



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8046

VOL. XXXI No. 104B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 11 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

Monday, 11 July, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND
READING**

**BILL 55 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
ACT**

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. When we recessed for the supper hour, the question before the House was the second reading of Bill 55.

The Honourable Member for Springfield has 31 minutes remaining.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just before Private Members' Hour, in discussing some of the comments that have been made on this bill, I was attempting to illustrate for members on both sides, that the argument that MLAs in this Legislature have placed upon them, many more obligations in the 1980s than they have at any previous time in the history of this Legislature or the Legislatures of any province.

Mr. Speaker, what I was attempting to do was demonstrate, and I think I did just before we broke for Private Members' Hour, that essentially the job of being an MLA renders it impossible for a member to engage, on a full-time basis, in any other occupation. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's possible for some members, by virtue of their career interests or business interests, to maintain a finger or several fingers engaged in other activities. But as members opposite were acknowledging by their nods, and some of them in the speeches they made on this subject, it is virtually impossible for those with careers which are not based upon self-employment, or a professional status that allows part-time employment, it's virtually impossible for those members to maintain any outside source of income or source of community engagement in the business world, or in the services or trades, if they are not self-employed.

Mr. Saker, coming from that perspective, and I think that's a reasonable proposition which no members on either side would find objectionable as a statement of fact, I then logically have a problem with the argument that members must have something outside - must, as some have said, be in the real world - have career activities outside of the House, must prevent themselves from "becoming isolated and insulated from the realities of life," and that's the argument that's being made by some people on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, that argument logically leads one to deduce that the only people that members on the other side feel are qualified, not only to run but to become elected and then continue to properly serve, are those who hold those attributes from a career or business perspective that enable them to continue those activities. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that would limit membership in the Chamber to those who are self-employed, either in business, or farming, or some other associated activity.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's a very very narrow perspective of the Legislature that's being proposed by members opposite. I'm sure if they realized that that's what they were proposing those comments wouldn't have come through quite as clearly. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if members realized that they would be denying membership in the Legislature to virtually all other sectors of Manitoba society, that they would rethink that argument. — (Interjection) — Members are not full-time, says the Member for Roblin-Russell. Members shouldn't be full-time, says the Member for La Verendrye and the Member for Emerson. Members must have outside interests, must be involved in a career, in business, in a job outside of the Assembly so they stay in touch with the real world. That's what members opposite are saying. They're assuming it's impossible for members who don't have those other interests to remain in touch with the world outside this Assembly. They're assuming that a member who doesn't have another job, that the Member for Concordia who's remained an employee of Canada Packers for the duration of his 17 years of service to this Assembly, must continue that relationship or he will be out of touch with the real world. The Member for Concordia is one of those very lucky individuals who was able to arrive at that kind of accommodation.

The Member for Flin Flon couldn't make that sort of accommodation with the school board in Flin Flon when he left a teaching position there; and to make those kinds of assumptions is very dangerous for the integrity of this Assembly and for the ability of the people of Manitoba to have an Assembly that represents all the segments of our society, that's important. That's important, otherwise we have a very narrow base upon which to draw for MLAs in this province.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek acknowledged this afternoon when he said, well, but the salary has gone up accordingly. He acknowledged that MLAs' salaries in the last 20 years have risen to the point where no one could view it as simply a part-time honorarium. It's no longer the small amounts that were paid for a six-week Session in the '50s and early '60s. There's no question that it's recognized as a full-time job with full-time responsibilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, the arguments of members opposite are arguments based upon a very narrow definition, of who should be entitled to represent the people of Manitoba and a requirement, that people who don't fit into that shouldn't be here because they're not in touch with the people of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, I reject that argument and I suggest to members such as the Member for Emerson and the Member for Roblin-Russell, the member for La Verendrye and the Member for Fort Garry who, to somewhat less of an extent, advanced the case that those who do not have those separate private interests are not properly capable of representing their constituencies and will become insulated and isolated from the real world.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think from the arguments I've advanced, it is very clear that I believe that an MLA's

obligation to represent his constituents not only as a full-time obligation, but in many ways if an MLA is to do that job properly that time which he spends away from the House is also important in terms of his or her ability to represent the people of his or her constituency. That time spent in the constituency meeting with people, dealing with people, councils, school boards, solving problems perhaps on occasion creating problems because not all of us solve all the problems we encounter.

