

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 18 May, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

POINT OF PRIVILEGE (Cont'd)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):
The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. PETER FOX (Concordia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It grieves me that I have to address myself to this question here in this Chamber. I had thought that we would strive to maintain the decorum, in fact, to improve it with the new group of MLAs but I find that the ones who are probably abusing the system more than anyone else are the ones who have already had some time in here and who should know better.

Now, I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that this motion really should not have come to a debate. A matter of privilege is something of a very serious nature. I have always understood that a matter of privilege only arose in respect to a member when he was prevented from doing his duties as a parliamentarian.

Secondly, that a matter of privilege in respect to the House only arose when the House could not carry on with its duties as it deemed it should. This was not the case in this instance. In this instance, a member raised a question that he called privilege in respect to a matter which both sides have admonished each other continually and which are not in the rules but we have become accustomed to saying that we will not discuss the absence or presence of a member.

Now, both sides have adhered to this and all of a sudden we want to make a matter of privilege out of it. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to any matter going before the Rules Committee, but I do object to the rules being abused by members because they want to gain some brownie points.

Now, the members that have made this issue into a debate are the ones who are really losing on the grounds that the Budget Debate is generally the debate for the Opposition. Yet, because they have no real debate in respect to the Budget they, I believe in my opinion, have raised this as a red herring. I can hear them moaning and groaning but the issue is very clear to me, Mr. Speaker.

As I have indicated, we debate matters of privilege only and I would say that in this case, the motion was made correctly but the substance of the motion was not a matter of privilege. The fact that the motion is correct, that the issue that is being raised is correct in format, does not make it a matter of privilege. I again repeat, that since we have agreed and many times reminded each other that we will not mention who's in or who's out of the Chamber, that that question then cannot become a matter of privilege. If someone wants to take it up with the Rules Committee they can very well do so. There are a number of ways to bring it before the Rules Committee but a matter of privilege is not the way to do it.

Let me go on a little bit further, Mr. Speaker, and indicate that there are a number of other things that

have occurred which it grieves me to have to repeat in this House in respect to the procedures. I know it was partly my fault that we never got to debate the matter of which takes precedence, point of order or matter of privilege. But I want to indicate to you today and this is my opinion and I think it's just common sense that a point of order has to take precedence over anything else whether it comes before the House at this time or any other time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Virден on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe we're discussing a Resolution before us. I think the honourable member is bringing some extraneous material into the debate that has no relevance whatsoever to the debate before us.

MR. FOX: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that one of the problems we have in this House is procedure and a matter of privilege is part of the procedure that we're having difficulty over because, when the member was speaking some members try to get up on a point of order and they were denied the floor at that time. Later on somebody was speaking on a point of order and somebody was denied on a matter of privilege so we've got to get our act together one way or the other. I'm going to again say it's plain common sense what we have to discuss in respect to a matter of privilege or a point of order.

A point of order has to take precedence because if you're using the wrong procedure, a privilege or any other matter is invalid. You may have no quorum; that's a point of order. So you can discuss all the matters of privilege you like, you can't come to any decisions because you don't have enough members in the House. So again, I want to reiterate a point of order takes precedence and a matter of privilege, in this instance, it was not.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm quite surprised that members in this Chamber would want to discuss something that has already been dealt with and I would suggest to you, Sir, that any person who wants to argue about whether or not it's a point of privilege or not is really, in essence, challenging the ruling of the Chair and, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to defend the ruling of the Chair because if you destroy the paramounts of the Chair you have destroyed the parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, what we see today is the face of idiocy in this Chamber, not realizing that when we are discussing a matter of this urgency in the House that it is democracy itself that is on trial. The very subject matter before us today is whether or not the Executive Council should be called or should be in this Chamber when debate is occurring on a very important matter which is the whole policy of the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring it to the honourable

members' attention that before they can come into this Chamber they have to be elected to sit in this Assembly and once they have been elected to sit in this Assembly, and I realize that it's not entirely true, but in 99 percent of the cases the Executive Council is chosen from members who have been elected to sit in this Assembly. This Assembly meets, according to our rules, it must sit at least once every 12 months where the program of the Executive Council is placed before every member of the Assembly and the Executive Council is called to explain their program to every member of the Assembly and that includes members on the other side who are not in the Executive Council. That is part of the parliamentary system and that is part of democracy.

If you challenge the parliamentary system, then you challenge democracy. If the Honourable Government House Leader wants to do that, then I suggest that he go out and do that to the people rather than do it in this Chamber, because the system of democracy and the parliamentary system is one that must be protected. It is a very fragile thing, but it is a system that brings into this Assembly at least once every year the members of the Executive Council and they are called before this Assembly to answer for their actions. If those members choose not to take part in Debate, then it does to some extent curtail the amount of debate that goes on and does prevent the wholesome . . .

Mr. Speaker, there may be some in this Chamber that want to get in the gutter, but I prefer to debate in this Chamber and parliamentary debate belongs in this Chamber. The parliamentary system must be protected and this is the place for true parliamentary debate to take place. So I suggest to every member of this Assembly that if you want to preserve the parliamentary system and preserve the democratic system, that you support the Resolution that is before us. The Resolution asks that the Rules Committee consider a request that half of the Executive Council be in this Assembly when its program is being debated.

The Resolution makes no mention of question period; makes no mention, Mr. Speaker, of any bills that are before the House; makes no mention of any government resolution. All it is asking is that in the one single program of government, that is, when they put forward their Budget for the entire year, that members of the Executive Council be in this Assembly to listen to the debate, to take part in the debate and, if there are points raised in debate, that they are here to answer them, correct them or make their contribution so that the debate can be carried on to the benefit of the democratic system and to the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to each and every member who is not a member of the Executive Council, to support this Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a debatable motion and I certainly intend to take part, it is my right no matter what high-pockets says out there.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not a bit disturbed, I am not insulted, I am not incensed, I am not sur-

prised. I might be insane, if I'm here long enough I could be insane, that's possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is something that I would expect and I'd like us again to examine the strategy that we see in front of us today. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget Speech is there mostly to give the members of the Opposition a chance to speak. It is, therefore, the members of the Opposition and remember that there is even a set number of days, and remember that this has to be called and there is no other business during that time, unless it's adjourned.

It is obvious, after listening to the debate, that they have nothing to say, they were caught by complete surprise. All we heard is platitudes. They felt so bad, they were so sure that it was going to be sales tax, as I said yesterday, all their speeches were on sales tax and that's all they were stick with it. Now they're losing out and they want to waste time. As the Member for Concordia said, it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection)— there's smiley. There's the genius. Can we stop for a minute and look at the genius and look at the person that likes to rule by degrees? — (Interjection)— He's right here. He wasn't here all afternoon but the genius is here. People are dumb. He doesn't know how they got their call to the Bar. He's insulting his own tradition and a beach whale. Well listen, you weigh three quarters as much as I do and you are this short, so I guess you'd call that a half-assed beach whale.

Mr. Speaker, they want to introduce a red herring. This is what they want to do on their own time; they don't want to talk about the Budget. The member that introduced the resolution certainly knows more than that and he had a big smile during the debate before 5:00 o'clock. He's a leadership candidate for that side and he introduced the motion — (Interjection)— What's that degree, what's that again? Well, certainly not for the leadership of your party and neither . . . Are you going to let them call a leadership . . . Oh no, you changed that rule. — (Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Could I remind honourable members to address their remarks to the Chair?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I should go on a higher level; I'd sooner talk to the Chair as the Leader of the Opposition; you're right.

Are you going to speak on this?

A MEMBER: You're a bigger fool now than you were when you were elected and I'm here to testify to that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Maybe you should tell my constituency that.

A MEMBER: What party do you belong to now?

MR. DESJARDINS: The good party. — (Interjection)— I welcome that. He wants to know what party. I have certain principles that I've never changed. I've got the courage of my convictions; not like shorty out there. We talk about restraint and all of a sudden, give, give, give and who came in with a big flower and a big smile? — (Interjection)— Look at skinny. This is the same party that wants the Rules Committee; fat stuff,

stupid, beach whale. Doesn't it scare you to be so bright and the only one so bright? It doesn't scare you? No, you believe that.

