

Wednesday, October 5, 1983

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. J. Price.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Mr. Speaker delivered a reserved decision as follows:

Honourable Members:

Yesterday, the Member for Skeena rose on a matter of privilege stating, *inter alia*, that "Members are being menaced, or threatened, with a certain course of action unless they behave in a certain fashion."

In support of this serious charge, the Member states that he has every reason to believe there exists a timetable for the passage of legislation through this House. He further alleges that House business is being regulated to accommodate the alleged timetable.

While the Chair has no specific knowledge of such a timetable, it would seem to the Chair most difficult to accept the proposition, if such a timetable existed, that this would amount to an impropriety. Indeed, it is the Chair's understanding that most parliaments attempt to conduct their affairs in an orderly manner. The Chair does not consider that a timetable, in the hands of a government, would menace an opposition any more than an imaginary scheme on the part of an opposition to delay government legislation would tend to menace government. In short, each side of the House is entitled to their parliamentary tactics provided these tactics are conducted in accordance with the Rules of this House.

The Chair can find no evidence of obstruction or menacing in the material presented by the Honourable Member for Skeena.

There is, however, another matter with which the Chair is gravely concerned. In the statement made by the Member, he refers to "the actions of certain members who occupy the Chair from time to time", and implied, in a grossly improper fashion, that the actions of the Chair are for the purpose of serving the alleged timetable. This clearly imputes an improper motive to the Chair in relation to its decision-making responsibilities.

If it is the Honourable Member's intention to bring this institution into disrepute, he has embarked upon an effective course, but I must assume that the Member's remarks arise out of an imperfect understanding of the Rules, rather than to any base motive. I feel certain that the Honourable Member's respect for the institution of parliament will prevent him from falling into this error again but I will caution all honourable members that the use of a matter of privilege to criticize the conduct or motives of the Chair is not acceptable, and should it arise again, the House may wish to consider an appropriate course of action.

K. W. DAVIDSON, *Speaker*

Mr. Nicolson rose on a matter of privilege relating to an answer given by the Minister of Education during Oral Question Period on Tuesday last.

Mr. Speaker stated he would take the matter under advisement.

Mr. *Howard* rose on a matter of privilege relating to certain answers given during Oral Question Period.

Mr. Speaker stated he would take the matter under advisement.

The Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, on behalf of the Hon. *A. V. Fraser*, presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, which read as follows:

ROBERT G. ROGERS
Lieutenant Governor

The Lieutenant Governor transmits herewith amendments to Bill (No. 23) intituled *Motor Vehicle Amendment Act, 1983* enclosed herewith, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
September 16, 1983.

(ENCLOSURE)

Section 1.1, by adding the following section:

“1.1 The following section is added:

*“Inspection of vehicles
and refusal to issue
licence*

“24.2 The superintendent may refuse to issue

- (a) a licence and corresponding number plates, and
- (b) a permit

for a motor vehicle or trailer that is required under section 215 to be presented for inspection and has not been presented for inspection or has not passed inspection.”

Section 7, in the proposed section 215 (1),

(a) by deleting paragraph (e) and substituting the following:

“(e) prescribing

- (i) fees or the method of determining the amount of fees payable to the Province in respect of inspections of vehicles and in respect of applications for and any consultations relating to the issuance of authorizations, designations and exemptions under section 215.1, and
- (ii) charges payable, by persons required to present vehicles for inspection, to operators, other than the Province, of facilities designated under section 215.1, and,”

(b) in paragraph (f) (iii) by deleting “inspection certificate, and” and substituting “inspection certificate.”, and

(c) by deleting paragraph (g).

Section 11, by deleting “65, 67,” and substituting “24.2, 65, 67,”.

Section 12, by adding the following section:

“Insurance (Motor Vehicle) Act Amendments

“12. Section 38 of the *Insurance (Motor Vehicle) Act*, R.S.B.C. 1979, c. 204, is amended

“(a) in subsection (1) by striking out ‘contrary to this section’ and substituting ‘contrary to this subsection’, and

“(b) by adding the following subsection:

‘(1.1) No owner’s certificate shall be issued for a motor vehicle or trailer for which the superintendent refuses to issue a licence or permit under section 24.2 of the *Motor Vehicle Act*, and a certificate issued contrary to this subsection is null and void and shall be deemed to have always been void and of no effect.’ ”

Section 13, by adding the following section:

“13. Section 40 (3) is amended by striking out ‘by reason only of a suspension of a licence under section 25.10 of a regulation under the *Motor Vehicle Act* made by Order in Council 30/70, until the superintendent notifies the corporation that the licence and the number plates have been returned to the superintendent pursuant to paragraph (b) or (c) of that section.’ and substituting ‘by reason only of the surrender of a vehicle licence in compliance with a regulation made under section 215 (1) (f) of the *Motor Vehicle Act*, until the superintendent notifies the corporation that the vehicle licence and corresponding number plates have been returned to the superintendent.’ ”

By leave of the House, *Resolved*, That the said Message, and the amendments accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee having in charge Bill (No. 23).