So, Mr. Speaker, that becomes very much a part of the role of an MLA. Those who take that role seriously and conscientiously, as I know many members on both sides of this Chamber do, find that when the House is not in Session many of the obligations that they must fulfil to do an honest and conscientious job remain and are just as time-consuming and in many ways just as onerous as they are when the House is in Session. The Member for Fort Garry nods. I am sure he has felt that both as a federal MP and as provincial MLA, so he's aware that those kinds of obligations continue. He is also aware there is no way he could go back to the regular full-time desk job for an employer that he had before he engaged in those types of activities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I reject totally the argument that only those who remain in the private business world are capable of serving the constituencies in this province and that only those people are the ones that are in touch with the real world, because that is just not true. It is perfectly proper and certainly, in many ways, probably more efficient a way of representing one's constituents to be dedicating one's whole resources and all of one's energy and time to serving one's constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the best way. Certainly there is no question about a federal MP or an MPP in Ontario or an MNA in Quebec not devoting full time to those duties. In some of the smaller provinces, the development of full-time status and full-time obligations has been more gradual, but certainly in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan the development of those obligations and of that status has certainly advanced ahead of Manitoba.

I think the Member for Inkster talked about some of the resources which are provided to Members of the Legislatures in other parts of this country. But, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about an MP in Ottawa receiving a staff allowance, staff alone - that's not the cost of a constituency office, the cost of mailing, or stationery, or anything else - just a staff salary allowance for personal staff - doesn't count the staff in the caucus rooms, doesn't count travel, nothing else - but a personal staff allowance in excess of \$80,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, something's wrong, even if we accept the fact the constituencies in Manitoba are only one-fifth the size; even if we accept the fact that the case workload of constituency calls is going to be somewhat less. There's a dramatic difference in terms of the resources that are available to MLAs in Manitoba and MPs in Ottawa.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Emerson, in a sister province, in Saskatchewan, the resources provided to MLAs amount to almost \$16,000 a year purely for salaries, stationery and rent, and the associated costs of setting up a constituency office or, if the member chooses not to

do it that way, of hiring staff to enable that member, on a personal basis, to better serve his or her constituents. That has no relationship to the dollars set aside to each of the caucuses for the provision of caucus services.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we begin to talk about those kinds of dollars, the proposal that members opposite are decrying in this House, and have been for several months now, that MLAs in this province should get \$2,500 a year placed in a ledger against their name and, as they spend \$2,500, purely for purposes of serving their constituents, they should account for those dollars against the \$2,500 placed in the books of the Legislative Assembly. That's the real debate, whether or not \$45,000 a year for many southern Ontario MPPs; over \$50,000 a year for MNAs in Quebec; over \$15,000 - about \$15,600 for Saskatchewan MLAs; more than that for MLAs in British Columbia and Alberta; and the people of this province, who are demanding that MLAs provide them with service and be available to them, are being asked to spend \$2,500 a year per MLA, to enable that MLA to better service his constituency.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I hear those kinds of arguments, and then I hear the argument that an MLA shouldn't be full time, should have other resources on which to draw, then I have some very real difficulties even beginning to understand the logic of members opposite on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the other argument that some members put forward, and certainly the Member for Emerson who's asking what members on this side are worth, probably asking his own colleagues the same thing, he and many other made the argument that the purpose of this bill is to entrench sitting members. Mr. Speaker, if that were true, then certainly the government in Saskatchewan wouldn't have changed last year; certainly the NDP in British Columbia wouldn't have lost any seats; certainly there wouldn't have been any changes in 1979 in Ottawa; certainly the Member for Fort Garry who had many of these resources at his disposal in the '60s would never have ceased to be a federal MP.

Mr. Speaker, that's a preposterous suggestion, that the only sitting Conservative member in the City of Winnipeg, in St. James-Assiniboia, is totally entrenched by virtue of the fact that he has a constituency office and spends \$80,000 a year of taxpayers' money providing support services for his constituency? That entrenches that person. That's the argument being made by members opposite; that every member who provides services to his constituency, entrenches his own position and prevents himself or herself from being thrown out by the electorate at the next election.

Mr. Speaker, that shows the arrogance of the members opposite when they assume that they are elected on their own merit. It's contempt for the people of this province and of this country. Mr. Speaker, those people elected members on both sides of the House because the policies of the parties and the leaders of those parties commended themselves to those people. They didn't elect the Member for Morris because they knew he was going to do an excellent job of serving their needs, and no matter how good a job he does, if the people of his constituency do not think the policies of his party no longer commend themselves, he will be defeated; it's that simple.

Now I'm sure, knowing the Member for Morris, that he'll do his best to make sure that the policies that he and his party stand for will always commend themselves to the people of his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, to assume that giving an MLA or an MP the resources to serve his constituents, to answer their phone calls, their letters, to be held to account by them in his constituency office, or wherever he or she holds office hours within the constituency, to say that that alone, giving the member those resources, will then entrench the member and prevent his or her defeat, shows an arrogance and a contempt for the wisdom of the people.

