainly I met with the people from the Interlake, some from my constituency and some from other constituencies.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, can the member who I'm sure is certainly regarded as a member who is supposed to represent his constituents, in fact, gone so far as to be on a very informal basis of Bill Uruski or Mr. Uruski that they now call him Billie because of the relationship. Can he confirm, Mr. Speaker, that those people were there to meet him; the very grassroots honest people of his constituency were there to request that he not support the government's proposal to entrench the French language in the Constitution? Were they opposed to him and his government's position on the resolution that is before this Chamber?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants an answer, certainly there were matters raised, discussed, views were exchanged, during a meeting on a number of issues dealing with the issue before this House. I certainly heard the views of the people who were there, as I would listen to any Manitoban who would come to my office expressing their views and, Sir, we exchanged those views. There may be disagreements in terms of approach, but we certainly had a very good meeting and exchange of views on this issue.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** We don't say one thing in Arborg and another in Winnipeg.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has a lot to say from the seat of his pants; he never seems to be able to stand up and face this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

### Constitutional amendment

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for the Interlake. As a representative of the people and the party that was elected on a policy and a platform that they listen to the people, in view of the many hundreds of signatures on petitions, and the very fact that many people came to protest he and his government's action, will he reverse his position on the language issue, Mr. Speaker, and support the people who sent him to this Legislature?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member should be aware that I was very pleased to meet with people from my riding, even though we were just informed yesterday afternoon that they were coming to the Legislature, I did make time to meet with them and exchange their views.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that anyone in government, in any elected position, will make up his mind on the basis of people coming to an office and making their position heard; but we want to hear from the people and we have heard. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether people will want to know what the Conservatives have said about the legislation where their former House Leader said that he is prepared to support this legislation; whether they want to hear that; where the former Leader of the Opposition in his speech last week said he is prepared to support this legislation and that French and English are the official languages of this province. People should want to hear those kinds of things.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture quit misleading the people which he represents . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Will the Minister quit . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of privilege.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I just heard a member accuse me of misleading my constituents. Mr. Speaker, had he been at that meeting he would have heard what was said. Everyone who was there at the meeting was there at the meeting, and for him to accuse me of misleading my constituents, Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister did not have a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Arthur knows that he should phrase his questions properly if he wishes an answer.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture, and the Member for the Interlake, tell his

constituents the truth as to the matter which is before this Legislative Assembly; and will he now stand in his place and say that he is not going to support the government that got the Province of Manitoba into such a political and a divisive mess; will he now stand in his place and say he will support the people which he represents, the people of Manitoba, rather than this misguided government?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the honourable member that part of the issues that were discussed at that meeting was the bill that was passed in this House in 1980 by his administration which dealt with, and I quote the first section, this act, "official language means the English language or the French language," passed by his administration as one of the issues.

As well, Mr. Speaker, issues were discussed because people are confused. At one time, the former Leader of the Opposition said no longer will English or French be the official languages of this province, and yet, last Friday, and I quote on Page 5563 of Hansard, "English and French are the official languages of Manitoba for the purposes of Section 23." They always have been; the Attorney-General of Manitoba said so in May of 1983; they have been since the Forest case in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, there certainly is a lot of confusion on the issue, and I hope the honourable members, once question period is over, are prepared to debate the Order Paper dealing with this issue and are prepared to get up in this House. That honourable members who let the bells ring, Mr. Speaker, all afternoon and all evening yesterday, today we will get up . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please. Members should not permit either questions, nor answers, from moving into debates rather than Oral Questions.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

### Rail line abandonment

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday when the Honourable Member for Pembina was responding to the transportation agreement that was signed between the Federal and Provincial Governments . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** . . . he referred to the Schreyer years where there was a wholesale abandonment of rail lines. He said the Lyon administration stopped the abandonment. Can the Minister of Highways tell me if the abandonment was stopped during the Tory administration?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, that is rather an embarrassing question. I can see the embarrassment on the honourable members' faces across the way when that question was asked.