A MEMBER: Compared to you we all look bright.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh well, if you look in that kind of mirror, that's fine. That's the kind of mirror that's in a funny house and that's probably where you are because you belong to a funny house out there. — (Interjection)— You wouldn't understand anyway. No, the mover of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, did not say that the rules were broken. He didn't say that there was something against tradition or the customs. You know he is talking about something that is done in the House of Commons, in every House. Here it's the same thing and it was done when these people were in government; it was done during the Roblin years; it was done during the Schreyer years and it'll keep on being done because it is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to try to run a department and be here at all times. I was one of the front bench that was here when this motion was passed, by accident. At 3:00 o'clock, after the question period, I was asked by one of the members on the other side who had a problem, a legitimate problem, with somebody in his constituency and I went to my office to try to help these people immediately and that motion could have been called then and there's no way, Mr. Speaker, that you can do your work. The Session has been four to eight weeks and there is no way that you can be here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: How embarrassing it must be for the members on that side and especially when I'm talking about the rules and we have the genius out there coming in and making statements like this. He doesn't even know what it's all about as usual.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the member that moved this motion would have been serious he certainly wouldn't have taken time from his people, time during the debate on the Budget, because they are facilities. He certainly is entitled to give his opinion, there is no doubt about that at all and, in fact, the tradition and the rules provide exactly for that because there is an opportunity to make a speech on grievance and to get it off your chest if there's something that bothers you, Mr. Speaker, so that could have been accomplished without this red herring and without taking time from this Debate on this Budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the member said, well there had to be Cabinet Ministers? I don't see where they differentiate between the front bench and the backbench and he even added that as far as he was concerned, that he didn't care if the members of the backbench were here at all. This is exactly what he said. Everybody has one vote, one vote only and, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Minister of Finance feels that we have to hold his hand to show that we support him.

You know, if the people want to know the way it works, we've had meetings to talk about the Budget; we've had Budget meetings — (Interjection)— what're you saying, shorty? Oh he's dumb. Oh boy, that's

great. It takes a genius to call people dumb and fatso and communist. You know, no wonder he's been an embarrassment to all the members of this House and especially to his own party who'd like to get rid of him. Mind you, he's the biggest asset we had. I think that he did more to help the — (Interjection)— Well, at least I keep my principles, not like you. I've got the courage of my principles and if it means changing party, I change party. — (Interjection)— Exactly where I've been all the time, exactly from . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, if shorty can keep quiet awhile, if he can crawl back — oh no, he is in his own, oh no, he's sitting up, I'm sorry, I couldn't see him for awhile there, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection)— Flatter you, that's the last thing I'd do.

Mr. Speaker, I think the member that made this motion could have said what was bugging him. He had all the chances in the world but he didn't want that. As I said, the Minister of Finance knows that he has the backing. We've met two long weekends in a row, including the Friday afternoon, all day Sunday to discuss that. We met with the Caucus; that work has been done. We're standing behind the Minister of Finance 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere does it say that you have to be here to listen to all the speeches. It is impossible and, in fact, I think there were eight of the members of Cabinet who spoke on this Debate already, eight of us, and there was one that was slated for tonight, to speak tonight and a few more. I would imagine that, if we would have had all the time, that all the members of the Cabinet would have spoken; there's eight that spoke already.

Now a Session could be anywhere from four to eight months and anybody, especially those that have had experience, can tell me that they can sit here all day and run a department, I certainly don't believe it and I can't see how they could do it, it is impossible. They did the same thing as we did. Then the saying is in Ottawa, the same thing, everybody is setting up meetings after the question period. That has been the tradition of this House and the member said, well he would like to have the Rules Committee meet to make sure that there's more Ministers. Well, what does he suggest? Half of them? Three-quarters of them? How many? How many should be there and should it be each their turn or should it go by the responsibility that you have, the amount of Budget that you have? I'd imagine the Minister of Health would have to be here all the time when I have responsibility for one-third of the Budget, I guess I should be here all the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin was saying that I wasn't meeting with his members of his constituency, people that wanted to meet with the Minister. So we're supposed to be here? We're supposed to look after our own department and we're supposed to meet with everybody else. So all right, the Session started when? So you know it's impossible, Mr. Speaker, to be doing all those things at once. As I said, it doesn't surprise me, it doesn't excite me, it is a strategy, it's quite obvious because they're taking some of their own time not to debate this Budget, they don't want to debate this Budget.

We've participated and I think the public knows that we've supported the Minister of Finance, that we're behind him. The work is not done here, you don't have

to hold his hand. You have other work to do, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— I'm afraid I can't say the same thing as you, you can't be any dumber than you are now. So it's impossible to be bothered. You know, this is a great way to debate. You're dumb. No I'm not. You're dumb. No, you're dumber. Any time now you're probably going to say, you're mother wears running shoes or that kind of thing or a babushka or something like that. You know, your mother wears a babushka or you're a communist. You know, Charlie McCarthy? Well, it's not Edgar Bergen, it's Charlie McCarthy mouthing Joe McCarthy you know, you're a communist.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one thing though that I'm very pleased with, that the member talked about the Rules Committee. I think we should, I think it's about time we have a meeting of the Rules Committee and we'll look at the Rules on both sides; the way questions are asked, the way questions are answered, because we're making a mockery. There's yelling continually on this thing. I'm speaking for all the members because we're all as guilty one as the other, I'm guilty and you're guilty, we're all guilty —(Interjection)— well, I'm not speaking for you.

Mr. Speaker, the member who comes in and the name-calling that we've seen, who embarrasses people to tears, who's been an embarrassment to the province is out there and talking about speaking for himself. He's the one that wants to rule by decree; he said then it becomes rules, it becomes law. Well, he's had it, he'll never come back, he's on his way out, he's not going to last four years. Talk about four years, they're going to kick him out the first chance they have. They'll use him as the hatchetman for a few years and then before the election they'll change their image and get somebody a little more reasonable, that won't be too difficult.

If we're going to talk about the Rules Committee let's talk about the Rules Committee. Let's bring the Rules Committee in and talk about the way the committees are made, talk about what is . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: What deal did you make to run again and become a member of the Cabinet?

MR. DESJARDINS: How in the hell did you ever become Premier of this Province?

MR. LYON: By opposing people like you.

MR. DESJARDINS: And that is why you lasted one term at best or your mother wears running shoes!

MR. LYON: You're really clever, aren't you?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm just as clever as you any day of the week, any day in the gutter, and on the hockey rink, anywhere you want. You might scare some of these people but you don't scare me a damn bit, not even a little bit —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Indeed, all members should address their remarks to the Chair. I think it adds to the decorum of the House. In addition I

believe that all members will have their opportunity to speak on this motion if they so wish, therefore, would they please wait their turn and wait patiently while each member has a chance to express himself on this motion?

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if he could contain himself just for a few minutes —(Interjection)— you've passed that stage —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if we're going to talk about the Rules Committee, I've been trying to make a point; I've been interrupted about 20 times. But, Mr. Speaker, let's have a meeting of the Rules Committee and let's look at the question period to start with, the way the questions are asked, the way they're answered. Let's have the same rules for everybody; let's look at the condition that people come in to make sure that people don't come in under the influence of liquor in debate. Let's look at these things and let's clean up the act here. I'm all for it. I'm ready to go along with anybody and I'm ready to follow the rules providing the rules are played the same by everybody. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): Mr. Deputy Speaker, what a tragedy. The government over here is not prepared to listen to the Opposition or the taxpayers of this province to talk about this Budget; scared stiff to walk in the door; scared stiff to stand in their seats. And, Mr. Speaker, we have to be stood up tonight and listen to one of the most — the oldest member of this Chamber — of more service, Mr. Speaker, and to give a lesson especially to these new members about the decorum of this House from that Member for St. Boniface. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had about four hours to tell about the political career of that Honourable Member for St. Boniface who stood up in this House tonight, Mr. Speaker, and said he's not disturbed — he's never been disturbed — he's been a Liberal, he's been an NDP, he's been everything, he's not disturbed about anything. He also said he's not insulted. Who can insult him? He's never been insulted by Liberals or NDP; he just runs rampant through this place. He's big, he's rough, he's tough, he abuses you, Mr. Speaker, he just takes over.