People don't vote for you because you did them a favour, because you give them what was their right and that was the right for you to act as their Ombudsman in dealing with the Civil Service. People don't vote for you because they came to you and you assisted them in providing information. People vote on the basis of party and leader and the performance of the individual members as an ombudsman to his constituents has always been a consideration, but certainly not the overriding consideration. If it was the overriding consideration, Mr. Speaker, then the whole British parliamentary system would have broken down a long time ago because there would be no need for parties or leaders. Members would be elected purely on individual merit; members would be elected on the basis of what they did solely within their constituency. The Member for Fort Garry knows that that argument extended to its logical extreme, which is what I'm doing, I freely admit I'm extending the argument that's been made by members opposite to its logical extreme. It makes no sense it doesn't hold water. Members definitely do not entrench themselves by serving their constituents with the use of taxpayers' dollars.

A member who's effective will certainly gain kudos with his or her constituents but that will be done because the member works hard at serving those people, not because they're putting taxpayers' dollars to work. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition from his seat is expressing some concern about jobs in the private sector for those leaving this Chamber. Obviously, his concern for me is based upon the depth of his own personal experience in that matter. If he wishes to debate those arguments — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I don't have a great deal of time argue with the Leader of the Opposition but when he's met as many payrolls in his lifetime as I've met in a lifetime that's only half as long, I'll be glad to debate the issue with him. I've had to meet payrolls. I don't think he's yet seen that day.

Mr. Speaker, what the basic argument in this Chamber comes down to is a question of dollars. I hate to put it this crudely, Mr. Speaker, but some members in this Chamber have been getting \$1,500 a year as part of their salary for the last nine years and they've been getting it every two weeks on a pay cheque and they've been doing absolutely nothing to serve their constituents or using those dollars. Mr. Speaker, that's not a dramatic announcement. Members on both sides know that it's been happening, that some members work hard serving their constituents and others have taken it pretty easy.

Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act designed to separate the sheep from the

goats. Designed to show that there are people who are willing to go out and serve their constituents and spend dollars doing that, but they're going to have to account for those dollars. Mr. Speaker, members opposite talk about the size of the deficit. What was the deficit in Ottawa when these same changes were brought in? What was the deficit in Ontario when the Davis Government implemented the Camp Commission Report, and did much more for MLAs to serve their constituents than is being proposed here. Mr. Speaker, in many ways this is a miserly proposal compared to everything that's being done elsewhere in the country.

A MEMBER: If it's so miserly you pay for it, then, never mind the taxpayers.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that most MLAs have, after taxes, \$700 or \$800 today which some do and some do not spend . . .

HON. S. LYON: . . . sticky hand in the taxpayers' pocket.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition wants to adjourn this debate, and I intend to listen to him and I wish he'd give me the same courtesy.

A MEMBER: You're a bunch of cheating no-goods, that's what you are.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, \$2,500, in comparison to \$700 or \$800, that's the bottom line.

HON. S. LYON: Let the taxpayers pay for it.

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks about spending your own money. Mr. Speaker, who paid his salary? Did he pay it himself when he was not an elected member of this Assembly?

Let's talk about spending one's own money. Who supplied the \$36,000 a year that was paid to the Leader of the Opposition? — (Interjection) — Let's call a spade, a spade.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. S. LYON: Go back to the wastepaper baskets, eh, Andy?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, . . .

HON. S. LYON: When you were sweeping up you were using all of your intelligence.

A MEMBER: You'll live high and let the guy down south starve.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

HON. S. LYON: Back to the wastepaper basket.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, for \$2,500, to each MLA in this province for services rendered, for money

spent serving one's constituents compared to \$1,500 which now goes out, and for which there's no accounting, none whatsoever, members can spend it or not spend it; it can go in their pocket. A lot of it goes to taxes, in fact, Pierre Trudeau's the biggest beneficiary of this \$1,500 worth of largesse coming from the Province of Manitoba, he takes his cut right off the top, roughly \$500 from every single MLA in this Chamber. — (Interjection) — If we go to an accountable system, he gets none of it. I think that's probably one of the benefits. I'm surprised that members opposite would want to be supporting this Liberal Government in preventing Manitoba MLAs from serving their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain has been an advocate of fall committee meetings in this Chamber. He suggested that certain business of the Assembly should be conducted when the House isn't in Session, Provincial Auditor's Report, Public Accounts, could be referred to Public Accounts Committee before the House is brought into Session. I agree with him, I think it's an excellent suggestion. This government should have been doing it and I hope they will this fall; in fact, I suggested that to the Minister of Finance in committee.