I just want to confirm, and it's just some sampling, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that the wholesale abandonment, as was referred to by the Member for

Pembina, did indeed stop when the Lyon administration came into government here in 1977. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that there were a large number of abandonments that continued, for whatever reason, and whether the honourable member chooses to blame that on the previous New Democratic Government before they came into government, or on their administration, but there were a number of subdivisions that were abandoned during that period of time. Mr. Speaker, the Rapid City subdivision, the Pleasant Point subdivision are two examples. The Alita subdivision, Lenore subdivision, Miniota subdivision - I could go on. There are a great number of them that were abandoned, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would bring your attention to the rules that we have adhered to . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** . . . that the Minister of Highways is truly abusing the rules of this Chamber. He's reading off names which could be well presented to the Member for The Pas in a caucus meeting or at some other time. Rather than deal with the issues that this government are really on the ropes on, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to abuse the rules of this Chamber and take our privileges away as an opposition.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. There was no point of order. The Honourable Minister of Highways may complete his answer.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I just want to clarify. There was misleading information that was presented in this House by the honourable member when he said that abandonment had stopped; and I was just pointing out to the House, to clarify for the record, that that was not the case, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Highways if there were any policy changes, when this government came into office, which encouraged abandonment of rail lines.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, there were certainly no policy changes that encouraged the abandonment of rail lines in this province. Policy changes that did take place, upon our government assuming office, were that the interventions by the Provincial Government were direct, as they had been under the previous New Democratic Government and discontinued under the Tory Government in 1977.

What they did, Mr. Speaker, is, according to the statement made by the Honourable Member for Pembina last Thursday, he did indicate that they supported - they backed up, I believe were his words - they backed up the local retention groups. What they did not do is take a front-line role, a front-line position, a direct intervention, as the previous New Democratic

Government did and as our government has done in this case, Mr. Speaker.

We have had direct ministerial intervention and that was a direct policy change that came about when this government came into office and has resulted of course - as the honourable members acknowledged the other day - in the saving of a very difficult subdivision, a very tough case, Mr. Speaker, and the Ministers had direct intervention, something that the members opposite did not do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

### French language proposal

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister concerning the government's French language proposals.

Has the First Minister been notified that the continuing opposition of Manitoba's municipalities has now culminated in a call for the head of the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I want to just advise the House that I am sure the vast majority of Manitoba municipal people are extremely impressed with the work and the efforts of the Minister of Municipal Affairs . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . and they will not indeed be worried about cries or initiations encouraged by the Honourable Member for Elmwood in respect to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs is handling his matters as Minister of Municipal Affairs, his function as House Leader and his function as responsible for the FLS in a very responsible manner.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister again, given that the municipalities have submitted to the government 123 or more resolutions in opposition to the government's proposals, dozens of briefs at the public hearings and at their last annual general meeting another resolution . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. R. DOERN:** . . . passed against the government proposals, shouldn't somebody in Cabinet reflect their thinking and represent the 80 percent of Manitobans who are opposed to the government's proposals, past and present?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of 123 municipalities forwarding resolutions in opposition to this proposal that is before the Chamber today.

Maybe the honourable member has not read the new proposal that is before this Chamber but I'm sure that most Manitobans have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

### Request for removal of Minister of Municipal Affairs

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the First Minister, as a follow-up to the question of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, will the First Minister be replying by letter to those municipalities that have requested that the Minister of Municipal Affairs be removed from his office as Minister of Municipal Affairs? Will the First Minister be replying to the request from the municipalities?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have not received any requests. I heard a radio report this morning of a reeve from the Municipality of Elton making such a request. I also know that the particular reeve attended the Conservative Leadership Convention as a delegate from the Constituency of Minnedosa.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Virden.

### Reeve of Elton

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question to the Honourable First Minister.

Will the First Minister apologize to the Reeve of Elton Municipality for the sleazy remarks he has made about his personality in this House?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Virden may feel it's sleazy to attend a Conservative Convention. I don't feel it's sleazy to attend a Conservative Convention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa on a point of order.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Municipality of Elton is in my constituency and the reeve in question did not attend the Progressive Conservative Leadership Convention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member did not have a point of order.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, if that be the case, then I will certainly withdraw but I'm not so sure that he didn't attempt, on an alternative slate, to become a delegate to the Conservative Convention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West. — (Interjection)

**MR. H. CARROLL:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

### Brandon University - President

**MR. H. CARROLL:** The Minister of Education has refused to intervene in the serious situation at Brandon University because she says the board is autonomous. The government has now indicated it will allow a bill to come forward with respect to the City of Winnipeg Pension Plan and I understand Winnipeg is an autonomous body . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. H. CARROLL:** . . . in light of this, will the First Minister instruct the Minister of Education to intervene in the extremely serious situation at Brandon University?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, that question has been asked on several previous occasions within the last week in this Chamber. The answer remains as it has on other such occasions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. H. CARROLL:** A supplementary question to the First Minister.