By leave, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the House proceeded to “Public Bills and Orders.”

On the motion for second reading of Bill (No. 2) intituled *Public Service Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983*, a debate arose.

The debate continued.

The Speaker’s attention was drawn to the clock.

On the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, it was *Resolved* that the House stand adjourned until 8 p.m.

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

EIGHT O’CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill (No. 2) intituled *Public Service Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983*.

The debate continued.

Mr. *Hanson* moved the following amendment—

That the motion be amended by leaving out the word “now” and adding the words “on this day six months hence.”

The debate on the amendment continued.

The House continued to sit after midnight.

On the motion being made that the House do now adjourn, the Speaker declined to put the question on the grounds that the motion amounted to an abuse of the Rules.

The Speaker further stated that his declining to put the question on adjournment of the House was not a ruling subject to appeal.

The Leader of the Opposition, having failed to obey the directions of the Chair, was ordered to withdraw for the balance of the day's sitting.

On the refusal of the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw from the House, as ordered by the Chair, he was removed from the Chamber by the Sergeant-at-Arms, acting on the Speaker's instructions.

Mr. *Howard* rose, pursuant to Standing Order 11, and sought to move a motion relating to the Member for Maillardville-Coquitlam.

The Speaker ruled the motion out of order and stated that such a motion required notice under the Standing Order.

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—29

<i>Reid</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		<i>Waterland</i>

NAYS—12

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Lauk</i>	<i>Howard</i>
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Skelly</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Member for Skeena, having disregarded the authority of the Chair, and being in contravention of Standing Order 20, was ordered to withdraw from the Chamber for the balance of the day's sitting.

The Member for Mackenzie rose to ask leave of the House to proceed to Motion 24 on the Order Paper.

The Speaker ruled the Member out of order on the grounds that the House was currently debating an amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill (No. 2).

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	
	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>
<i>Passarell</i>		<i>Lauk</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>		

The debate on the amendment continued.

Mr. Speaker made the following ruling:

Honourable Members:

I wish to address the House on a matter of grave importance. Earlier this evening an event took place which appears to be both unparalleled and unprecedented in the history of this House. I will now read from Sir Erskine May's 19th Edition regarding this incident and the action that the Chair is forced to take, at page 442:

"A member who is suspended from the service of the House under this order must forthwith withdraw from the House. If he does not withdraw, the Speaker directs him to do so. If he does not comply with the direction, the Speaker orders the Sergeant-at-Arms to summon the member to obey the Speaker's direction. If he still refuses to obey, the Speaker calls the attention of the House to the fact that recourse to force is necessary in order to compel obedience to his direction, and directs the Sergeant to remove the refractory member. The Standing Order provides that in such a case the member shall thereupon, without any further question being put, be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the session.

"Where the Speaker has directed the Sergeant to cause a member who had been suspended but refused to leave the House to be removed from the House, he has suspended the sitting until the member should have been removed.

"On July 2, 1931, a member persisted in disregarding the authority of the Chair, whereupon the Speaker named him and he was suspended on the motion of the Prime Minister. The Speaker then directed the member to withdraw, but he refused to comply. Accordingly, the Speaker directed the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove him. The Sergeant-at-Arms, finding that force was necessary, brought in his officers who, in their attempts to remove the member, were resisted, not only by that member but by certain other members. The member who had been suspended was eventually removed. While this was taking place, the Speaker announced that grave disorder had arisen and suspended the sitting. After an interval of a quarter of an hour, the Speaker resumed the Chair and informed the House that resort to force having been necessary to remove the member, he was therefore suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the Session."

Honourable Members, force was necessary, and it is with great reluctance and some sincere sorrow that I inform the House that the Leader of the Opposition is suspended for the remainder of this session.