But the tragedy is, Mr. Speaker, he made a lot of statements that I cannot digest. He said and I wrote it down, "the Budget that's for the Opposition." What an insult to the taxpayers of this province, the Budget — he said it, Mr. Speaker, and I quoted him — I'm standing up here and defending the taxpayers of this province in this Budget; so are all of us. He said, in fact, and I quote him, "the Budget for the Opposition" and that's the problem with that government over there, they don't understand; they never will understand; they don't know what the political process of this province is all about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of the motion that was put before the House by my House leader. I was thinking at the end of his remarks that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was going to support that motion. It seems to me as I got the tenor of his voice, that he is in support of it because he said call the

Rules Committee and that's in the motion, so I suspect he's going to vote for it. He said, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition don't want to debate the Budget, what a farce. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, they haven't read the Resolution that's before this Committee. Have you read the Resolution? All the Resolution asks is for at least a minority of the Treasury Bench to sit over at your desk and listen to what we have to say and that's all it said, a minority to listen and they're not prepared to do that but they're going to vote against it, Mr. Speaker.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, with this government, I've said it in my Throne Speech and I've said it, weak, ill-conceived, no planning, no direction, they're running rampant over there. They've got no whip; if they had a whip they wouldn't have this problem they got today. The other problem, they got this Member for Springfield over there who thinks he's a speaker and he can run all the Rules of this House and he was here before Moses that's sitting over there behind him. I hope the Member for Springfield one of these days will clean up his act and if the House Leader of the party over there would stop listening to him and listen to my House Leader, we wouldn't get ourselves into these problems because I suspect the Member for Springfield has got you in more problems than anybody over here has, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, could I have a glass of water please? Because, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go about 40 minutes if I could, on this subject. I think it deserves great debate; I think it deserves long hours of debate because there's a lot of things that have to be — and it gives me a second chance to make a second Budget speech.

Mr. Speaker, this is a political arena and surely members over there understand this is a political arena. To stand up and be critical of us for catching you off guard and put a resolution on the Order Paper and now you're mad, we caught you off guard. You've got a poor whip; you've got a poor leader over there and you've got no Premier, you're ill-led you're ill-conceived and, Mr. Speaker, there they stand. Either Anstett, the Member for Springfield's running the place or the House Leader's running the place or the whip's running the place, it sure isn't the Premier.

I still think as I stand here tonight, because I watched the conference that took place around the desk of the Honourable Member for Springfield, he's running that caucus, at least he's trying to. He's the guy that's getting in trouble. I tell you my friends, we know about the Honourable Member for Springfield. He was here one time and he left this place and we have a lot of knowledge about his works in this place, Mr. Speaker. I advise the Premier and the House Leader real quick, dump that guy over there. Get rid of him because he'll get you in more trouble in one day than you can possibly experience in a whole week. He thinks he knows the rules; he thinks he knows this place; he thinks he was here before Moses who is sitting over there behind him. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, he has a lot to learn about this arena and about politics. I know the learned Member for Ste. Rose who is sitting beside him should be guiding him better than he is.

Mr. Speaker, the substance of this motion; what is the substance of the motion? The motion asks for at

least a minority of the Treasury Bench to sit and listen to see if we can get you out of this difficult problem that you have, where you basically have a worse Budget than MacEachen had in Ottawa. You really have. The more we dig into it and the more we try and develop, it's a worst Budget than MacEachen has.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are not acquainted with hidden taxes. There's hidden taxes listed all through that Budget. The people of this province are not acquainted with that. It's our duty as an Opposition to make them acquainted with those hidden taxes. They stand up - sure they're not prepared to listen over there - no. Luckily today the First Minister stayed in for a little while. I see, Mr. Speaker, they're scared of the Budget already. They can't defend it. I haven't heard one Minister over there stand up and defend this Budget. They'll talk about Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island. We heard the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs today and he went at great length. He never defended this Budget. He attacked us when we were in Opposition, but I never heard him espouse one word in support of this Budget. Not a word, Mr. Speaker, and he can rise in his place again at a later date.

So, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as an Opposition to stand up and let the people of this province - even if we have to do it by a resolution that was conceived by the House Leader of our party - to alert the people of this province. It's that bad; it's ill-conceived; it's ill-timed and we don't want no part of it. We're going to tell the people, even if we have to do it this way. It's that bad.

Mr. Speaker, is the Member for St. Boniface trying to tell me tonight and the members of this Legislature and the people of this province, it's not the duty of the Opposition to stand up and fight this Budget until we can't breathe no more if it's that bad? Is that what they're trying to tell us? Well, we'll learn when they vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have that learned whip that they got over there now to make sure enough bodies are in the Chamber. He should resign. That's about the third time he's been caught with his pants down - at least the third time. I apologize for him because he's a new member. I don't think anybody even explained to him what the duties of a whip are. I say, Mr. Speaker, that he has failed his party miserably. This is not the first occasion, Mr. Speaker; it's the third occasion that member has failed his party. I don't know if the First Minister's going to put him in the government or not. I doubt it now. He'll likely go to the salt mines now or back home.

Mr. Speaker, let's go through this document again to tell the people of this province what they promised and what they pledged and all the things that they said they were going to do. That's the reason why we're standing up and fighting —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson on a point of order.

MR. STEVE ASHTON (Thompson): The debate is on the motion with regards to the Committee of Privileges, it's not on the Budget or on whatever whims the Member for Roblin-Russell has. Really, for that matter, it shouldn't be a matter of having personal insults. There is a substantive motion on the floor and this is

not on that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for his comments. The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a classic example of the mentality of their whip over there. He doesn't even know the rules - doesn't understand the rules. How can he be whip? How can he whip that party when he doesn't understand the rules? He just rose in his place and put certain sentiments in the record which you understood, Mr. Speaker, and I understood but, he doesn't.

That's the tragedy of that party: leaderless, weak, no whip. Listening to the Member for Springfield guide them through these difficult times and there they stand. It's a tragedy. I would think, Mr. Speaker, if this resolution had been on the Order Paper tonight that we're discussing, the people of this province wouldn't really realize how bad they are over there; how really bad they are.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back and look what they said in the Throne Speech. Have you read that one lately? I'm asking the Member for Springfield. Has he gone through that one lately?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to rule whether or not what the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell is doing referring to the Throne Speech as he attempted a few moments ago, to refer to some piece of election literature, is in order. It seems to me that there ought to be some return to sanity in this House at this time. If members want to speak to the motion, then speak to it. Let their remarks be relevant to the motion. I think we've had enough of this kind of insane nonsense from either side of the House. We're bringing the House into disrepute and it's time that there was a little bit of settling down. Speak to the motion. Let's deal with the motion. Let's get on with the business of the House.

If you want to debate the Budget, then have a vote on this; get it out of the way one way or another and get back to the Budget. I'm sure that the people of Manitoba, Sir, who elected all of us did not elect us to engage in the kind of circus which has been started by that ill-conceived motion. But, if we are to debate it, let's at least debate it, not go all the over the map. The members opposite are taking up the time they claim is so precious to them to debate the Budget. Well, debate the Budget, but let's not debate everything including these ridiculous, childish remarks.

I'm sitting here — (Interjection) — yes, minute after minute wondering if I'm in a House with adults in it or a House of people who ought to be back in some kind of kindergarten or zoo. Let's restore a sense of decorum. I appeal to you, Sir, sitting as you are, as Speaker, to exert your authority to make sure that is what happens.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on the same point of order.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the same point of order. If the Government House Leader has a point of order then he should use it as a point of order and not rise to debate the motion for a second time, which is what the Government House Leader has just done.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to thank both members for their comments and I would say that I am also concerned by the remarks of the Member for Roblin-Russell. He indicated, I believe — although to be certain I would have to check Hansard — I believe he indicated that this was an opportunity to debate the Budget a second time.