Mr. Speaker, how are you going to do that if you assume MLAs are part time? How are you going to begin to put MLAs on a full-time basis and require their attendance fairly regularly throughout the year for committee meetings and other activities?

A MEMBER: Lyon's going to pay for it.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, and who's going to pay for it? The taxpayers of the province are going to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — I have some problem when the members opposite suggest that members aren't full time, and this isn't a full-time job requiring full-time dedication when the Member for Fort Garry himself says, we did it, we demanded that kind of participation by MLAs. So, the logic of some members opposite is found wanting.

The other problem members opposite have is they suggest that the purpose of this bill, as the Member for Roblin Russell put it, was to put a flashing light outside a constituency office to get re-elected. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that half the members on this side have no desire for a constituency office. I know, from discussions on these very questions last year, many members on the other side have no interest and feel no need for a constituency office. Mr. Speaker, there are many other ways, in addition to constituency offices, that MLAs can serve their constituencies. The Member for Emerson might want to install a toll-free Zenith line to his home and have the bills for that paid. — (Interjection) — The Member for Emerson, if he can get his name in the phone book, right. The Member for Emerson might want to spend more time setting up office hours so constituents can meet him in various small communities in his riding. A constituency office in Emerson or Springfield, in one town, might offend all the other towns because he didn't put it there. He's probably much wiser to go around from community to community and visit with people. Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of things that members will sort out for themselves, that's why the package is totally flexible.

Mr. Speaker, the other problem I have with one of the things that's being attacked by members opposite is the fact that members opposite are free, if they choose, not to spend a penny of the money they're complaining about. Some of them claim they already spend the money; well then, fine, submit the bills. If they're legitimate expenditures on constituency service, submit the bills and you'll be reimbursed, and you'll be reimbursed if you spend \$1,500 a year, the full \$1,500. The taxpayers of Manitoba won't be out a penny, the only person who'll lose will be Pierre Trudeau. If what you spend now is \$1,500, that's all you have to spend in the future. If you want to spend more you can spend up to \$2,500.00.

Mr. Speaker, the objection of members opposite that they're already spending it doesn't hold any water. The objection of some members that they don't want all this taxpayers' money being spent is very simple to accommodate. If they don't think it should be spent they don't have to spend it; if they think they can serve their constituents without spending it, and they're choosing to do that now, and choose not to spend the money, and consider that \$1,500 part of their salary, don't spend it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there's the rub. Not only do they not spend it but, from here on in, they aren't going to get it. Mr. Speaker, that's my concern about the logic of the arguments of the members opposite. The real nub of the argument, for some people, and I wouldn't paint too broad a brush with this because I know there are many on the other side who do not feel this way, but the nub of the argument for some people on the other side amounts to \$1,500 a year in lost income. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to have to say that, because I didn't think I could begin to believe that about some members, but I'm sorry there are some who view the question from that narrow an interest, and that's a very sad perspective.

Mr. Speaker, there are members opposite as well, especially rural members, who have some quarrel with the provision of 40 trips a year to and from this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, those are the same members who a year ago, when we were discussing members' services, had some real concerns on the committee we'd set up to discuss these matters about the fact that 26 trips was not adequate, and yet those same members now are going to, I suppose, when the debate ends, stand up and vote against a bill which is now going to allow them to come to this building 40 times year round, for whatever government business they have to attend to.

Similarly, the printing of one franking piece members have had now for nine years; they can mail one piece throughout their constituency. Some members opposite have objected to the idea that the government should pay for that one franking piece and yet, during the debate on this bill, some members opposite said, do you know what I use my \$1,500 for - well, actually my \$700 or \$800 - I use it to print the sessional householder that I send out once a year. Well now, Mr. Speaker, once again, I'm having a little trouble with the logic. Some members opposite say the people of the province shouldn't pay for the printing of this. In fact, some of those pamphlets say right on them, not printed at public expense and yet the members stands up in this Chamber and says, I used that money to pay for that

pamphlet. Well, how did you put on it, "not printed at public expense?"