K. W. DAVIDSON, *Speaker*

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	
	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>
<i>Passarell</i>		<i>Lauk</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>		

Mr. *Lauk* rose on a point of order and sought to move a motion pursuant to Standing Order 40 (3).

The Speaker ruled the motion out of order on the grounds that such a motion required notice and must be in writing and cited Standing Orders 48 and 50.

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—25

<i>Reid</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	
	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	
	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>		<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>
<i>Passarell</i>		<i>Lauk</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>		

Mr. *Lauk* sought leave, pursuant to Standing Order 49, to move a motion.

The Speaker ruled the motion out of order on the grounds that the House was not engaged upon the order of "Motions and Adjourned Debates on Motions."

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	
	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>
<i>Passarell</i>		<i>Lauk</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>		

Mrs. *Wallace* sought to move the following subamendment—

That the words “six months” be deleted and the words “twelve months” be substituted therefore.

The Speaker ruled the subamendment out of order as an established form of amendment such as the “six months’” formula, used to obtain the rejection of a bill, is not capable of amendment.

The Speaker’s ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	
	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—6

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>
		<i>Lauk</i>
<i>Wallace</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>		

The debate on the amendment continued.

On the motion of Ms. *Sanford* that the House do now adjourn, the House divided.

Motion negated on the following division:

YEAS—9

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	
		<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>	<i>Lauk</i>	
		<i>Lea</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>			

NAYS—24

		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>		
	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

The debate on the amendment continued.

During debate, the Hon. *W. S. Ritchie* advised the Chair of his intention to reserve his right to raise a matter of privilege relating to statements contained in the Hansard "Blues" which had recently become available.

The debate on the amendment continued.

On the motion of Ms. *Brown*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

On the motion of the Hon. *J. A. Nielsen*, the House adjourned at 9.29 a.m.

Thursday, October 6, 1983

TEN O'CLOCK A.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *G. Evans*.

Mr. Speaker declared a short recess.

The Hon. *P. L. McGeer* made a statement relating to a matter of privilege raised by the Honourable Member for Nelson-Creston on October 5.

The Member for Nelson-Creston made a statement and the matter was withdrawn.

By leave, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the House proceeded to "Public Bills and Orders."

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill (No. 2) intituled *Public Service Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983*.

The debate on the amendment continued.

Mr. *Mowat* sought to move that the question be now put.

The Deputy Speaker declined to put the question as the Speaker was not in the Chair.

The debate on the amendment continued.

Mr. *Kempf* moved that the question be now put.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—29

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>			<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>		<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—10

	<i>Lockstead</i>		<i>Dailly</i>
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	
		<i>Stupich</i>	

The question on the amendment being put, the House divided.

The amendment was negated on the following division:

YEAS—11

	<i>Lockstead</i>		<i>Dailly</i>
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Lea</i>	
		<i>Stupich</i>	

NAYS—30

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>		<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

The debate was resumed on the main motion.

On the motion of Ms. *Brown*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

On the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the House adjourned at 12.07 p.m.

Thursday, October 6, 1983

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

By leave, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the House proceeded to "Public Bills and Orders."

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill (No. 2) intituled *Public Service Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983*.

The debate continued.

Ms. *Brown* sought to move the following amendment—

That the Bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour and Justice.

The Speaker ruled the amendment out of order citing the Journals of the House, March 17, 1961.

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—33

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—9

	<i>Hanson</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>Brown</i>		<i>Howard</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The debate continued.

Mr. *D'Arcy* sought to move the following amendment—

That the Bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Labour Relations Board.

The Speaker ruled the amendment out of order referring to his earlier ruling, and citing the Journals of the House, March 17, 1961.

The Speaker's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—30

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>			
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—10

	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Passarell</i>		<i>Lauk</i>	<i>Howard</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Skelly</i>		
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The debate continued.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—30

<i>Reid</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—9

<i>Blencoe</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
		<i>Lauk</i>	<i>Howard</i>
		<i>Lea</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>		<i>Stupich</i>	

Bill (No. 2) read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 14) intituled *Gasoline (Coloured) Tax Amendment Act, 1983*, a debate arose.

The debate continued.

Bill (No. 14) read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

The Hon. *H. A. Curtis* tabled a document referred to during debate on second reading of Bill (No. 14).

By leave, on the motion of Ms. *Sanford*, Motion 30 standing in her name on the Order Paper was withdrawn.

On the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, it was *Resolved* that the House stand adjourned until 8 p.m.

And then the House adjourned at 5.53 p.m.