Will the First Minister come out and say then that he considers the business of the City of Winnipeg and their pension plan to be more serious than the problems at Brandon University?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, what I have indicated, and I repeat, there is a responsibility on the part of those that are charged with the responsibility for the administration of our universities to be able to carry on that kind of responsibility without undue interference by the Provincial Government; No. 2, Mr. Speaker, though it has been repeatedly been requested for, no evidence has been submitted that the educational standards at the University of Brandon have been disturbed by any action whatsoever; and what we must think in terms of is the standard of education received by the students at the University of Brandon, not the interests of other individuals, pressure groups, or otherwise, that are not directly affected by the University of Brandon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, following on the Premier's answer, I wonder if the Premier would confirm that the Board of Governors at Brandon University were politically appointed, whereas the councillors of the Winnipeg Council were democratically elected; can he tell us again how he can distinguish the difference?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Member for Morris is not better informed. The City of Winnipeg, the city councillors that are responsible for the affairs at the City of Winnipeg level, have the



right to fire, to hire, city employees in the same manner as do the members of the Board of Governors of the Brandon University.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

#### **Cable rate increase for rural subscribers**

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Last fall the MTS gave advance notice of an increase in the cable network rental charges to rural cable operators. Subsequent to that, those cable operators applied for a pass-through rate increase on their customer subscriber rates through application before the CRTC. I would ask the Minister if he's satisfied, in view of the fact that new rate is now in effect from MTS, and that CRTC has not yet made their pass-through decision on a rate increase for the companies, whether the Minister considers the advance notice given by the Telephone System to the rural cable operators is sufficient?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

#### **MTS - retirement program**

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I can give a full answer to the member's question. I can undertake to seek out the information and reply subsequently. But, while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a question put by the same member some few days ago with respect to the policy of MTS on the question of numbers of people that were retired under the option that was available to them prior to June 30th. In that respect, there were 113 that took up that option which was commonly referred to as the window and, of that number, there were five who were hired on short-term contracts totalling 19 weeks.

I would like to also advise the member opposite that we do not, as a policy, encourage the hiring back of those that have opted for retirement, but in these few circumstances, there were some special skills involved that were not readily available, and they were brought back on a very short-term basis. I believe we have one additional one that is on a three-week contract at the moment.

#### **Cable rate increase for rural subscribers**

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I thank the Minister for his reply and his undertaking to investigate the initial question I raised today and, as a supplementary question to that, would the Minister give consideration to instructing the Manitoba Telephone System, in view of the fact that the cable companies are not likely to receive their pass-through rate increase possibly for another two months, to instruct the Manitoba Telephone System to delay their rate increase to the cable companies until such time as an agreement on the pass-through of that increase is arrived at via CRTC negotiations and hearings.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that if the cable companies did have a problem that they would have communicated that to me. I've not had a communication from them in that regard, but I'm prepared to get the information for my honourable friend.

#### **Taxis - exemption of seat belts**

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I have a question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Could the Minister of Highways and Transportation confirm that taxi cab drivers in the City of Winnipeg, and elsewhere throughout the province, are exempted completely from the requirement of wearing seat belts?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware of the answer to this question. Taxi cab drivers are exempted only when they have a paying fare in the cab with them, and that is for safety reasons, otherwise they are required to wear them the same as anyone else.

#### **Seat belts - demerit points**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide an answer to the honourable member who asked a question, I believe, last week with regard to the matter of demerit points for people convicted of violations under the seat belt and child restraint legislation. Currently there is a regulation in place, 33274, that was made under the authority of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act that requires two demerit points to be assessed for violations under Sections 172 and 172.2 and 172.3 of The Highway Traffic Act. However, in order that this won't be the case, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is currently preparing the necessary changes to those regulations so that there will be no demerit points assessed for convictions pending.

#### **Seatbelts for children - shopping carts, school buses**

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I have to congratulate the Minister responsible for Autopac in taking the initiative, at the behest of this side of the House, to assure that no demerit points will be assigned for violators of the seat belt law.

Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Transportation. Since he has wholeheartedly endorsed the seat belt legislation, as recommended by the medical profession in the Province of Manitoba, is he now considering legislation requiring the compulsory use of seat belts for infants in shopping carts and, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, broadening the seat belt legislation to make the requirement of seat belts in school buses mandatory for all of our children in the Province of Manitoba?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, you'd think that the Member for Pembina would not be making jokes about something as serious as the matter of seat belts.