Mr. Speaker, there are some real problems with the logic of members opposite on this bill, but the real problem is that part of the extension of members' services that was talked about last year was an increase in secretarial services for both caucuses. Because that didn't have to be provided for in a bill, it could be done by the Board of Internal Economy and a Treasury Board minute to set up the staff positions, members on the other side found it quite appropriate to employ those additional people on the grounds that they needed them to serve their constituents, but when it came to debating, in the House, the provision of those positions - not the provision of those positions, but the provision of increased services - they came out opposed to it. But members opposite, when it came to taking something that didn't have to come before the Assembly, were quite prepared to accept those service increments.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Charleswood has some difficulty because he was one of the principle individuals involved last year in sabotaging what could have been a meaningful agreement for all members in this Assembly in improving members' services, because of his unwillingness to see members come to an accommodation on the expansion of services to members. So, Mr. Speaker, if he thinks he has some points to score, I welcome greatly his intervention in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line here is that I believe members opposite want these increases in services. I believe, without a doubt, that most members opposite share my concern about members' ability to serve their constituents but I believe they've been muzzled by their leader. I believe the agreement last year went down the tubes because their leader was not prepared to see members better serve their constituents, because he is one who subscribes to a very narrow definition of the role of an MLA.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if members opposite were allowed the free vote about which they talk so often on the other side, the Leader of the Opposition would find that many of his troops want this bill; they want the ability to serve their constituents. I believe those members are just as dedicated as members on this side in wanting to do a good job and serve the people who elected them.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If no other member wishes to speak to this bill, it is moved by the Leader of the Opposition that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Would you call Bill No. 60?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Minister of Highways, Bill No. 60, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point or order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a point of order and put it on the record that the Member for Springfield cannot adjourn debate on behalf of the Minister to close debate. If the Member for Springfield doesn't wish to speak, then indeed the Minister may be able to close debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate is open. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, just before it goes into committee, is a piece of legislation that has had an ample amount of debate, has had a number of observations made to it by media people, by people that have interfaced with us individually - I'm sure members opposite - and I believe it is the kind of an issue that will never command unanimity and I suppose one can argue that that indeed is an understatement.

It is the kind of legislation that one has to make up one's mind about and make a determination whether or not it is in the public interest to pass a measure that indeed will, based on evidence that is available, reduce traffic fatalities in Manitoba, reduce the death rate and I think that all of us really have a true desire to do that. There may be some argument as to which way it might be done better but, in any event, I think we have to agree that our position is at least valid in the context of the experience that we have had throughout many parts of the world and certainly in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to again go over all of the statistics that were available to us, and many of the statistics were used in the debate, it's not my intent at this stage to attempt to rebut some of the comments that came from the other side, because I know that a lot of the opposition is based on one premise and that is the freedom-of-choice option and I think that's understandable and fair; I don't think that's an unfair position and I can feel that way many times myself, Mr. Speaker. Even on this one, I have felt that way, but we have made a determination that it is in the public interest to proceed in the way that we are and having heard all of the evidence we intend to follow through with that piece of legislation to its ultimate proclamation.

It will be interesting to see the evidence, if you like, further arguments that will be presented to us in committee. I would like to indicate at this point that, rather than hold things up, I would like to see the bill go to committee with the knowledge, Mr. Speaker, and I want to indicate to the House that we will be bringing forward some amendments but the bill will be pushed forward. It may be that members opposite may want to offer constructive suggestions in Committee and we are open to that as well and I think that's the proper legislative process.

I will be looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to responsible, constructive suggestions from the other side, to the

extent that there is a willingness to deal with it other than on an emotional basis, other than on the issue of free choice, but more to the question of how can we make it work better. To that extent I suppose I'm challenging members opposite to bring forward those kinds of innovations and new ideas that have not yet been mentioned.

The question of one component, the helmet component, I think again I should restate that this is indeed the last province to bring that in. Manitoba will round it out by this measure. All of Canada will then be covered by that kind of legislation and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we shall want to monitor the results.

I, for one, don't mind stating a personal option on that, and that is if it appears that we were wrong we should not be afraid to say so three or four years down the road. If it appears that we haven't managed to reduce fatalities proportionately speaking based on per capita, registrations or whatever formulation that one wants to use as a comparison; if it appears to us that it isn't doing the job that we think it will do then by all means that's what Legislatures are for, to review things that were done in the past, to find out their effectiveness and benefit to society. — (Interjection) — All right, the Member for Turtle Mountain says I wouldn't entrench it, of course not. I believe anything we do here should never be looked upon as being sacred for all time because, Mr. Speaker, if one was to argue that everything that we have ever done in the past is good for all time in the future then that would be the time that this place should dissolve. There would be no need for this Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I look with a great deal of anticipation towards what will take place in committee and encourage members opposite, members on this side, to continue to dwell on it and bring forward the constructive kind of changes that will make the bill work better; but not changes that will indeed defeat the purpose of the bill.

Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 60.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Cowan, Mrs. Dodick, Ms. Dolin, Messrs. Eyer, Filmon, Fox, Harapiak, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Pawley, Ms. Phillips, Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Sherman, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Graham, Manness, McKenzie, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Steen.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK, G. Mackintosh: Yeas 26; Nays 12.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 74, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 74. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 87, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 87, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

HON. A. MACKLING: No. 88, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 88, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 3, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, Bill No. 3, the Honourable Member for Emerson. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate on a point of order that it is not my intention to allow Bill 3 to stand the next time it is called.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to call the constitutional amendment re Official Languages standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed languages resolution. (Stand) The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: The other constitutional amendment, re aboriginal rights, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution regarding aboriginal rights proposed by the Honourable First Minister, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes. If the Clerk would give me the slips, I would call the third readings, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

THIRD READING GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 80 - THE CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 84 - THE RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Residential Rent Regulation Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden that debate be adjourned on this bill.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 91 - THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that debate be adjourned on this bill.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 2, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, I believe that bill is a bill that was introduced by the Attorney-General and was adjourned by the Attorney-General for the purpose of a closing debate. In the absence of the Attorney-General

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 48, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is Bill No. 2 then standing?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 48, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to indicate that it is our intention to call the bills, not allow them to stand. The honourable members say that they want to debate legislation and yet they are not debating legislation, Mr. Speaker. So it happens that at 9:10 p.m. there is no debate? — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow we'll be calling bills and we will insist on debate.

I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Before accepting the motion, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I just want to be perfectly clear on what the Acting Government House Leader is doing this evening. Is the Acting Government House Leader saying that he is not prepared to have any bills stand from this point on?

A MEMBER: That's what he said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I was not prepared to allow bills to continue to stand and no debate to be taking place in this House when there is ample reason why debate should proceed. So that is notice to the opposition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: I want to be absolutely clear. The Acting Government House Leader is saying that every

bill that he calls from now on, he is not going to allow that bill to be stood?

A MEMBER: Yes, he did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I brought to the attention of the House, by way of a point of order, that members opposite are not debating bills. There was not one bill that was called tonight for which standing in the name of opposition members for which they wish to speak. — (Interjection) — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition wanted to speak on Monday and that request was made to me. This is Monday. There was almost an hour for the Leader of the Opposition to speak. The Leader of the Opposition chose not to speak. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm indicating that at least some of the bills, we're not prepared to allow them to stand indefinitely on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is provision under Rule 37 to provide for closure of debate. The Minister will be obliged to give notice now of any bill which he does not intend to allow that bill to be stood when it is next called. He has to give an indication of the specific bill, he has done it on one bill, Bill 3.

He has then given a blanket statement that he is not going to allow any further bills to be stood. He is now beginning to try and qualify it, Sir. The House cannot proceed on that basis but must know specifically which bills the Acting Government House Leader is invoking closure upon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a request by the Acting Government House Leader to members opposite that they speak to bills is not a request for closure.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The Acting Leader of the Opposition did not invoke Rule No. 37 with respect to Bill 3, and he is not invoking it with respect to any other bill. Rather than invoking closure, the Acting Government House Leader is asking members to debate and telling members that tomorrow he will not allow Bill 3 to stand. In other words, just the opposite of closure - the Acting

Government House Leader is trying to force members opposite to speak. The Rule which provides for closure under Rule 37 would provide that the question would have to be put at 2:00 a.m. Wednesday morning. The member has not suggested that. Rule 37 provides for closure and the question being put at 2:00 a.m. at the latest the following morning.

The member is not proposing closure. For members opposite to suggest that is irresponsible. The right of a member to stand debate is done by leave. When a member takes adjournment, it's understood that that member will be prepared to speak the next time the bill is called. Every time a bill is stood a member does so by leave. The Acting Government House Leader has only said he's not going to allow members to hold up debate. In other words, you're going to have to speak when bills are called and he's given formal notice to Bill 3, that's all. It's no form of closure. You can speak for two weeks on Bill 3.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon, we were treated to the perversity of the Acting House Leader in not once, not twice, but three and four times naming those bills standing up for third reading as taken by adjournment by our House Leader, the Member for Turtle Mountain, when it is common knowledge that third readings don't get passed in this House until such time as we are commonly agreed to winding up the Session.

Mr. Speaker, third reading of the bills are rarely, if ever, debated in this House. Having passed through second reading, having passed through committee stage, third reading is just a final catch, if you like, if there is an issue that members of the opposition wish to raise. Third readings aren't meant for debate and for this Acting House Leader to waste a day calling third readings, when traditionally we don't have debates on third readings only demonstrates their inexperience and their nonsense and their lack of House management - their lack of House management in so ordering the affairs of this House so that we do spend our time worthwhile. Mr. Speaker, we were prepared to discuss, perhaps, the most important issue facing this House, the House Leader chose not to call it - the issue on bilingualism.