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

Bill (No. 4) intituled *Income Tax Amendment Act, 1983* was committed, reported complete without amendments.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 1 the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave, on the motion of the Hon. *W. R. Bennett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—26

<i>Reid</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Veitch</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		<i>Waterland</i>

NAYS—7

<i>Rose</i>		<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Dailly</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 9 the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave, on the motion of Mr. *Nicolson*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—28

<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		<i>Waterland</i>

NAYS—7

<i>Rose</i>		<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Dailly</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	

On the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 4) the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—29

<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Veitch</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Segarty</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>

NAYS—7

<i>Rose</i>		<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Dailly</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	

Bill (No. 4) read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 6) intituled *Education (Interim) Finance Amendment Act, 1983* was committed, reported complete with amendments.

Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

Bill (No. 28) intituled *Provincial Treasury Financing Amendment Act, 1983* was committed, reported complete with amendments.

Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

On the motion of the Hon. *H. W. Schroeder*, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Friday, October 7, 1983

TEN O'CLOCK A.M.

Prayers by Major *A. Swan*.

Mr. *Howard* rose in his place and advised the Chair that it was his intention to raise a matter of privilege later today.

Mr. Speaker stated that the fact of a member giving notice of intention to raise a matter of privilege would not preclude the Chair from considering whether or not the matter raised had, in fact, been raised at the earliest opportunity.

Bill (No. 26) intituled *Employment Standards Amendment Act, 1983* was committed, reported complete with amendments.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 2 the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Cocke*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>		<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—12

<i>Blencoe</i>		<i>Sanford</i>	<i>Daily</i>
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Hanson</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Lea</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 27 the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>		<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—10

		<i>Sanford</i>	<i>Daily</i>
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Hanson</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

On the motion that the Committee rise and report the Bill complete with amendments the Committee divided and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>		<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—9

<i>Blencoe</i>			<i>Daily</i>
<i>Rose</i>			<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The Hon. J. R. Chabot presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor which read as follows:

ROBERT G. ROGERS
Lieutenant Governor

The Lieutenant Governor transmits herewith amendments to Bill (No. 3) intituled *Public Sector Restraint Act* enclosed herewith, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
September 22, 1983.

(ENCLOSURE)

Section 1, by adding the following definition:

“ ‘terminate’ includes lay off.”

Section 2 (1), is deleted and the following substituted:

“(1) Notwithstanding the *Labour Code* and the *Public Service Labour Relations Act*, where a public sector employer

- (a) considers that there
 - (i) is insufficient work, or
 - (ii) are insufficient current operating funds budgeted, to maintain current levels of employment,
- (b) makes a change in the organizational structure of the employer,
- (c) discontinues a program, activity or service of the employer, or
- (d) reduces the level of an activity or service of the employer,

the public sector employer may terminate the employment of an employee in accordance with the regulations.”

Section 2 (2), by adding “Subject to subsection (2.1),” at the beginning.

Section 2, by adding the following subsection:

“(2.1) Notwithstanding any provision of a collective agreement, a notice of termination may be given under subsection (1) before the termination or expiry of the collective agreement if the termination is to take effect on or after the date of termination or expiry of the agreement.”

Section 2 (3), is deleted and the following substituted:

“(3) Subject to subsection (2), subsection (1) and a regulation made under section 3 or 4 apply notwithstanding any provision of a collective agreement, and, where there is an inconsistency between

- (a) the power of termination under subsection (1) or a regulation made under section 3 or 4, and
 - (b) any provision of a collective agreement,
- subsection (1) or the regulation, as the case may be, prevails.”

Section 2 (4), by deleting “subsection (2),” and substituting “subsections (2) and (2.1),”.

Section 2 (6), by deleting “school board.” and substituting “board of school trustees.”

Section 2 (7), by deleting subsection (7) and substituting the following:

“(7) Where a board of school trustees terminates the employment of a teacher under subsection (1), the effective date of the termination shall be the end of the current school term, as determined under the *School Act*.”

Sections 2.1 and 2.2, by adding the following sections:

“Exemption order

“2.1 (1) Where a written contract of employment or a collective agreement contains provisions that

- (a) enable a public sector employer to terminate the employment of employees in the circumstances described in section 2 (1),
- (b) provide fair and equitable procedures, which are consistent with efficient management, by which those terminations of employment will be implemented, and
- (c) provide fair and equitable compensation to be paid to those employees whose employment has been terminated,

the Compensation Stabilization Commissioner appointed under the *Compensation Stabilization Act* may, on the application of a party to that contract or agreement, order that section 2 (1), (3) and (5) does not apply to the parties to that contract or agreement.