It's clear that the Leader of the Opposition - he was not the leader at that time - stood up in this House and supported that legislation, as did a number of other thinking people on that side. Mr. Speaker, a number of people there realized the importance of wearing child restraints and seat belts. The number of injuries that are saved each year because of that, and the number of deaths that are prevented because of it, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate that he has chosen to make a joke and talk about shopping carts. Maybe he has some data on that, that he wants to suggest. If he's recommending that, Mr. Speaker, he can wait another 20 or 30 years until he gets into government and then perhaps introduce that.

I want to say, in terms of school busses that currently federal regulations do not require the installation of seat belts by the manufacturers in school busses, therefore of course, we cannot have any kind of regulations or legislation that would require the wearing of them because there are not seat belts in school busses.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

### Cost of running Chamber

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Government House Leader. I was wondering if he could indicate the approximate cost of running this House and, in particular, how much money has been wasted by the continuous abuse of ringing bells by the opposition?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I honestly have no idea what the cost per hour permitted is of running this Chamber. If the member wishes me to provide that information, I take the question as notice and see if it's possible to obtain it. I don't even know if the records are kept in such fashion, or accounts, to provide that information.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that if most Manitobans showed up . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that if most Manitobans showed up at their place of work and then disappeared one hour later and did not return for their remaining seven hours of the working day, that they would be deducted pay for pulling such a stunt, I wonder if the Government House Leader might consider reviewing the allowances and pay paid to members in situations where they do only appear for one hour for the sitting of the Legislature. — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honourable member's concern with regard to the

obligation of all members to attend to the service of the House and to serve their constituents. However, I would reject any suggestion that the government or the Clerks at the Table should determine whether or not the performance of a member justifies whether or not that member should receive his or her indemnity. I think that would be very inappropriate.

I think clearly it is up to the people of the Province of Manitoba to judge honourable members as to their behaviour. The indemnities provided for members are provided regardless of whether the member does his or her job, regardless of whether or not the member attends at the service of the House.

However, Mr. Speaker, the member does raise a very important point in his question and that question is, whether or not the obligation of members to attend the service of the House and the calling in of members by the bells is an obligation that stands above all others under our rules.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, we recognize that government backbenchers have the right in this Chamber, as do all members, to ask questions, but we don't have to be lectured to by the Government House Leader rather than answering the question that was put by his member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** To the same point of order, the Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, unlike the Honourable Opposition House Leader, I thought the Member for Thompson was raising a sincere question about the obligations of members in this Chamber.

I did not propose to lecture members opposite but rather explain to the Member for Thompson why I was rejecting his suggestion that members who behave, not in the best interest of the service of this House, should still receive their full indemnity. That, Sir, was the question; that, Sir, was my answer.

Sir, when one throws a stone amongst a pack of dogs and hears one yelp, one knows one's hit one's mark.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.  
The time for Oral Questions having expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call the bill, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa on Second Reading, Bill 115.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader on a Point of Order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I rise on a point of order on the Business of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal through you to the government benches and to the House Leader to take seriously our continued objection to dealing with Bill 115.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote the words of the House speaker when he first introduced these measures some two weeks ago in this House. He indicated at the time of the introduction of the Constitutional Resolution and he said the following: "This amendment is part of a substantially different proposal to address the subject matter." He goes on to say that, "Copies of the bill respecting French language services are being supplied to members. That bill is consequential to and flows from the amendment I will be proposing."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you must understand and I appeal through you to the House Leader, the problem that the opposition has. Had we, for instance, dealt with and acted upon the first proposal before us as we were urged to do, indeed, Mr. Speaker, as we were threatened to do, we may not have been dealing with the bill at all or certainly a very different bill. Mr. Speaker, had we dealt with the amended resolution before us some time in September, we would be looking at a different bill than is now before us.

Mr. Speaker, I do not say this in criticism of you, Sir, but I remind you, Sir, that we have yet to hear a ruling from you, Sir, as to the admissibility of what has been described by the House Leader as a major fundamental change in the resolution currently before us and I appeal through you, Mr. Speaker, to the House Leader, to acknowledge the problem that the opposition has in dealing with the bill that, in the words of the House Leader, "flows directly from this amendment", consequential to this amendment and, Mr. Speaker, we have no idea what the final form of that amendment will be.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and I say this not facetiously, I acknowledge that the House Leader has indicated that this would not be his intention. But we, Sir, have reason not to trust this government, not to trust this House Leader. Sir, there is legal opinion available to us as has been available to him, that should this bill by some manner pass before the constitutional resolution is dealt with, then everything in this bill would be entrenched.