Clearly the Member for Thompson had a legitimate point of order when he indicated to the House, and to all members, that speeches were to be directly relevant to the question. Any remarks contrary to that ruling would be clearly out of order and I would ask all members to deal directly with the motion and let us deal with it forthrightly and directly, dispense with it and proceed with the important business that is before us.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, are those members opposite trying to tell me that the Throne Speech is not related to the Budget or, in fact, that the House Leader stood up and said, well, I'm waving this document in front of my hand from this great Premier of our province, that it was a childish message that he sent out to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker? Is that what he said? If I heard him correctly, that's what the House Leader said. — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The motion before us is the motion that was presented by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. That is the motion that we're debating, not the Budget, that we would wish we could continue to debate once we were finished. If the honourable member could confine his remarks to the motion that is before us.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your guidance, but if you read the motion, the motion is related to the Budget, the Budget Debate, and I'm speaking about the Budget Debate and the way the members opposite, they don't sit in their seats. I've related it back to the Throne Speech and I've related to the Budget, and I've related remarks — if I'm out of order, Mr. Speaker, you rise in your place and I will sit down.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the edification of all members, the motion before us is, moved by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside;

THAT the Rules Committee consider the advisability of requiring that a majority of members of the Treasury Bench be present during the Budget Debate.

The substantive issue here is that this majority of the members of the Treasury Bench be present.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. Does

the honourable member have further comments on the motion?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd be much happier if I had a copy in my hand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm waiting for the Clerk to deliver the copy if I can have that privilege.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again and thank you for the consideration of presenting me with a copy of the Resolution that's before the House.

It says here: "THAT the Rules Committee consider the advisability of requiring a majority of the members of the Treasury Bench be present during the Budget Debate." And, Mr. Speaker, I've related to the Budget several times in my address and you must have heard me, Mr. Speaker. I've also related to the Throne Speech. If it's going to embarrass the members opposite that much I don't want them to be embarrassed because of my address, Mr. Speaker. All I want them to do is to sit and listen to what the Opposition has to say in this Budget Debate. I'll not go back and dwell with these great documents that came out during the election campaign like this one, where Conservatives will give away anything to be re-elected, in fact, they're willing to give away Manitoba . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Time and time again we have heard from members opposite this evening about our great parliamentary system — and I think it is a great system — and the rules which underlie that system. Here twice you have ruled, Mr. Speaker, sitting in the Speaker's Chair which symbolizes the authority of the House and the authority of the Speaker, that Her Majesty's business be done in the House, twice you have ruled that what that member has done is out of order and now a third time he has dared to stand in his seat to defy your ruling? I call upon you, if he does it again, to name that member, as he has named before, and to let him know what the authority of the Speaker is. If we don't know tonight what the authority of the Speaker is, we never will.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Attorney-General for his advice. If the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell would conclude his remarks on the motion, please.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I regret very much the sentiments of the House Leader. I don't think in all the years I've been here I've ever heard such arrogance, ever, from a House Leader. This is a British Parliamentary system that we're practising in

this room, Sir, and if that's the rules that you're going to apply as House Leader in this place I will sit down. Democracy is gone in this province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will stick to the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I don't want to live in fear of the House Leader.

I can only accept, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if the House Leader can stand up and give the House instructions, such as he just did previously, we are in a sorry position.

Mr. Speaker, the motion that has been put before us, Sir, has been put before us for a reason that has become very obvious since the Budget Debate started in this House. The motion, I might say, Sir, was thought of several days ago but it was also thought that it would be not the best thing to do and possible the Treasury Bench would come down and start to give the Opposition the courtesy, and the people that elected the Opposition, the courtesy of listening to their debate.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the First Minister and he talked about people who missed question period and people who missed debates previously within this House. I don't presume to do that because I don't presume to say anything and I won't say anything because I don't have the proof of who was here when, if ever before, except in 1973, Mr. Speaker, I went to a town hall during the election and found somebody from the NDP Party had been keeping my attendance up in the House and I hope that never happens again and I hope that we do not refer to who's in the House and who isn't.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the reason for this motion is a request for a majority, I believe, or a large percentage of the Cabinet to be here.

Now yesterday when the Government of Canada, a Minister from the Government of Canada took the time to be concerned about the Budget of Manitoba and what it may do to Manitoba, I would say that this has to be one of the important Budgets that will ever be before us for a long time and certainly one of the most important that we've had in a long time. I would suggest that when the members opposite on Treasury Board met with the Honourable Mr. Axworthy, there might have been three or four of them, there would have been no reason why there couldn't have been other Ministers in the House. Sir, I don't think the motion would ever have been presented if we hadn't found on many occasions when there were none and many occasions when there was only one. Mr. Speaker, I say on many occasions, I am not one of the best attenders in the House from time to time but I appreciate the Budget Debate because I think it's one of the most important debates that is in this Legislature.

Now let's talk about the importance of this one, Mr. Speaker. Here we have a government and the Minister of Finance and a Premier who is presenting a brand new tax into the Province of Manitoba. The sales tax was presented many years ago. We've had occasions when there have been increases of taxes. We have had many occasions when there have been decreases in

taxes but under this Budget Debate, Sir, there has been a brand new tax introduced into the Province of Manitoba and the Treasury Bench should be here to listen to the debate that goes on in the House.

We have now had introduced to us, Mr. Speaker, by this government, a tax that every person who pays a salary in this province must take 1.5 percent of that payroll and pay it. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance says, I know better than that. It wasn't me that said it. I'm only going by what the Minister has said in this House. He said, everybody who has a payroll in this province . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk): The Member for Sturgeon Creek had told us but four or five minutes ago that he would restrict himself to the motion. It has taken but a few words for him to enter into the substance of the Budget. Mr. Speaker, I think that Manitobans expect and indeed, deserve to have us dealing with the substance of the Budget and not this kind of unfortunate wavering and wandering and reckless moving about that really is providing no constructive result.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if honourable members can't restrict themselves to the motion then I would suggest that we have a vote so we can get back to the debate that Manitobans are interested in, rather than ducking the debate on the Budget.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on the point of order. —(Interjection)—

MR. JOHNSTON: On the point of order and with all due respect, Sir, I don't know that it was . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister has made some comments about a point of order. I simply ask the members to make their remarks relevant to the motion before us. Remarks that stray towards remarks on the Budget or other matters either being debated or previously debated are clearly out of order and I would ask honourable members to confine their remarks to the specific motion before us.

MR. JOHNSON: I would like to speak briefly to the point of order and then I will get back, Sir.

I have been speaking, mentioning the Budget and every time I've mentioned the Budget I have referred to the reasons why the members should be in the House. If the important points of the Budget are not the reasons for the members to be in the House then, really, I don't know why the resolutions are there because they obviously don't believe in being in it. So, Mr. Speaker, I will try to stick to the Resolution and I'm only saying why the Resolution was presented and why the members should be in the House for the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I heard him say that I'm afraid to

debate the Budget. I have debated the Budget and I'm saying that the members on the opposite side and the Treasury Bench who have placed before us a Budget which they should be in the House to listen to, and that's what the request is, because it's probably a time in history in the Province of Manitoba that we won't see for a long time, that they should be here, Mr. Speaker, because the Budget introduces a brand new tax to this province. It introduces a new bureaucracy to collect it and it introduces all kinds of money to have to collect it and everybody that hires somebody has to pay it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that does not have an effect on the industry coming to this province, if it does not have an effect on everything in the province . . . —(Interjection)—

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

MR. PAWLEY: I would ask again whether or not the member is speaking to the Resolution at hand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member was making his comments on the Resolution. It is very difficult indeed, for the Speaker to rule on each occasion where a member refers to a budgetary matter because it is my opinion that the honourable member has tried to relate it to the motion in some way. I would ask members to confine their remarks as closely as possible to the matter before us so that we can indeed continue with the debate on the Budget.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your ruling and if the childish request of the First Minister is such that he wants me to say, every time I mention the Budget, that he should be here soliciting to it, I will say so.

The First Minister should be listening to the Budget because it's a brand new type of tax that's in the Province of Manitoba. The First Minister should be listening to the Budget because it is the first time that we've had this type of a payroll tax in the Province of Manitoba. The First Minister should be here listening to the Budget with the Minister of Finance because everybody in this province who pays a salary will now have to submit money to the Province of Manitoba in some way, shape or form. He should be listening to the Budget, Mr. Speaker, because they will have to have a bureaucracy to collect it; they will have to have inspectors for church's books and everything, so the First Minister should be listening to the Budget.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On a point of order, the Honourable Government House Leader.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PENNER: You have, Sir, this evening three or four times already ruled that speeches should be relative to the motion. The Member for Sturgeon Creek has, despite the liberality of your ruling, has chosen — thinking that he's being smart I suppose and that he can pull one over your eyes — to try and do an end-run around your ruling. I think that it should be clear that he can't nor can any member. There is a motion,

debate the motion, if he's not prepared to debate the motion then he should be told to sit down, not by me but by the Speaker. The Speaker must rule that we have to restore the decorum of this House, we have to restore the order in this House. If we can't do that this evening then I think we've lost the game.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the same point of order.