“(2) The Compensation Stabilization Commissioner may

- (a) impose any conditions he considers necessary in respect of an order made under subsection (1), and
- (b) reconsider and revoke, amend or vary an order he has made.

“No pre-existing right to terminate affected

“2.2 (1) Nothing in this Act impairs, alters or affects a right that a public sector employer has to terminate the employment of an employee pursuant to the provisions of a collective agreement or at common law.

“(2) Where a public sector employer exercises a right referred to in subsection (1), this Act does not apply to that termination.”

Section 4 (1), by deleting “or under any other circumstance without cause”.

Section 4 (4), by deleting “or under any other circumstance without cause”.

Sections 4.1 and 4.2, by adding the following sections:

“Review panel

“4.1 (1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint members to the review panel.

“(2) A member

- (a) may be appointed for a term and on the conditions specified by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and
- (b) shall be reimbursed by the minister for any reasonable expenses necessarily incurred by him in the performance of his duties.

“(3) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint one of the members as chairman.

“(4) The chairman shall refer a review permitted under this Act or the regulations to one or more members of the review panel, and, in those matters referred, the member or members have the powers of the review panel.

“(5) The chairman may, before the commencement of the hearing,

- (a) withdraw a review that he referred to a member under subsection (4), and
- (b) replace a member of a review panel.

“(6) Money required to be paid to members of the review panel under this section and to hold hearings by the review panel may, until March 31, 1984, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund.

“Right to request review

“4.2 (1) An employee whose employment has been terminated under section 2 (1) may request a review of the termination by the review panel solely on the ground that the public sector employer terminated the employment for a reason other than that specified in section 2 (1).

“(2) A review may be requested by giving written notice of the particulars of the request to the chairman of the review panel and the public sector employer not later than 15 days after the effective date of the employee’s termination.

“(3) The review panel shall render a decision within 2 days after the hearing of the matter and is not required to provide written reasons beyond that which it considers necessary to render its decision.

“(4) On a review under this section, the review panel may, order that the employee be reinstated with compensation.

“(5) Notwithstanding section 4 (6), where an employee requests a review by the review panel, the operation of section 4 (6) is suspended until the review panel has rendered its decision in the matter.”

Section 5, is deleted.

Section 5.1, by adding the following section:

“Judicial review

“5.1 (1) On an application for judicial review from a decision of the review panel under section 4.2, a court may, in addition to any other powers it has, order that the employee be reinstated with compensation.

“(2) No application for judicial review from a decision of the review panel under section 4.2 shall be brought later than 60 days after the date the review panel has rendered its decision.

“(3) Notwithstanding section 4 (6), where an employee makes an application for judicial review before the 60 day period in section 4 (6) has expired, the operation of section 4 (6) is suspended until the court has rendered its decision in the matter.”

Section 6 (1),

(a) by adding the following definition:

“ ‘contract of employment for a fixed term’ means a contract by which an employee agrees to provide his services during a term that, if not renewed or extended, is to end on a date that is ascertainable at the time the contract is entered into;”, and

(b) in the definition of “senior manager” by deleting “and” at the end of paragraph (a) and substituting “or”.

Section 6 (3) (c), by deleting “and records” and by deleting everything following “employed by them,”.

Section 6 (4), is deleted and the following substituted:

“(4) Except as expressly provided by this section, no provision of any contract of employment prevents the application of this section to that contract of employment.

“(4.1) Where there is a conflict or inconsistency between

(a) a regulation or direction under this section, and

(b) any other enactment or contract of employment,

the regulation or direction prevails.

“(4.2) Where there is a conflict or inconsistency between a direction and a regulation under this section, the regulation prevails.

Section 6 (5) (a), by deleting "or period".

Section 6, by adding the following subsections:

"(5.1) A contract that is, after July 7, 1983, renewed or extended is not, after the renewal or extension, a contract within the meaning of subsection (5) (a).

"(5.2) Where a contract for a fixed term contains an option to terminate the contract before the expiry of the fixed term, and the option may be exercised on or after July 7, 1983, the contract ceases to be a contract within the meaning of subsection (5) (a) on the later of

(a) July 7, 1983, or

(b) the date the option becomes exercisable.

"(5.3) A person is not entitled to damages by reason of his compensation being limited, reduced or affected under this section."