MR. H. ENNS: My leader was prepared to speak on that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: We were prepared to speak on that and he chose to call third reading. We're not prepared to listen to that nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is a point of order on the floor. This is not a debate on the merits of the question. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. The Honourable Member for Lakeside

tries to make a point about House business. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had third readings already by the House and they've been approved. I think it's a saving of government, of taxpayers' money to have to keep printing all of that and if really, Mr. Speaker, he wants to show that the House is working, surely we can get on with the passage of legislation. The honourable members are accusing me of invoking closure. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside can rant and rave on somebody else's time. I'd prefer that at least he give me the good grace to listen, as I did to what he had to say.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members are accusing me of invoking a closure rule. That is not the case. Closure, Mr. Speaker, involves the termination of debate. We are not saying, terminate debate; we're saying, please debate. Honourable members have been saying, well, let's get on with it. They've been suggesting that we're not running the House; we're not presenting legislation. We presented legislation in December; we've had it here ready for debate; honourable members have continued to stand, stand, stand these bills. They are trying to thwart the ongoing business of the House and, Mr. Speaker, I'm giving caution to the members that we have another technique and that is not closure; that is not terminating debate; that is not shutting off debate. That is going to insist that all members that have a right to speak, exercise their right and speak on the bill or vote on the bill. But don't sit there or continue to stand the legislation because that's not what we're here for. We're here to get on with the passage of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since the members opposite have alleged that the Leader of the Opposition refused to debate the bilingual resolution, let the record show that the Government House Leader had been approached last Friday with an indication that my leader would like to speak this afternoon on such an important constitutional amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . Mr. Speaker, on such an important constitutional amendment as this and what the members opposite have attempted to do is to break the flow of argument that the Leader of the Opposition would use in presenting his case on this constitutional amendment, Sir. Let the members opposite not try and make the case that they have not received co-operation from members on this side.

Specifically, Sir, the Acting Government House Leader stated, and I'm confident that an examination of the record will show that he said that he would not allow anymore bills to be stood. Now, if that is the position that the Government House Leader is taking, then let him be specific. If he is not taking that position on all bills, let him designate those bills for which he . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe if the Acting Government House Leader does not wish to specify

the bills then, indeed, his statement applies to all bills now standing on the Order Paper. Perhaps for the sake of the business of the House, the Acting Government House Leader could clarify that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, for the record, let it be known that the Government House Leader did have, apparently, a conversation with the Opposition House Leader and there was an intimation that the Leader of the Opposition wanted to speak on Monday. Well, we accommodated the Leader of the Opposition, this resolution was called. If the Leader of the Opposition wanted to speak on it on Monday, this is Monday. There was virtually an hour where the Honourable Leader of the Opposition — (Interjection) — the honourable members opposite let the bells ring while they tried to decide how many of them were going to vote for or against a bill; and Mr. Speaker, there was ample opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to speak tonight on that resolution. They chose not to, Mr. Speaker. I have not indicated any closure; I've indicated that some bills there had been persistent standing. For example, I can refer, Mr. Speaker, to Bills No. 87 and 88 have been on the Order Paper for three weeks and haven't been spoken to.

Mr. Speaker, there are bills that have been standing and standing, and we asked that honourable members speak, present their arguments, because we're concerned to hear what their arguments are, and then we will get on with the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry to the same point.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a reprehensible argument offered by the Acting Government House Leader and he knows it, and all fair-minded members of the House on both sides of the Chamber know it, Sir. The Acting Government House Leader knows full well that my Leader was prepared to go and there was at least a tacit understanding that he would go on the resolution at approximately 3 o'clock this afternoon. For the Acting Government House Leader, after contriving to embarrass my House Leader, contriving to embarrass various other members on this side, and spare members on his side, in whose names bills are standing, spare them embarrassment, and try to pretend that there was never any intention that my Leader would speak on the resolution until this evening is absolute patent cynicism, absolutely nonsense, and is an absolute distortion of the events of the day, Sir.

Now, the Acting Government House Leader may not, in what he has said, have invoked technical closure, Mr. Speaker; it may be true that technically he has not invoked closure. What he has done is invoked de facto closure; what he has done is force debate the conclusion against the proper procedures of the legislative process, and the public will know that, and the media will know that, and this side will know that, and I can assure him that every voter in Fort Garry will know that, and I can assure him that every constituent represented by every member on this side of the House will know that. If he hasn't invoked technical closure it is simply because he has pulled another one of his sleazy little tricks; it's simply because he has pulled another one of his cynical

little manoeuvres, Mr. Speaker, and he is invoking de facto closure, and that is reprehensible and despicable conduct on the Acting Government Leader's part.