Mr. Speaker, we will not take that chance with this bill, with this matter, with this government and with this House Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. I respect the argument made by the Opposition House Leader. In fact, I agree with it that he's right.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I offered to do exactly what he suggests yesterday. I offered to give him a commitment and now I make it on the record and that, Sir, is, that the government proposes to pass the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act prior to giving Third Reading and Royal Assent to the bill. We've suggested that before. We have no problem with it.

Mr. Speaker, that is now on the record, clearly on the record, that it would be our intention, because the bill makes no sense if some of the questions addressed in the amendment are not first confirmed by this House. However, Mr. Speaker, having made that offer to the Opposition House Leader yesterday, it was rejected.

Having suggested, over the last week to 10 days, to the Opposition House Leader that it made sense to proceed simultaneously because the two proposals were completely intertwined and part of a package — (Interjection) — Absolutely. The bill flows from and is consequential to the amendment; they are part of a package; they are interdependent. — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I gave the Opposition House Leader the courtesy of listening to his remarks. I would hope that he could control his colleagues to the extent that they extend to me the same courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, if the opposition wants to proceed with the amendment to The Manitoba Act and subamendment, if it is admissible, the main motion itself, there will be no objection on our side to see that that is passed and forwarded on to the next step of the constitutional amending process as members opposite suggest.

If the member is concerned, as he was when he raised his point of order, about the possibility - and I certainly agree that there is that possibility and I agreed in discussion with the Member for St. Norbert that there was that possibility - that the bill might be construed by some to be entrenched if it were passed before the resolution, I made a commitment in this Chamber, Sir, to provide for, on the advice of legal counsel, an amendment to the final section of the bill during committee stage.

Mr. Speaker, what more can I do? You know, as the Honourable Opposition House Leader knows, I can't bring in an amendment to the bill during second reading. What does he want? Does he want to change all the Rules of the House so that we now begin to amend the bill clause-by-clause during second reading? Mr. Speaker, all members know we can't do that according to the rules but, worse than that, we can't do it because they won't even talk about the bill. How are we going to amend it when they won't talk about it?

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. A commitment clearly to provide, subject to the advice of Legislative Counsel, whatever amendment is required to ensure that the bill cannot come into force prior to the proclamation of the amendment or in any way be impinged upon in the amendment to 23.1, that commitment was given. So I say, Sir, the point of order raised by the official Leader of the Opposition fails on that point. A commitment, Sir, that I offered in conversation yesterday, I have now made in this House, that final passage of the resolution will predate the final passage of the bill. Sir, I make that commitment and, if that has to be made in debate on the resolution I will rise at the earliest opportunity and make it in debate, rather than on a point of order.

The argument, Sir, then fails on that second point. But, Sir, there are several other points that must be addressed in terms of the Rules of our House on this question.

The Opposition House Leader suggests that one of the most fundamental traditions of Parliament be violated. He suggests that the government's right to call the order of business in this House should somehow

now be overturned, and the government and the order of business of the people of the Province of Manitoba should be dictated by the opposition. Sir, we reject that completely.

Sir, as well, I have advised the House Leader of the Opposition, as I am sure members are aware, that it was our intention to call both matters simultaneously so that they could be discussed as a total package dealing with French language services. We could have, as of 3:30 yesterday afternoon, after the opposition stated, for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, as well as the government. So the opposition states their position on the bill, which they alluded to last Thursday evening and last Friday morning, we could have been on the resolution by 3:30 or even a shorter time than that; we could have called the resolution. All the people of Manitoba — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I will come to that point in a moment. There is no question that the government has the right to call the order of business as it sees fit. There are only two items on the Order Paper. We proposed to call the bill first. We do not propose to force members opposite, or members on this side, to speak at great length, but the people of Manitoba want to know where that opposition stands on that bill and they have a right to know.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba also have a right to know where the government stands on the proposed subamendment proposed by members opposite, and I would propose that once members opposite have spoken to the bill and stated their position, which could be very short or could be a 40-minute speech, that the next item of business to follow that, when the debate is adjourned, would be to call the resolution. It's the only other item on the Order Paper. What do you think we are going to do the rest of the day? Take a holiday the way you did yesterday; no way. We will call the resolution.

The first item of business when the resolution is called is the Speaker's Ruling on its admissibility. If the Speaker rules it is admissible - if I may, Mr. Speaker - we will put up a speaker to debate it and give you our position. If the Speaker rules it is not admissible, I expect that the first speaker on the amendment would continue to address both the question of the amendment and the very dramatic reversal the opposition took last Friday with their subamendment.

Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. It has been suggested that in some way the order of business of this House is not being properly handled by the government because of the sequence of passage of the amendment, resolution and the bill. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that members opposite last July took a different position. They were very very concerned that a referral motion allowing for public hearings be the priority item of this Legislature. In fact, for two months they held up those public hearings by debating the referral motion, even though we had agreed to it on June 27th. Now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite want to hold up . . .

Please don't point that thing, it's got a nail in it. I believe the Speaker is standing because he is hearing a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of second reading is not to provide detailed approval; the purpose of second reading is to provide approval in principle. So the question of some fine detailing is still to be examined in committee, but the secondary purpose of second reading is to send that bill to committee where the people of Manitoba can be heard and members opposite, by refusing to debate it, and in effect closing down this House and debate on that bill, are frustrating the rights of the people of Manitoba to be heard in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I raise one additional point in addressing this point of order, with regard to the suggestions made by the Opposition House Leader, and that is, the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that this House will make no progress if we don't follow the business in the order in which they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I could find for you the citation which relates to threats against the Legislature or against this House, but I'm sure, Sir, the Clerk or you have already researched that precedent and are aware of it.

Sir, not only is it a violation of that precedent to make that kind of threat against this House and against the right of these members to sit, the suggestion was made that we would make no progress if we persisted in calling the bill; that was a suggestion. That's not a threat; that's a promise. That's even worse.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would raise a point of privilege if I was not on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I would remind members there is no motion on the floor and there should be no debate until there is such motion on the floor. I allowed the two House Leaders to speak because I recognize that they did have some difficulty, a difficulty that they perhaps should be sorting out in private and not on the floor of this House.

The second reading of Bill 115 has been called.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, Bill 115, the Honourable Member for Niakwa has 40 minutes.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Stand, Mr. Speaker. If any member wishes to speak on it, I would have no reluctance to allow them to do so, as long as the bill stands in my name, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, government is not prepared to allow this matter to stand for the fourth day in a row, considering that opposition members have had copies of the bill in its draft form and its final form for a period approaching a month, from December 15th. So, for that reason, Sir, we're not prepared to allow the matter to stand.

I would also, Sir, through you to all members of the House, advise that we have some concerns that a dilatory motion for purposes of delaying House business, which then results in a division, may, Sir, breach the very principle of your call to call in the

members. In that, Sir, it will be used, not to call in the members, but to tell them to go home.

I think, Sir, you may wish to consider at what point you wish to advise members that the purpose of the bells is to require their attendance to do their duty on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** No, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the House do now adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Can we do things in the proper order?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. No motion can be moved when the debate stands in the name of the Member for Niakwa and, once having moved that motion, an intervening piece of business must occur before the motion can be moved again.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Let us do things in the proper order. Does the Honourable Member for Niakwa have leave of the House to have this matter stand?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** No.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Then I call on the Honourable Member for Niakwa to make his remarks to the second reading of Bill 115.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that this House do now adjourn.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me while I locate the specific citation to which I referred earlier. I believe, Sir, you will know that a motion to adjourn the House is in order at any time and, Sir, I

do not question the appropriateness of the Member for Niakwa moving the same motion he moved yesterday for the same purpose, in terms of his right to move that motion, Sir.

However, I understand, Sir, and perhaps the Clerk could be of assistance in finding the appropriate citation, that once a motion to adjourn - as I raised just a moment ago, Sir, before the motion was put - has been moved by one member, no further motion to adjourn can be made and is in order until an intervening piece of business on the Order Paper has been dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside moved that the House do now adjourn. There was no intervening piece of business, Sir, unless you rule that the motion moved by the Member for Lakeside was completely and totally out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I certainly have not accepted any motion to adjourn the House since the Honourable Member for Niakwa did so yesterday. I believe that his motion to adjourn the House is entirely in order.

**MOTION presented and defeated.**

**MR. H. ENNS:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I have been advised by the Official Opposition Whip that the Opposition will not return before 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. In view of this advice I have informed Chamber staff that they will not be required to remain on duty outside normal working hours. I made arrangements to secure the Chamber and the sounding of the bells will be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

I am accordingly leaving the Chair to return at 10:00 p.m. this evening in order to adjourn the House.

**(And the Division bells shaving stopped ringing at 10:00 p.m.)**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 10 o'clock and adjournment hour this House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)