Sections 7.1 and 7.2, by adding the following sections:

Validation

"7.1 Where, on or after July 7, 1983 but before this Act comes into force, a public sector employer gave an employee a notice of termination that would have been validly given if given under this Act, the notice of termination shall be conclusively deemed to have been validly given under this Act as though this Act were in force at the time the notice was given.

Regulations

"7.2 The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations that he considers necessary or advisable for purposes of carrying out the intent of this Act."

By leave of the House, *Resolved*, That the said Message, and the amendments accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee having in charge Bill (No. 3).

Bill (No. 35) intituled *Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1983* was committed.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 3 the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Ms. *Brown*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>		<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—11

Blencoe
Rose

Sanford

Daily
Cocke
Howard

Brown

Lea

Mitchell
Wallace

Gabelmann

Order for Committee of Supply called.

Pursuant to Order, the House again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

The Committee rose and reported progress.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next.

Mr. *Howard* rose on a matter of privilege relating to the ability of the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to discharge his duties.

Mr. Speaker stated that while he would take the matter under advisement, the Member in question had on previous occasions been advised of the rule applicable in the circumstances which had occurred.

And then the House adjourned at 12.48 p.m.

Tuesday, October 11, 1983

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *D. W. Whiddicombe*.

The Hon. *G. B. Gardom* advised the House of the death of Col. the Honourable John Robert Nicholson, former Lieutenant Governor of the Province of British Columbia. Mr. Speaker stated he would convey to the family of the late Hon. J. R. Nicholson the condolences and sympathy of the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision as follows:

Honourable Members:

On Friday last the Honourable Member for Skeena raised, as a matter of privilege, an allegation that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been impeded and obstructed in his duties, contrary to the long-established usages and customs of Parliament.

In support of this allegation, the Honourable Member has cited Standing Orders 1, 19 and 20, as well as excerpts from *Parliamentary Practice in British Columbia*, including references from the 4th edition of Beauchesne and the 18th edition of Sir Erskine May. The Honourable Member concludes his recitation of the rules relating to the power to punish disorder with two submissions; (one), that "the ancient usages (of Parliament) have been codified with our Standing Orders", and (two), "any remedy is within our own power."

The Chair completely agrees with the second submission that the remedy, i.e., punishment of disorder is within our own power. However, the first submission that the ancient usages have been codified in our Standing Orders is clearly contrary to the Honourable Member's own citation from Sir Erskine May, which states under the heading, "Dual Source of Modern Powers to Punish Disorder" . . . "the power to punish disorder is regulated partly by practice and partly by standing order."

Furthermore, the Honourable Member for Skeena's citation from Sir Erskine May, in support of his matter of privilege, clearly states, under the heading "Disciplinary Powers of the Speaker Under Ancient Usage", as follows: "It is still open to the House to proceed against a Member according to ancient usages in preference to relying upon the powers conferred by standing order."

Without doubt then, as at Westminster, our rules and procedures are an amalgam of customs, usages and Speakers' decisions, as recorded in the Journals of the House, and some codification of rules known as Standing Orders.

In the result, the authorities which have been advanced to the Chair do not merely fail to support the basic proposition advanced by the Honourable Member, but they are in direct contradiction thereto. This being the case, the Chair is bound to conclude that there is no foundation established for a matter of privilege.

I should also note that the Honourable Member, in his submission, raises the question of whether or not the Standing Orders of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom may properly be applied in this House, pursuant to our Standing Order 1, last adopted on February 20, 1930, which refers us to the "usages and customs" at Westminster, as far as they may be applicable to this House. "Custom", by definition, means habitual or usual practice. It may well be that there was never any intention that a Standing Order of Westminster, newly adopted from time to time, would necessarily be applicable to this House, but it is a fact that the Westminster Standing Order providing for sessional suspension was adopted many years ago and the use thereof must now of necessity have become the usual practice or "custom" of that House, and therefore under our Standing Order 1, qualifies as being applicable to our House. On the other hand, if one still insists that the Westminster rule as to sessional suspension is not applicable, *per se*, to this House, then we have a complete void, as our own Standing Orders do not specifically provide for the consequences of a forcible ejection from the House after the repeated refusal of a member to leave after repeated direction from the Chair. If such a void did then exist (although for the reasons stated, the Chair is of the opinion it did not), the Chair made a ruling of the first instance and that ruling was supported by the House.