HON. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): On the point of order, I distinctly heard you, Sir, less than two or three minutes ago say that you, in response to the First Minister, had determined that the Member for Sturgeon Creek was speaking to the motion. I've not determined anything from his comments since that time that would lead you to believe that the irresponsible comments by the Attorney-General, and putative Leader of the House, are in any way deserving of your consideration.

I would suggest, Sir, with the greatest of respect that you tell the Leader of the House that he should read the rules and become more acquainted with the methods of procedure in this kind of a Canadian parliament before he stands up and tries to inflict his kind of personal bias with respect to debate upon this House.

You, Sir, have made a ruling with respect to the Member for St. James. I suggest, with the greatest of respect, the Member for Sturgeon Creek be allowed to carry on as before without the interruptions from the First Minister or the Attorney-General who don't seem to like free democratic parliamentary debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would thank both the honourable members for their comments. I would say that the initial intent of my remarks to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was to indicate that an occasional reference to the Budget Debate would be acceptable. However, to infer from that that prefacing each statement that he makes that the Honourable First Minister should listen because, does not constitute arguing to the point.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I might say that this would not have been necessary if we hadn't have had them becoming very touchy of why the Resolution is the way it is, Sir.

The Resolution reads that the Rules Committee consider the advisability of requiring that a majority of the members of Treasury Bench be present during the Budget Debate and the debate on it is basically the reason why they should be here. I have said the reason why they should be here is, this is a brand new tax in the Province of Manitoba. This tax can have an effect on everybody in Manitoba and that's why three-quarters of the Treasury Bench should be here during the Budget Debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find it kind of hard to say that they should be here during the Budget Debate to listen to something else. I can only say to them, Sir, that the reason for the Resolution is that we want them here during the Budget Debate to hear the Budget Debate. The reasons for wanting to hear the Budget Debate is the Budget and I've tried very hard to stick to

that but they're very touchy on the other side. They don't like wanting to know that the Treasury Bench really has an obligation as the people who sat down and designed this Budget and brought us a tax in Manitoba for the first time in history that we'll ever have the tax, that that isn't important.

If they do not regard the fact that the Treasury Bench were the people that put this Budget together and the Treasury Bench should not be here to listen to it, if they believe the Treasury Bench shouldn't be here to listen to it after they've put it together, Sir, they have a very high disregard for this Legislature. —(Interjection)— That's right, he says hallelujah when I said that. They don't have a regard for this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in the system that we have in Manitoba we have a government, they have a majority and they have an Opposition. The Opposition is there to present to the government the opinions of the Opposition side when the government presents its Budget, when it presents its Throne Speech. They must tell the people of Manitoba what they intend to do and how they collect the money and they must do that once a year in the Province of Manitoba.

Now if we eliminate that, Mr. Speaker, and we have a situation where there's no Opposition or they're speaking to a House which is void of the people that basically made the legislation we go to a totalitarian system, Sir, because that's the basic reason for Opposition and that's the basic reason for the Treasury Bench to listen to the Opposition of this House. This piece of legislation really says, Sir, that we are asking the Treasury Bench that has brought a brand new tax to this province, to have the courtesy to listen to the people from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance gets very proud of the fact that he has talked to businessmen about this Budget. I would be willing to say, Sir, that I have probably talked to more than he did since the Budget.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is clearly debating the Budget? If the honourable member has some remarks on the motion, he may conclude.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, so I say to the honourable member that I think he should be here to hear the opinions of the members on this side of the businesspeople that they have talked to. But the members on the other side choose not to listen to the Opposition who has taken the time since the Budget came down, to get opinions from other people to present to the House for the Ministers to listen to and consider before the vote on this Budget. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have not had the courtesy to be here and quite frankly, I will be very interested to see how they do vote.

I want the people out there to know that the Treasury Bench, if they're voting against it, if the government does not believe that at least half of the Treasury Bench should be available to hear the members from the Opposition while the Budget is being debated, when we have a brand new tax in the Province of Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I would like to comment briefly upon my regret that this debate has even taken place today. In fact, the Attorney-General is suggesting that our first question to him tomorrow should be whether or not having to listen to this debate not be a violation of our Charter of Rights in terms of cruel and unusual punishment.

Certainly an argument can be made because it is not a debate which has addressed either the issues of the Budget — although an attempt has been made by several members opposite — or really a question of privilege as it's defined under our Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I have some concern about the Member for Roblin's comments with regards to myself in that although he heaps faint praise, I think he might be in danger of protesting too much because if he keeps it up somebody on this side might actually believe it and I'd just as soon they didn't.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Virden talked earlier about members on this side who have some reservations about this motion that's been presented by the Opposition House Leader challenging the Speaker's ruling. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the question of this motion very specifically in terms of what we are talking about in this debate tonight.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the motion that was moved was ruled on by the Speaker — the member is quite correct, although substantively we did not hear a ruling from the Acting Speaker this afternoon — by placing the motion before the House, he admitted that the motion was correct as to form. Mr. Speaker, I'd refer you and honourable members opposite to Citation 80 on Page 24 of Beauchesne, Citation 80, Subsection 2. "A question of privilege on the other hand is a question partly of fact and partly of law; a law of contempt to Parliament." That's what we're talking about here, whether or not as a matter of substance the motion and the question raised by the Opposition House Leader is really a matter of contempt to parliament and is a matter for the House to determine.

The Honourable former Speaker of this Chamber said that the Speaker ruled. There was a matter of privilege here. It wasn't a matter of privilege in terms of the ruling of the Speaker. There was a matter of privilege that the Speaker said the House should decide. That's the first point.

Many members over there were quite concerned and castigated members here when we raised the question of substance. Mr. Speaker, that's the essence of this debate. For those who doubt it, I suggest that they should be the ones who should do some research in parliamentary practice, not the Honourable House Leader on this side who's demonstrated an amazing acumen in the short time he's been in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is again on his feet crying out the kinds of things he cried out earlier. Oh, he's sitting, I'm sorry. Well, the Honourable House Leader is speaking. He said earlier, he knows reds when he sees them. That should be on the record, Mr. Speaker. That's what he said. He shouted to the Premier of this province, if you want to hold a Marxist meeting, don't hold it in here, hold it in your office. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of Opposition contribution we've been putting up with in this House. Mr. Speaker, that's my concern and that's

why I've chosen to speak on this motion and speak about the privileges of this House and the abuse of them and the fact that those privileges have been abused more in the last five years in this House by the Leader of the Opposition than probably any other member and I intend to document that.

Mr. Speaker, before I get to that subject I suggest to him that rather than keep his mouth open, he think back to December, 1980 when he sat in the Premier's chair and lectured the House and the Speaker and ordered the House and the Speaker to do certain things with respect to the privileges of a member and when he's done thinking, he can open his mouth. I suggest that won't be in a very short time. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the quality of the former Premier's contribution in this debate is at about the same level as the quality of the government he offered to this province for the last four years.

Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from Beauchesne before the one-term Premier interrupted my remarks. The decision of the House on a question of privilege like every other matter which the House has to decide, can be elicited only by a question put by the Chair by the Speaker and resolved either in the affirmative or the negative and this question is necessarily founded on a motion made by the member. I suggest to those members opposite who said that the question was decided by the Speaker in admitting the motion, that that assumption is incorrect based on that rule.

I quote further, Section 3 of Citation 80. "It follows that though the Speaker can rule on a question of order . . ." —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Springfield is intending to challenge the ruling of the Chair, then he should do so. If he is purporting to speak on the motion, Sir, I don't believe that he's speaking on the motion. —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sorry, I did not hear the honourable member's remarks. Order please.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I say if the Member for Springfield intends to challenge the Chair, he should do so. If he is purporting to speak to the motion then I suggest he's out of order, Sir, on the basis of the ruling that you have just made.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield on the same point of order.