If he wonders why he doesn't get much co-operation from this side of the House all he need do is look in the mirror, and look at his own record, and look at his own performance in trying to manoeuvre cynically, in trying to manipulate crassly the affairs and the events of this House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address, as calmly and as rationally as possible, the question that I think is before the House, which relates to the statement by the Acting Government House Leader, specifically, that he would not allow debate on Bill No. 3 to stand when that bill is called tomorrow; and that he would not necessarily allow debate to stand on all other bills. Now, which ones he chooses to not necessarily allow debate to stand, of course, are up to the Government House Leader or the Acting Government House Leader. I think the statement has been made in the past, particularly by Mr. Jorgenson when he was House Leader, the former Member for Morris, that he would not necessarily allow all bills to stand tomorrow was a warning to members that debate was not proceeding. It was used by Mr. Green, when he was Government House Leader in the Schreyer Government; it was used by the Member for St. Norbert, when he was Government House Leader in the previous administration.

So, the question of asking members to speak on bills has a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. ANSTETT: . . . has a tradition in this House. As I said earlier on the point of order, the request to have a matter stand is done, by leave, at the acquiescence of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are three ways under our Rules to deal with debate. The first one is the question of asking for a matter to stand on an adjourned debate. That request to allow a matter to stand can be either acceded to or denied.

The second way in which debate can be dealt with is to refuse an adjournment. If one member speaks, and another then proceeds to adjourn the debate, to deny the opportunity of adjournment and force one more member to speak that day, and allow the third person then to take the adjournment. Neither are a form of closure, but they are a way of forcing debate.

The third stage in bringing a question to a head is to force that question. The Minister of Natural Resources is not suggesting that in the least. The mechanism of closure is usually used to shut off debate before the speaking rights of all the members have been used. The member is not suggesting that. Debate automatically ends when the right to speak of all members has been expired.

So, we have, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, a three-stage mechanism for getting a bill to any level of reading, second or third; and that includes having

members refuse to speak and being granted the right to have it stand. We have provision for any member, upon conclusion of a debate, to take an adjournment, but that too can be denied.

Both of those ways require members to speak in debate, otherwise this House, Mr. Speaker, could come here every day at 2 o'clock, conclude at 3 o'clock. The last 10 minutes having been exhausted in calling all the bills and having members opposite say, because we're opposed to certain bills, we choose not to call them.

Mr. Speaker, that's the matter that the Minister of Natural Resources has addressed. He has not proposed closure; he's not invoked Rule 37; he has said, I want members to debate and, certainly, he has indicated that on certainly bills, but not necessarily all of them, he will refuse to allow debate to stand. I think it also goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that he may also, on occasion, deny an adjournment where he wants members to speak to a bill to move that bill along. Otherwise, with regard to the fears that have been spoken by members opposite, we could well be here all summer, which I know members opposite don't really want to be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur to the same point.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this point of order and make two points. The first point, Mr. Speaker, is on an issue which the people of Manitoba are very much opposed to, and that is, the introduction of bilingualism to the Province of Manitoba in a forced way which the NDP Party are doing. The Attorney-General stood up and introduced a resolution at an opportune time, prime TV time, and put their case across to the people of Manitoba, to sell to the people of Manitoba an issue which is very controversial and against the wishes of the people of Manitoba. Today it was by general agreement in the process, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I wonder if the honourable member would keep his remarks to the point of order and not to debate an issue or to start a new debate.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the point of order being that the Leader of the Opposition, today, has been denied his opportunity to put the Official Opposition — (Interjection) — Well they laugh about it, Mr. Speaker, because there was evidence that of a denial of freedom of a member of this House to have the privileges of this House; he was denied the opportunity to put the Official Opposition's position forward at a prime time this afternoon, to tell the people of Manitoba precisely the direction this government were going, denied that opportunity.

Point No. 2, the Government House Leader has tried to politically embarrass the opposition by calling all bills that were in the opposition's name, but didn't call one bill - or maybe called one bill - that were standing in the name of the government. They have deliberately tried.

Mr. Speaker, further to that, they are invoking closure on Bill No. 3 which the Premier, in recent press releases, said he would invoke closure - he said in the press release he would invoke closure - the bill that they couldn't get through, Bill 54, at the last sitting of this Session, the Minister of Agriculture falsely introduced it and went to a media . . . — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I will put it on the record that the Government of the Day, because they cannot get their way in operation of this House, that they are raping the opposition of their right to speak for freedom for the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).