It must further be noted that in the 112-year history of this Legislature, no member, no matter how aggrieved he may have felt, has so conducted himself in the manner recently witnessed by this House with the attendant result of forcible ejection.

In view of the gravity of the events of Wednesday last, however, the Chair cannot conclude the matter without some further comment on the specifics of those events. This

Legislature, and the institution of Parliament, belong to the people of the Province and we, the Members, are merely its custodians. It is therefore imperative that there be a response to any perverted and distorted version which may have been presented to the public at large, in relation to the ejection of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The record will show that over the preceding week the Chair has repeatedly and consistently taken the position that when the Chair declines to put a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 44, the Chair exercises a power conferred upon it but in doing so makes no ruling, as is also the case of exercising a power, pursuant to Standing Order 45 A (3), when the Speaker interrupts the proceedings and puts the question. Prior to his expulsion, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition ignored not only the numerous previous statements from the Chair, in explanation of Standing Order 44, but repeatedly and persistently sought to impose his own will, despite all efforts of the Chair to bring him to order. The consequences of disregarding the authority of the Chair and thereby offending the dignity of the House are well known to all Honourable Members and need not be repeated here. Furthermore, and of crucial significance, is the fact that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was well aware, having been specifically informed by the Chair on earlier occasions when he, the Leader of the Opposition, was personally involved, that failure to voluntarily leave the Chamber would result in a sessional suspension, if force was needed to bring about compliance. He cannot now be heard to complain, and it cannot be appropriately claimed on his behalf, that he is unable to perform his duties in this House when he, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with full knowledge of the consequences, brought upon himself the manner of his removal from the Chamber.

In these circumstances, the transgressor cannot, by any interpretation of the law of Parliament, be magically transformed into the aggrieved party. The injured body is Parliament itself.

K. W. DAVIDSON, *Speaker*

By leave, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the House proceeded to "Public Bills and Orders."

Bill (No. 16) intituled *Employment Development Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment.

The Chairman further reported that on the motion that the Committee rise and report the Bill complete without amendment, the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *H. A. Curtis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS — 41

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Campbell</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Ree</i>	<i>Davis</i>	<i>Johnston</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Michael</i>
		<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Wallace</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
	<i>Dailly</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
		<i>McCarthy</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>D'Arcy</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	

Bill (No. 16) read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 14) intituled *Gasoline (Coloured) Tax Amendment Act, 1983* was committed, reported complete with amendment.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 2 of Bill (No. 14), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Davis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS — 40

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Campbell</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Fraser, R. G.</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Ree</i>		<i>Johnston</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Michael</i>
		<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Wallace</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
	<i>Dailly</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
		<i>McCarthy</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>D'Arcy</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	

NAYS — 1

Davis

Bill (No. 14) as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

Bill (No. 15) intituled *Social Service Tax Amendment Act, 1983* was committed, reported complete with amendments.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 1 of Bill (No. 15), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *H. A. Curtis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—26

	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
		<i>Johnston</i>	
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 2 of Bill (No. 15), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *H. A. Curtis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Johnston</i>	<i>McClelland</i>
			<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—6

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Skelly</i>		
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that he had ruled a proposed amendment to section 4 of Bill (No. 15) out of order as it interfered with Crown revenues and his ruling had been challenged.

The Chairman's ruling was sustained on the following division:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

		<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
		<i>Lauk</i>	
	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 4 of Bill (No. 15), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *H. A. Curtis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—9

		<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
		<i>Lauk</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of section 7 of Bill (No. 15), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Lauk*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—26

	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

		<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
		<i>Lauk</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>		<i>Stupich</i>	
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

Bill (No. 15) as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

Bill (No. 3) intituled *Public Sector Restraint Act* was committed.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again later today.

The Chairman further reported that he had ruled a proposed sub-amendment to section 1 of Bill (No. 3) out of order on the ground that it exceeded the scope of the amendment being considered.

The Chairman's ruling was sustained on the following division:

YEAS—26

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

<i>Blencoe</i>		<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
		<i>Lauk</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Barnes</i>			

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 1 of Bill (No. 3), the Hon. *D. M. Phillips* moved that the question be now put.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
			<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—10

<i>Blencoe</i>		<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		<i>Cocke</i>
		<i>Lauk</i>	
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	
<i>Wallace</i>			
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Cocke*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 1 of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

*Blencoe**Sanford**Mitchell**Lauk**Wallace**Lea**Barnes**Gabelmann*

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *H. A. Curtis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

Mr. *Lauk* rose on a matter of privilege relating to the use of Standing Order 46 during Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker stated he would take the matter under advisement.