MR. ANSTETT: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the Honourable Opposition House Leader and you, Sir, and other members of the House, that at the beginning of my remarks I said that the ruling made by the Speaker in admitting the motion was certainly correct and I did not dispute it. In fact, I would commend the member for having made that decision considering the length of time he's had

to be in this House. Certainly, Sir, I do not challenge either the Acting Speaker's ruling nor do I intend to challenge you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the point of order made by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is that the remarks were not consistent with the motion before us. Although we thank the honourable member by way of explanation his remarks, could he continue on the main motion?

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, for the edification of members opposite, I would point out that I am describing for those members who had some doubt as to whether or not members on this side by reviewing the rules, were challenging the Speaker's ruling before supper, that that is exactly what we were not doing. What I wish to do is demonstrate hopefully, to some members opposite who may have qualms again about the nature of this motion, that this motion does not have the substance which would cause members in this House to vote for it. I would not challenge for one minute the Speaker's Ruling which allowed the subject to come before this House for debate; that was eminently correct.

Mr. Speaker, subsection (3) of Citation 80 provides and I quote, "It follows that, though the Speaker can rule on a question of order, he cannot rule on a question of privilege." Well, Mr. Speaker, how are we challenging a Speaker's Ruling on a question of privilege? I commend that Citation to the Leader of the Official Opposition who just had some concern here about me challenging a Speaker's Ruling when the Citation says none can exist. Mr. Speaker, I suggest . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before us is somewhat removed from the comments being made by the honourable member. I have thanked him for the indication and for his enlightenment and for pointing out those sections to us. Could he confine the remainder of his remarks to the motion?

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to confine my remarks to the matter of privilege before the House. I thought that with a singular exception I was addressing matters of privilege, in principle, as an introduction to very specific comments and I thought with a very singular exception the last hour or so I was one of the few members who was doing so, but I will do my best to be much more direct to the current question before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is the question of substance, the question of whether or not the Rules Committee should, as a matter of privilege in this House, should as a matter of privilege consider the advisability of a majority of the members of the Treasury Bench being present during the Budget Debate, being required to be present. I don't think the word, "required," is in the motion.

MR. ADAM: Does it say that there, in Beauchesne?

MR. ANSTETT: "Requiring that a majority of the members of the Treasury Bench be present during the Budget Debate." Mr. Speaker, that's the substance of

the question of privilege; that's the matter which must be decided in this House. Beauchesne, on that question, in terms of the rules to which we must address ourselves to determine whether we'd even consider voting for this motion, provides also in the same subsection I quoted earlier, Citation 80(3), "his function, when a question of privilege is raised, is limiting to deciding whether the matter is of such a character as to entitle the motion, which the member who has raised the question desires, to move it over priority of Orders of the Day." That's been done, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, who suddenly assumed that meant that the Speaker had said that for some reason there was an attendance problem on this side of the House, were sorely mistaken.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is not a question of form; the form has been decided. The motion is in order, it's a legitimate matter to raise. The question before us, provided for in Citation 84(2) extends to deciding the question of substance whether a breach of privilege has, in fact, been committed. And that's what this debate is all about. Has a breach of privilege in this House been committed? The Speaker has said only that the motion is correct.

Mr. Speaker, let's turn to our own rules to address the question of whether or not, in substance, there's been a breach of privilege. Page 59, second paragraph provides: "There are privileges of the House as well as members individually. Willful disobedience to orders and Rules of Parliament in the exercise of constitutional functions, insults and obstructions during debate, libels upon members, interference of any kind in official duties."

The only one that could, by the furthest stretch of the imagination of the Government Opposition House Leader, might possibly be construed to relate to willful disobedience of orders and rules of parliament, might relate to our Rule No. 11. I'm going to try to give the members opposite the greatest benefit of the doubt in determining whether or not there's a matter of substance here that is a matter of privilege. Our Rule 11 provides that "every member shall attend the service of the House and of each Committee thereof of which he is a member, unless leave of absence has been given him by the House." What does that rule mean? We don't have any rulings on it. It hasn't been raised before because most members have enough respect for their fellows that they accept the fact that all members can't be in here at all times.

But, Mr. Speaker, we then turn to Beauchesne where this matter has been raised and we turn to Citation 103. Citation 103 is on page 34, Mr. Speaker, and it refers to the equivalent rule in Ottawa, Standing Order No. 5 which addresses the same question that our Rule No. 11 addresses with respect to the attendance of members. Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting Speaker Lamoureux in this Citation and he says, on page 35; "I have suggested that before, but for some reason the members of the Committee have thought that the Standing Order should not be interfered with and that it should be allowed to stay. According to my information the last time the Standing Order was applied was back in 1877. I would think after all these years that this Standing Order should be referred to signal the absence of any individual member of the House."

Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about here is a rule

which the Speaker, the Federal House, has said has not been applied since 1877 and, Mr. Speaker, with all respect, those on this side who think those in the Opposition are living in the last century have just had their opinion strongly reinforced. They have not recognized the growth in government, the complication and development of Executive Branch responsibilities which prevent Cabinet Ministers from being in the House to the same degree of attendance as was available prior to 1877. Mr. Speaker, that's the last time it was applied. So when we ask the question, is this a matter of substance? Mr. Speaker, if the date on the calendar watch on the wrist of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain predates 1877, I might give him the case, but not today, not in the 20th Century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next question, if there's a question of substance to be addressed, is whether or not in this House, in our experience in this House, the situation in the last six days has been particularly better or worse than the experience because it's only an affront to this House, only a contempt to this Parliament if the behaviour of this Executive Council is exceptionally different from that of Executive Councils in recent memory.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, who will hear better with his mouth closed, will find that he admitted less than 15, 20 minutes ago that his attendance record in this House has not always been what he would have liked it to have been. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't comment on that. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek now wants to debate the Budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek should exercise more control over the flagrant misuse of Budget time by his House Leader and not suggest that when I wish to speak, I must then curtail my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: is the attendance of Executive Council members on this side over the last six days substantially worse than it was under the previous administration, or under the Schreyer administration, or the Roblin administration? Mr. Speaker, I haven't been in this House that long but fortunately I had an opportunity to be in this House with a lot more regularity than the Leader of the Opposition. I was compelled, and let me tell you, sometimes it's not the most pleasant experience to sit with the Clerk, and that's not a reference to the Clerk, but rather sometimes to the debate, for a number of years. Mr. Speaker, I was used to observing, while I sat in that chair, the number of members who were in the House and let me tell you it's not only my opinion but the opinion of others whose opinion I respect, that the experience in the last six days has been basically, no better and no worse than it was in the last two administrations of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit on the second criteria that there is no justification, no substance to the motion proposed. When the member did propose the motion I noted that he did name a particular Minister and I would point out to him that he gave that Minister cause for a question of privilege in naming that Minister and making reference to his lack of attendance in the House. I expect a little more from someone who purports to be that knowledgeable in the Rules that he can make those kinds of contributions in debate and move these motions.

Mr. Speaker, I would expect things to be worse right now in this House, in terms of attendance because the problems we are left are far worse. I would point out to honourable members opposite that there are four fewer members in this Executive Council, saddled with much greater responsibilities because of the mess they've had to clean up. I would point out that the last government had one member in its Executive Council whose sole responsibility was to be in the House as House Leader; another member was responsible for Fitness; another Minister was responsible for Cultural Affairs. Mr. Speaker, with those kinds of portfolio responsibilities, it's very easy to keep two or three in the House at all times but with the load these Ministers are carrying and the problems they were left, I can understand why it's possible some members might mistakenly perceive them to be in the House a little less than they think they should.

Mr. Speaker, let's examine why, not why the motion was moved, but why the members opposite are so frustrated, why there is no substance to the motion. Let's examine why. I've given you two reasons but I think there's another reason which underlies the mood opposite, which makes them so chippy this evening. Mr. Speaker, when we address this question of substance in the matter of privilege we say, why? Why did they want to disrupt the Budget debate? I can see three people smiling in the Press Gallery who know the reason. They know the reason. For the last six days the Opposition got no ink and Jack Kuch didn't say a darn thing nice about them - I mean, I didn't hear anything nice on CBC radio. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for making an individual reference to a member of the gallery.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not threatening me but is suggesting that the CBC will do me in. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition suggests that one cannot make silk purses out of sows' ears. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he should not quote the uninformed source in the Winnipeg Sun, when that uninformed source last made reference to his Member for Pembina. I, too, recall the columns and the reference to the Member for Pembina and I consider it unfortunate. If anything, I think the Member for Pembina had a point of privilege with regard to that kind of commentary.

