

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS No. 42

FIRST SESSION, THIRTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

PRAYERS 10:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

Hon. Ms. FRIESEN moved:

THAT Bill (No. 16) – The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2)/Loi n° 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, be now read a Second Time and be referred to a Committee of this House.

And a debate arising,

And Hon. Ms. FRIESEN and Mr. MARTINDALE having spoken,

The debate was, on motion of Mrs. DACQUAY, adjourned.

Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK moved:

THAT Bill (No. 29) – The Health Sciences Centre Repeal and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi abrogeant la Loi sur le Centre des sciences de la santé et modifications corrélatives, be now read a Second Time and be referred to a Committee of this House.

And a debate arising,

And Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK having spoken,

The debate was, on motion of Mrs. DACQUAY, adjourned.

Hon. Ms. MIHYCHUK moved:

THAT Bill (No. 31) – The Electronic Commerce and Information, Consumer Protection Amendment and Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act/Loi sur le commerce et l'information électroniques, modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur et la Loi sur la preuve au Manitoba, be now read a Second Time and be referred to a Committee of this House.

And a debate arising,

And Hon. Ms. MIHYCHUK having spoken,

The debate was, on motion of Mrs. DACQUAY, adjourned.

The House resumed the Adjourned Debate on the Proposed Motion of Hon. Mr. CALDWELL:

THAT Bill (No. 12) – The Public Schools Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques, be now read a Second Time and be referred to a Committee of this House.

And the debate continuing,

And Ms. ALLAN having spoken,

The debate was allowed, by leave, to remain in the name of Mrs. SMITH (Fort Garry).

The House resumed the Adjourned Debate on the Proposed Motion of Hon. Mr. LATHLIN:

THAT Bill (No. 5) – The Wildlife Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune, be now read a Second Time and be referred to a Committee of this House.

And the debate continuing,

And Hon. Ms. WOWCHUK having spoken,

The debate was allowed, by leave, to remain in the name of Mr. ENNS.

The House resumed the Adjourned Debate on the Proposed Motion of Hon. Mr. LATHLIN:

THAT Bill (No. 6) – The Water Resources Conservation and Protection and Consequential Amendments Act/Loi sur la conservation et la protection des ressources hydriques et modifications corrélatives, be now read a Second Time and be referred to a Committee of this House.

And the debate continuing,

And Mr. SCHELLENBERG and Ms. CERILLI having spoken,

The debate was allowed, by leave, to remain in the name of Mr. MAGUIRE.

1:30 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. SANTOS, Chairperson of the Committee of Supply, presented the Report of the Proceedings of the Committee of June 7, 2000 as follows:

IN THE COMMITTEE

The following Resolutions were adopted:

RESOLVED that there be granted to HER MAJESTY a sum not exceeding FIFTY-TWO MILLION. ELEVEN THOUSAND. FOUR HUNDRED DOLLARS for AGRICULTURE AND FOOD: RISK MANAGEMENT AND INCOME SUPPORT PROGRAMS \$52,011,400.00 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 2001. RESOLVED that there be granted to HER MAJESTY a sum not exceeding SIX 3.3 MILLION, SIX HUNDRED FOURTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS for AGRICULTURE AND FOOD: MANITOBA AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION \$6,614,000.00 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 2001. RESOLVED that there be granted to HER MAJESTY a sum not exceeding ONE 7.1 MILLION, TWO HUNDRED EIGHTY-NINE THOUSAND, EIGHT HUNDRED DOLLARS for FINANCE: ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE..... \$1,289,800.00 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 2001. Resolutions were reported. Report was received and the Committee of Supply obtained leave to sit again.

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

On Tuesday, May 23, 2000, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Carman regarding words which he had withdrawn on May 19, however subsequently after reading Hansard, the Member realized that he had not spoken the words that were allegedly attributed to him. The Honourable Government House Leader also spoke to the same point of order, and indicated that in the raising of the point of order, the Honourable Member for Carman had used unparliamentary language directed towards the Government House Leader. The Honourable Member for Carman and the Official Opposition House Leader then spoke to the same point of order. I took the matter under advisement in order to consult the procedural authorities.

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

After having reviewed the information brought forward, it appears that the House has a situation where two Members have contradictory accounts of the same episode. The Honourable Member for Carman states that he said one thing, the Honourable Government House Leader asserts that he heard another.

Beauchesne citation 494 advises that it has been formally ruled by Speakers that statements by Members respecting themselves and particularly within their own knowledge must be accepted. On rare occasions, this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident. This citation is reinforced by rulings from Speaker Rocan on May 9, 1994, and March 20, 1995, and by rulings from Madam Speaker Dacquay on April 29, 1996, September 18, 1996, November 4, 1996 and April 20, 1999.

I am therefore ruling that the Honourable Member for Carman does not have a point of order, as the matter he raised essentially clarified for the record that the comments he said differed from the comments that were heard by the Honourable Government House Leader.

On the issue of the use of unparliamentary language in the raising of the point of order, the Honourable Member for Carman clarified that he had not used unparliamentary language because the words in dispute appeared in the list of parliamentary phrases contained in Beauchesne citation 490. Regarding the use of unparliamentary language, Marleau and Montpetit advise on page 526 of "House of Commons Procedure and Practice" that in dealing with unparliamentary language, the Speaker takes into account the tone, manner and intention of the Member speaking, the person to whom the words were directed, the degree of provocation, and most importantly, whether or not the remarks created disorder in the Chamber. They continue to state that the codification of unparliamentary language has proven impractical, as it is the context in which words and phrases are used that the Chair must consider when deciding whether or not they should be withdrawn. Although an expression may be found to be acceptable, the Speaker has cautioned that any language which leads to disorder in the House should not be used. This sentiment is also expressed in Beauchesne citation 486(1).

Although the words "barefaced falsehood" appear on the list of parliamentary phrases contained in Beauchesne citation 490, Manitoba Speakers have ruled the word "falsehood" out of order and have requested the withdrawal of the word. On June 1, 1993, Mr. Speaker Rocan requested the withdrawal of the word "falsehood" as did Madam Speaker Dacquay on September 21, 1995.

I note that on June 5, 2000, the Honourable Member for Carman rose and voluntarily withdrew the use of the word "falsehood" and I thank him for that. I would just like to reiterate for the House that for rulings on language, the guiding aspects for Manitoba Speakers are previous Speakers' rulings, and the context which the words are used, rather than relying on lists of words.

Pursuant to Rule 23(1), Messrs. STRUTHERS, DERKACH and JENNISSEN, Mrs. SMITH (Fort Garry)
and Mr. SMITH (Brandon West) made Members' Statements.

Mr. Speaker having left the Chair and the House resolving itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty;

And the House continuing in Committee.	

Thursday, June 8, 2000

The House then adjourned at 6:00 p.m. until 1:30 p.m. Monday, June 12, 2000.

Hon. George HICKES, Speaker.