On the motion of the Hon. *J. A. Nielsen*, it was *Resolved* that the House stand adjourned until 8 p.m.

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

Bill (No. 3) intituled *Public Sector Restraint Act* was committed.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a further amendment to section 1 of Bill (No. 3), Mr. *Reynolds* moved that the question be now put.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—28

Parks
Reid
Reynolds
Veitch
Segarty
Ree

Fraser, A. V.
McGeer
Phillips
Curtis

Smith

Kempf
Davis

Nielsen
McCarthy

Chabot

Campbell

Johnston
Pelton
Michael
Ritchie

Richmond
Hewitt
Heinrich
McClelland

Rogers
Brummet
Waterland

NAYS—8

*Rose**Lockstead**Brown**Nicolson*

Lea
Stupich

Dailly
Cocke

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a further amendment to section 1 of Bill (No. 3) as amended, the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Cocke*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—29

<i>Parks</i>	<i>Fraser, A. V.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

	<i>Lockstead</i>		<i>Dailly</i>
<i>Rose</i>		<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
		<i>Lea</i>	
		<i>Stupich</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a sub-amendment to section 2 (1) of Bill (No. 3) it was moved that the question be now put.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—26

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>

NAYS—12

	<i>Lockstead</i>		<i>Dailly</i>
<i>Rose</i>	<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
	<i>Brown</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>		<i>Lea</i>	
		<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a sub-amendment to section 2 (1) of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Cocke*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>			<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>			

NAYS—13

<i>Rose</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>		<i>Dailly</i>
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>Brown</i>		
		<i>Lea</i>	
		<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The House continued to sit after midnight.

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 2 (1) of Bill (No. 3) he had ruled the amendment out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—29

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

	<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>			
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
	<i>Skelly</i>		<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a further amendment to section 2 (1) of Bill (No. 3) he had ruled the amendment out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—29

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

	<i>Hanson</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>			
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
	<i>Skelly</i>		<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to add sub-section 2.1 to section 2 of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House on the motion of the Hon. *J. R. Chabot*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—28

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Passarell</i>			
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
	<i>Skelly</i>		<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 2 (3) of Bill (No. 3) he had ruled the amendment out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>		<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Passarell</i>			
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
	<i>Skelly</i>		<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 2 (3) of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *G. B. Gardom*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—27

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>		<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 2 (4) of Bill (No. 3) he had ruled the amendment out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—25

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>		<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>		<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>	<i>Gardom</i>		
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a further amendment to section 2 (4) of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *R. H. McClelland*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—25

		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>			<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to delete section 2 (5) of Bill (No. 3) he had ruled the amendment out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—25

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>			<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>Skelly</i>		<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 2 (6) of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *D'Arcy*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—26

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>		<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>			<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>		
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>Skelly</i>		<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a further amendment to section 2 (6) of Bill (No. 3) he had ruled the amendment out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged and sustained on the following division:

YEAS—26

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
<i>Reid</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Hewitt</i>
<i>Reynolds</i>		<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>		<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>			<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—7

	<i>Hanson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of an amendment to section 2 (7) of Bill (No. 3), the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *H. A. Curtis*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—24

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
			<i>Hewitt</i>
	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>			<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>		<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
<i>Davis</i>	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—8

	<i>Lockstead</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>	
<i>Passarell</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	
<i>Mitchell</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>	

The Chairman further reported that in consideration of a motion that section 2 of Bill (No. 3) as amended pass, the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House on the motion of Mr. *D'Arcy* the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the said division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—25

<i>Parks</i>		<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Richmond</i>
			<i>Hewitt</i>
	<i>Phillips</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Heinrich</i>
<i>Veitch</i>	<i>Curtis</i>		<i>McClelland</i>
<i>Segarty</i>		<i>Johnston</i>	<i>Schroeder</i>
<i>Ree</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Pelton</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Mowat</i>		<i>Michael</i>	<i>Brummet</i>
<i>Kempf</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>	<i>Ritchie</i>	<i>Waterland</i>
	<i>McCarthy</i>		

NAYS—9

	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	
	<i>Hanson</i>		
		<i>Lauk</i>	<i>Howard</i>
	<i>D'Arcy</i>		
<i>Wallace</i>			<i>Macdonald</i>
	<i>Gabelmann</i>		