Mr. Speaker, the real problem here and the essence of this question of privilege is that there is no substance to it and the Opposition has had to raise it because there was no substance to their criticism in the Budget debate. I don't purport to enter the Budget debate at this point, but what I want to do is point out that this motion arose just like a mushroom, just like their debate, but a mushroom that I particularly like, mushrooms called shaggy manes. They're also called inky caps and that's what this resolution was; a mushroom attempt on a rainy day when they could spring out of the grass to try to get them some ink in the local newspapers. Mr. Speaker, the shaggy mane is a mushroom; I do not purport to describe members opposite that way but I do compare their behaviour as such, and certainly, their attempt to get publicity for their inability to contribute constructively to the Budget debate is a charade of the worst order.

Mr. Speaker, why did they not get that publicity?

Why is this motion ahead of us? Why did we have to have this vehicle thrust on this House during a debate that could have been meaningful, could have provided some constructive criticism, could have offered in the true parliamentary tradition what the Opposition, as her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, purports to offer?

Mr. Speaker, I remind the Leader of the Official Opposition once again to think back to December, 1980, when he challenges others about their knowledge about the parliamentary system. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has a problem. There's no substance to the motion; there's no substance to their contribution to the Budget debate. Now, suddenly we're faced with insults on the other side because they cannot make meaningful contributions. Their problem is that they're going to have to clean house. The Honourable Attorney-General said yesterday there were only half a dozen on the other side who were intelligent and they were all smiling because each of them thought that they were part of that half dozen. Mr. Speaker, I will submit that they've got half of a baker's dozen; they've got six-and-one-half. I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition, in addition to the six who are intelligent, is the one who is half smart.

Mr. Speaker, their debate tonight . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I know that the member was speaking towards the Resolution when he was discussing with the House or explaining to the House the substantives, etc., and what have you, but basically forgetting there's a Resolution before us for a vote and that's all past, and he should be talking to the Resolution or voting on it. But when he starts to talk about the personalities on both sides of the House, Sir, I don't think that he is talking to the Resolution. I think he should be checked up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I accept the admonition of the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I concede that the comments by his Leader certainly drew me aside and distracted me and I apologize for paying any attention to him whatsoever, and I promise you I will do my best never do to so again.

Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about is whether there is any substance to the motion moved. Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about is denying members of the Treasury Bench, members of this Cabinet, the right to attend in their offices, the right to attend to constituency business on behalf of members opposite, as well as members of this side like myself. And, Mr. Speaker, the proof of the fact that members were there, attending to government business, the proof of the pudding, the proof that the motion lacks substance, is that within five minutes after it was moved more than half of the Executive Council of this province was in this Chamber, they were in this building attending to government business, doing their job.

So we now have three basic points which document the total absence of substance in the motion and, Mr.

Speaker, although I suspect there are many more I will leave it at that. I will leave it at three points because that's three good reasons to strike out the motion of the Honourable Opposition House Leader. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate their frustration, it is not my intent in any way avoid the Budget debate, I want it to continue but, Mr. Speaker, I offer several thoughts about how we can improve the level of the debate and avoid the kind of rancor and obvious time wasting that's occurred in the last several hours.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's of substance to this motion because I would like to avoid this kind of abuse of the Legislature's time in the future. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek is obviously disappointed that six months yesterday he got some bad news but that's no reason to raise a matter of privilege and demand that his successors must sit in their chairs 50 percent of the time. —(Interjection)— Well it's one-half, 50 percent of his successors must be here during the Budget debate. Mr. Speaker, there's no grounds for that. I expect the Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Member for Turtle Mountain to take a broader road; I expect those members to deal with the Budget Debate, with the economic difficulties that are facing this province, to make constructive suggestions. Mr. Speaker, if that were happening you'd find 95 percent of the Executive Council in this House but the contributions, and I dare say, Mr. Speaker, an unknown member who spoke a couple of weeks ago about the question of constructive criticism and valuable additions to debate and the Attorney-General's comments yesterday about the same matter, about the level of contribution, hit the mark.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question before the House on this matter of privilege and the substance of this matter of privilege that caused it to be raised is not the attendance of the Executive Council, the substance of this matter of privilege is the inability of the opposition to do its job, get proper attention in the media for doing an adequate job and the fact that members here were not receiving the kind of constructive criticism, debate on issues, suggestions of alternatives, the kind of high road contributions that I used to expect from the Member for Lakeside when I sat at the table, the kind of policy debates, the kind of alternative option debates, that this House has witnessed for most of the last few Sessions. That's absent this Session, Mr. Speaker, and that's a sorry comment on the quality of the opposition that faces this government. And, Mr. Speaker, I wish them well in cleaning house because I believe that a good opposition makes for a better government. I'm hoping to see it, I hope I see it sooner rather than later.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, many who begin debates in this House, Sir, say that they didn't intend to speak on the particular topic but I'm persuaded, after listening to a couple of the contributions from the other side tonight, if they may be graced with that expression, to say a few words in support of the motion that is before the House because it has to do with the heart of parliament. I've long since, Sir, come to understand that if

one wants to discuss and debate the essence and the heart of the parliamentary system of this country one doesn't listen too long to socialists because socialists don't understand and don't want a democracy in this country, they want things their own way.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, we have this motion before the House today, no one in Manitoba needs any improvident kind of unsolicited advice from the current and temporary Attorney-General of this province on free democratic society, ever. —(Interjection)— No, my honourable friend will do well to take that advice kindly because it's meant in a kindly way, worse could be said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was moved to speak tonight because I'd heard the alleged contributions to the debate from the Member for St. Boniface who, over 20-some-odd years in this House has never learned that buffoonery is no substitute for intellectual debate. So, of course, we're treated on a constant basis to his idea of what parliament is about which, thank God, is not what the system is all about. I listened, as well, to the recent contribution from the temporary Member for Springfield who, for a number of years, sat at this table as one of the Assistant Clerks of this House and was pleased to tell us about some of his impressions as an Assistant Clerk. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say to the Honourable Member for Springfield, while he's in that temporary position, is that he was not a great success as an Assistant Clerk and he's even less of a success as the Member for Springfield, from which position, we expect he will be vacated when the next election is called.

So, Mr. Speaker, having heard from those two mother-loads of parliamentary democracy I suppose we can proceed on with the debate. The purpose of the motion, Mr. Speaker, very simply is this and the motion should be passed because it's succeeded in its purpose.

As I sat here just before I stood up tonight, I counted 10 members of the Treasury Bench sitting in their place where they should be during the course of a Budget Debate. Even the Member for St. Boniface who usually is tucked into bed by this hour was here tonight. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the motion has served its purpose already because it has succeeded in getting the Treasury Bench back into the House.

Mr. Speaker, we're well aware of the fact that there are a number in the backbench who are preaching for a call because the First Minister has made it known that he's going to expand his Cabinet. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield was preaching for that particular call tonight. Mr. Speaker, as I hear those vacant voices on the outer rim — if I may use it that way — of the government's backbench, I may suggest that they would have as much, I would hope given the intelligence of the First Minister, that they would have as much chance of being in the Cabinet of this province as would a bunch of baying coyotes on the outer rim of some forest on the edge of Winnipeg, because that's about the level of intelligence that they add to the debate in this House.

Why is this motion being debated, Mr. Speaker? It's being debated because the Executive Branch of this government is showing its disabuse, its disinterest in parliament debating its purpose in life. The purpose in life of parliament, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of many

on the other side who will be unaware of this, the purpose of life of parliament is to vote Supply and then to vote Ways and Means for the purpose of raising that Supply. That's why we have such a debate. That's why we have a debate in Supply that is ongoing at the present time, which has been suspended in order that the government may move on its motion of Ways and Means to indicate how it intends to raise the money by which its supply, by which its expenses will be paid. That's what parliament's all about; it was never intended to be terribly complicated. I'm sure that even the Member for Springfield and the Member for St. Boniface might be able to collect that thought if they think about it for awhile.

Mr. Speaker, there he goes home to bed; the Member for St. Boniface. We are sorry to have kept him up. Before he leaves, Mr. Speaker, may I ask him to raise the same voice in this House on behalf of the independent schools that he used to raise 20 years ago when he was so vociferous on this side of the House decrying the lack of action on behalf of the government of that day with respect to independent schools? Why is it that voice of the Member for St. Boniface has been muzzled with respect to aid to independent schools as he now sits among his socialist and other friends in the Cabinet having, Mr. Speaker, disowned whatever political principle he might have been thought to have had before he joined that rather mixed group?

Well, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought that after a good deal of difficulty we had established the fact that members of this House should be speaking to the motion that's before us. For the last five minutes the Leader of the Opposition has done nothing of that kind. I suggest that he be brought to order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would indicate once again that the motion before us is a serious one and ask all members to speak directly to the motion.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and as you are well aware, that's precisely what I was doing.

Mr. Speaker, neither you, Sir, nor anyone else in a free parliamentary democracy needs any lecturing on the rules of a free democratic parliament by the kinds of Marxist interlopers who from time to time find their way into this House. If the previous member wishes to be included in that group, he's welcome because he makes statements that make him a part of that group. I'm speaking, Sir, to those who understand the system and who want to support it, not, Sir, to those who want to subvert it.

Mr. Speaker, the very simple purpose of this motion was that on a number of occasions during the course of the Budget Debate which lasts about eight days according to our Rules, there have been more than a number of occasions on which the representation

from the Treasury Bench, after all whose Budget is being discussed, has been down to one or practically nil. Now, if my honourable friends want me to be more specific and describe what practically nil is, I could make a personal description of what that means.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that the Executive Branch of this current government is displaying a disdain for parliament and is displaying a devil-may-care attitude toward the debate that goes on in this parliament with respect to its woebegone Budget. We fully intend to debate this Budget until the final vote is taken on the eighth day.

Mr. Speaker, that does not prevent us in any way, shape or form from calling the attention not only of this House but to the people of Manitoba to the fact that the Executive Branch of this socialist government doesn't care enough about parliament, doesn't care enough about the debate that's going on here to be here. But when they're called to account on a motion such as has been presented and which we're now debating by the House Leader of our party, which says that the Rules Committee should be called in order that a rule may be inserted which would require the attendance of a majority of the Treasury Bench during the discussion of the Budget Debate, then we find all of a sudden that they're able to muster a majority in the House because they feel the heat on their buttocks. That's why they're in the House tonight. There's a little bit of heat on their behinds. They know very well, Mr. Speaker, what their public reputation is in this province with respect to the sanctity with which they regard parliament. They don't give a damn about parliament.

One of the reasons for this motion, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that the current socialist government of this province while it's shortly in office, does begin to give a damn about parliament because that's our job as an Opposition, to make sure that we call to the attention of the people of Manitoba the kind of disdain that these left-wingers, while they're temporarily in office, show to the parliamentary system of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we all know and you know, Sir, that the number who support them in a doctrinaire way is very very small and it's incumbent, I think, upon an Opposition which believes in the parliamentary system to point out from time to time how these people, while they are temporarily in office, are bringing into rack and ruin those fundamental traditional forms of parliamentary debate which most people in this country exclusive of them, most people in this country hold rather dear; many people in this country have had to fight for; and many people in this country are still prepared to fight for if the need arise.

So, Mr. Speaker, we bring this motion to the House not necessarily expecting that it's going to carry the majority of the members on the opposite side because they're too narrowly partisan to understand that what is at stake is much more important than the New Democratic Party or whatever euphemism the socialists in Manitoba currently apply to themselves or of the Conservative Party; it's much more important than that. It goes to the taproots of Parliament and, Mr. Speaker, when an Executive brings in a budget, and don't let this Executive try to tell me or try to tell anyone else that they consulted with the backbench

about the Budget because, according to their temporary Minister of Finance, they wouldn't consult with the Federal Government out of whose hip pocket they were proclaiming as they rapped their chests they were taking money - at least that's what they said the first time around.

The First Minister now is saying, no, no, no, we didn't do it for that purpose, we did it for sheer revenue purposes. Nobody here but us socialist chickens and we weren't trying to rob money out of the federal pocket at all. Well, I wish that he, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Finance would get their act together. God knows if they ever do get their act together, the province may not be in any better shape, but God knows it's in bad enough shape when the act isn't together.

So we, Mr. Speaker, are happy to debate the Budget; we're happy to hear the contributions that are made from honourable members opposite with respect to the Budget even though we don't agree with them; we're happy to hear even such puerile comments and contributions as were made by the Attorney-General who is really not accustomed yet to the parliamentary system. God know what system he'll ever become accustomed to, but he certainly isn't accustomed to this system and he's certainly not one whose voice would ever stand up in support of the parliamentary system. I need say no more on that count, Mr. Speaker, except this, Sir, that we do not on this side of the House and we will never take on this side of the House, any instruction from a good number of the honourable members opposite with respect to the rights and the duties and the responsibilities and the democratic freedoms of Parliament. Some people happen to know intuitively what those are. There are very few on the opposite side who have even the most base understanding of what they're all about.

The purpose of this motion is to demonstrate to the honourable members opposite that the Executive has an accountability to Parliament and that the Executive should be — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I hear some odd female voices off in the left corner. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if that person is preaching for a call, may I suggest that perhaps she should take voice lessons first. Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to make sure that the Executive Branch of government in our parliamentary system which is part and parcel of the Legislative Branch. There is only a Cabinet here because members of that Cabinet are elected first to their seats in this Provincial Legislature. They have a dual responsibility; number one, to sit in this House as members for their own constituencies; number two, if they are appointed to the Executive Council, to be responsible to this Parliament and I know that this comes as a wave of new information to people such as the Minister of Finance and others who have been blocking their way along in life for a long time. But, Mr. Speaker, I know that they must understand the dual responsibility, first as a legislator and secondly as a member of the Executive Council. And all this motion seeks to indicate is that the Executive Branch of this particular socialist government is not paying enough attention to the Legislative Branch. Mr. Speaker, we are not speaking just on behalf of the Opposition, we're speaking on behalf of the voiceless backbenchers over there who are expected, Mr. Speaker, by the rulers down in the front row, by the Penners and the

Schroeders and the Parasiuks and all of that crowd who are expected by that, Mr. Speaker, expected by that bunch, the automatons to stand up —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. It is clearly out of order to refer to individual members by their names.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

A MEMBER: A lecture on parliamentary procedure from a turkey who can't even recognize parliamentary procedure.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the backbenchers of the current, temporary, socialist government, to be instructed on their parliamentary duties by the likes of the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for East Kildonan, the Member for Rossmere, the Member for Transcona, the Member for St. Boniface of all people to instruct anybody on parliamentary usage - really. So I'm saying tonight, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Legislature as much as on behalf of the Opposition that they don't have to put up with the kind of obvious disdain that has been shown by their front bench which I suggest, Sir, even though this motion may be defeated will have served its purpose because I can guarantee you, Sir, that notwithstanding the caterwauling coming from the backbenches, notwithstanding the rudeness that is customarily displayed by the backbench of the NDP, I can assure you, Sir, that there will be, as a result of this motion, a much better representation of this Executive in this Session, in this Budget debate and in subsequent ones because they know that even though they can use their temporary majority to defeat this motion; even though they may attempt to do that, we can raise the motion again and bring to the attention of their backbenchers who get precious little attention from them that they are abusing Parliament and that even if they are struck dumb, the Opposition will stand up and speak for the rights of Parliament at any time. That's why we have this motion before the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, we've just heard a rather hysterical attempt by the Conservative Opposition to deflect attention away from, I think, a well thought out Budget.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hour is 10 o'clock. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order to clarify the status of the motion, I would refer you to our Rule 21, Subsection 3, which provides "That where business other than motion on the Order Papers under consideration when the House adjourns the business is terminated when the House adjourns and shall not be continued the next day or at any subsequent sitting." So, Mr. Speaker, since we've exhausted our time it would appear we're not going to have an

opportunity to vote on this matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Accordingly the hour being 10 o'clock the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow