

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, May 10, 1971

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I'd like to direct the attention of honourable members to seven new Canadians in the Speaker's Gallery. Our new Canadians are with Miss Erna Hartman, the Executive Member of the Citizens Council. This group represents four different nationalities. The aims of the Citizens Council is to acquaint new Canadians with our laws. On behalf of all honourable members, I wish to welcome you to our Assembly.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourned for the supper hour there was a point of order raised by the Minister of Labour, the point being well taken. The point of order was referred to by the Member for Morris, and in perusing the references made both by the Honourable Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member for Morris, it would be my view that since a ruling of the Speaker does become a rule of the House and that a ruling of the Speaker can only be set aside by a substantive motion, that the report of this committee when it is reported to the House is by the way of substantive motion; therefore, any amendment made in Committee of the Whole therefore becomes part of a substantive motion. Therefore, the Member for Rupertsland,

MR. ALLARD: I presume, Mr. Chairman, that I'm in order then. Well -- (Interjection) -- in a manner of speaking. I'll be very short, Mr. Chairman. The subject I'm going to say a few words on is one that has been before us for some two years effectively - it certainly has been before me for two years and I have waited for a report of the House, a report of the Rules Committee to come before the House to be able to deal with it, and in the last session the Committee of the Rules did not report.

I'd like to start by reading a short piece in the Winnipeg Free Press of Tuesday, April 6th, which deals with the Legislature in New Zealand and what has happened there. Mr. Chairman, it's always the habit of those who hold to a way of doing things to say that they do so on the basis of tradition. It's my opinion that very often we're hidebound not for the sake of tradition but for the sake of hideboundness - if there is such a word - because it is less difficult to deal with something that has been done rather than something that has been enshrined because of its value.

I'd like to read this: "Wellington, New Zealand. New Zealand enjoys a pleasant climate without extremes of heat and cold, and air conditioning, consequently, is not common." The heading on this article is: "MPs Win Round." I emphasize they win the round.

"That is the fact behind the overthrowing of a long-standing tradition which has caused shudders of horror from the conventional. New Zealand MPs can now sit in shirt sleeves in the sacred precincts of the House of Representatives.

"A combination of an unusually hot day and a session which started earlier than usual during the southern summer brought the revolution which some MPs have been plotting for some time.

"The chamber where New Zealand's Parliament sits is not air conditioned, and Labour member W.W. Freer suggested to the acting Speaker, E.A. Allen, that conditions were 'sizzling hot' and that members should be allowed to take off their jackets.

"Prime Minister Sir Keith Holyoake objected and said that he would keep his jacket on whatever the ruling.

"I am traditionalist enough, ' he said 'to think that carte blanche to take jackets off would not be a good thing for the country.'

"But Opposition Leader" - I presume Labour of some nature - "Norman Kirk noted that the rule that women members must wear hats had been ignored for some time. He would keep his coat on, but he saw no reason why others should have to.

"Acting Speaker Allen finally agreed that for the present session members could take off their jackets. But he specified that members must wear shirts with long sleeves and must not undo the top button or loosen their ties.

"He specifically declared that the ruling was not binding on the permanent Speaker, Sir Roy Jack, who was out of the country at the time. But now that approval has been given, the ruling would be difficult to reverse.

(MR. ALLARD cont'd.)

"On the first day half a dozen Labour MPs immediately left the chamber and returned without jackets. But MPs of the government National party maintained party solidarity and declined to take advantage of the dispensation."

Mr. Chairman, the article here makes, in my mind, two points. One of them, you know, and the more serious one somehow has to do with the qualifications that the Speaker made that while they could take their jackets off they must wear shirts with long sleeves, they had to keep the top button on their shirt done and they had to keep a tight tie. Gentlemen, when I was elected to this House I think I was elected here for the purpose of deliberating and passing laws. -- (Interjection) - Thank you. It somehow seems an insult to my dignity as a human being to have to conform to a rule that we set up that has nothing to do with our function in this House.

Now I have nothing against wearing a tie. I wear them all the time, I enjoy doing so, but I dislike being told you must do such and such a thing. What if I had invoked my four percent of Indian blood, walked into this House one day wearing a leather jacket and said, "Gentlemen, here I am." Would you have forced me? Supposing it had been a Treaty Indian who was sitting here. Supposing the Chief of the Brotherhood had been elected in the last election and had been sitting here -- (Interjection) -- I'm trying to point out how ridiculous the whole situation is really and how offensive and how infantile in reality.

You see the reason the Speaker is delegated the responsibility of watching over our dress really has to do with the majority that the establishment in England controlling the House imposed, imposed on working men of the times who wanted to come walking into the House as working men - as working men, and why not? But the establishment what it controlled understood what Pavlov found much later, that if you force a man to conform in little things, you know, and continuously impose this on him, you can get him to conform on a great many other things. That's all. -- (Interjection) -- No. But to delegate the responsibility though for imposing certain conditions of dress on all the members, exactly the same conditions, on the Speaker, that was an act of an establishment. I don't care whether the establishment is right wing, left wing, upper wing or lower wing, you know, as long as it is the establishment that seems to perpetuate its own position and it does so through a process of conditioning. And this is all this is.

In any case, the Minister of Mines and Resources this afternoon said that the House should be the master of the rules and not the rules the master of the House. I think -- (Interjection) -- The press won't give a care what we do. They go about their own way, thank God.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ALLARD: I know, Mr. Speaker, that our . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would ask all honourable members to direct their remarks to the Chair, and if this is done then perhaps some of this by-play back and forth would not occur. The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I know that there are quite a few other members that want to speak in favour of my amendment so I'm not going to be over long. I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that under Section 4 the words "and the attire" be deleted. -- (Interjection) -- Oh well, I don't have a motion. Do I have to have a motion? Tell him to write it down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by the Member for Rupertsland . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . for seconder in Committee?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Chicken out?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Trying to abide by the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As soon as this House is ready to proceed the Chair will proceed.

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can ask the member a question when he's recognized.

The amendment placed before us by the Member for Rupertsland is that the ruling of Mr. Speaker with respect to decorum and the attire of members in the House should be amended by striking out the words "and the attire," so that the motion would then read "that the ruling of Mr. Speaker with respect to decorum of members in the House should stand." Members who wish to direct their remarks to the amendment will be heard. The Member for Roblin has a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, with your permission I have a question for the honourable member. He in his remarks dwelt at some length on action speakers. Would he elaborate more on that subject please? -- (Interjection) -- action speaker.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Chairman, the word was "acting Speaker", and I beg your pardon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take too long in making the comments that I have to make on the proposed amendment. It's a pity that the honourable member can only find time to waste his eloquence on a subject such as this, but if what the honourable member is suggesting is a removal of decorum in debate and if what was going on in this House while he was speaking is evidence of the lack of decorum that he wants in debate, then I can only say that we are going to oppose that amendment and oppose it every one of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: On a point of privilege, I think that what I said was a matter of "attire" not "decorum", and it did seem that the decorum of this House was not helped by the fact that our attire was all absolutely conventional tonight at this moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words on this subject. It's been debated before and I as a member of the Committee which took that position, I would say that I don't support my colleague's view that the styles in the House should be unlimited in terms of at the discretion of the individual members. We really haven't seen any radical styles in this House other than I suppose the appearance of the turtleneck sweater and more recently, I suppose, the wearing of the first pant suit in Manitoba's legislative history. I really wish that when my colleagues talk about hot pants, they're of course thinking of the styles for women, but I want to say that if they were to see the hot pant styles for men they wouldn't believe it because it consists not only of a pair of shorts but it then consists of some six inches of thigh followed by a pant leg which then runs from just above the knee down to the ankle. And I want to tell you that I have seen people wearing that type of style and I want to tell you it's the most radical and shocking thing I've ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that the reason that I believe that the recommendation of the Committee in terms of upholding the ruling of the former Speaker should stand, is simply that I believe there is a fair degree of latitude permitted in this House and those members of the House that wear more radical colours and radical styles have never to the best of my knowledge ever been admonished by the Speaker other than in perhaps the instance of the turtleneck which is rather passé these days, so that people who are wearing turtleneck sweaters are not exactly breaking fashion barriers. I really believe that the Speaker has permitted members of this House to dress freely and in a variety of styles and will continue to do so.

The other point I think that should be borne in mind is simply that although there is this latitude, I think that this is the highest debating body in the province, it's the highest political body in Manitoba, and I think a certain amount of decorum is essential and I think this follows through to the dress of the member, so that when the public is present and they are watching the members go about their business, that they are not astounded at an assortment of people walking around in tee shirts or motorcycle jackets or overalls or men's hot pants. I think it's desirable that members do wear the general styles of the day and I think that given the kind of freedom that members have had that it really does not in fact impose any restrictions or limits the freedom of members of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: As a member of this Committee I feel that I should rise on this occasion too just to say a word or two if I may. I noticed the honourable member when he was putting forward his proposition he spoke of New Zealand and that the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair and that the Speaker was away on that occasion. Obviously something went wrong with the works down there. So far as I am concerned, one without the other just doesn't function. The decorum and the attire are one and two.

The other day we had people from a foreign land as visitors, as distinguished visitors which happens from time to time, and as has been mentioned the public generally occupy the gallery from time to time and I feel in all seriousness that under those circumstances the attire of the members should be as it ought to be on the day.

I noticed the honourable member made no mention of the Speaker. We require the

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) Speaker to be adorned in clothing that has gone on for some hundreds of years, and as my point of where I stand, if we expect the Speaker to uphold the decorum and the dress of the House, I too will do my part and be dressed accordingly. Therefore, I cannot support the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, just a word or two. I listened with some interest to the mover of the amendment and I reject completely most of what he had to say. He made reference to tradition, establishment, and as to whether or not this House would permit an Indian Chief, if I recall his words correctly, to come into this Assembly with his attire on, and I would say that surely to goodness the members comprising the Assembly in Manitoba would, in due respect to a position of that nature, recognize the rights of an Indian Chief to come in here attired in his native uniform, as indeed we have in the past recognized other than a collar and tie with other members because of their particular profession - and I need not point to the Honourable Member from Point Douglas. There is no question or doubt about that, but I think that there is an area where we at least have to have some consideration as to the attire of members of the House. So I reject the arguments of my honourable friend as being invalid, without foundation, without any basis at all. As a matter of fact, if he were not a friend of mine I would say they go beyond all due bounds of propriety.

He made mention of the situation prevailing in New Zealand where a Deputy Speaker agreed that members could come into the House apparently without their jackets on providing they had long sleeved shirts. We went a little bit further than that in this House, Mr. Chairman, long before my honourable friend even deemed to run for office in this House, where we changed the rules as they applied during the hot season, summer season, to committee work, and it was deemed then advisable to take into consideration the climatic conditions prevailing - it was awfully warm at that time - and we agreed by a motion of the House to allow the members to take off their jackets when we were in informal session in committee, and this went a long way, I would suggest, to accommodate the desire of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

But after all, is it a great penalty for us as members of this Assembly to have some semblance of uniformity in our attire? I suggest that notwithstanding tradition that it is proper for members of this Assembly, even though it may be a penalty for holding office, at least while we are in formal sessions of this Assembly to look as though we really mean what we are dealing with.

As a member of the Rules Committee, we gave this matter deep and earnest consideration and it was the decision, and I believe unanimous decision of the Committee of the Rules, in consideration of this matter that the ruling of Mr. Speaker Hanuschak taken a short time ago should be upheld. I appreciate the desire of the Member of Rupertsland to permit certain other variations of attire, but how far would he permit, or should we permit deviations from old fuddy-duddies like Russ Paulley to deviate. Would it be okay for me to come in in a bikini? Now I would confess, Mr. Chairman, that I wouldn't look as good in a bikini as some other people that I would like to see in bikinis in gracing this Chamber. But how far do you really go when you do away without decorum in respect of attire in an Assembly? So we start out with a turtleneck, then we go to a turtle dove or something else which will upset the whole process of the appearance of this Assembly.

So I'm going to support the recommendation of the committee, notwithstanding there was some attempt to have the former Speaker reverse his ruling by seconding the motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, I'm going to stay with the decision that he made; I'm going to stay with the decision that the Committee on the Rules of the House made that the ruling insofar as attire be upheld.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Attorney-General.

HON. A.H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Chairman, I'll be extremely brief. I think that traditions have to be living conditions, Mr. Chairman. I think we have inherited many of the traditions of the Mother of Parliaments as we've inherited many traditions from our ancestors, particularly from the English parliamentary system and the English legal system, but some of the things we don't follow as slavishly as others. For example, I'm very happy that in our courts that the barristers are not required to wear wigs while addressing court or that the judges have to wear wigs or carry a woosack to sit on. I know there are members who say it's a pity, they should, but really you know, some of the trappings are unnecessary. Although I don't argue for a complete disregard of the formal attire

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) and the proper attire in this Chamber, I regretted the fact that last year particularly during the heat, not only of the session, the atmosphere was quite warm because of the very serious nature of the debates that were going on but it was exceedingly warm in this Chamber and there was a real reluctance, a real resistance to accept what I thought was quite a reasonable suggestion, that we doff our jackets and go on about our business in a much more cool manner. Perhaps it might have reduced the temper of the times, so to speak, if that had occurred.

I think that we have to look at our traditions with an open mind and a reasonable approach, and I frankly think that on days such as we experienced it should be possible for the Speaker to relax the rules as he sees fit, provide some discretion, because when we look at traditions around this House, I for one am a non-smoker but I tolerate those who do smoke, and I don't think there's anything particularly dignified about cigarette ashes and cigar butts and all the rest of them in this Chamber but we have it, we have them in good number and we have all that goes with that habit.

So, Mr. Chairman, all I ask is that the suggestions that are made be not dismissed in repugnance but recognized that there ought to be times when the Speaker should afford a reasonable discretion to the House in relaxing the rules which are there to guide our administration of the review of the laws and let's have a little tolerance and respect, not only for tradition but for the comfort of man in this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate my colleague for bringing forth this amendment because, as you so well know, he has taken a position in the past to actually contravene the rules of the House, but today he's taken the right measure to bring in an amendment to actually have all members of this House voice their opinion and either support or reject his amendment and for this I would like to commend him very sincerely.

So far as the attire of members of this House, I too do not attach that much importance to the attire, the physical appearance of the members of the House, as long as they contain themselves when someone is speaking and that they be gentleman enough to make their views known and not attack needlessly members of the opposition, no matter what side of the House you're sitting on.

I will not support my colleague's amendment for the simple reason that I do believe that the attire of the members of the House as it stands today is reasonable. If he brought such a motion when it's 90 above or 95 above I would be too glad to vote for his motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks and it will be very few. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we are sliding past, if I may put it that way, the point of view that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland was attempting to prevail on us, and that really our decorum in the House as such is maintained surely more by our general deportment in debate, our deportment when we're not in debate or when we're caucusing privately in the Chamber, and, as my colleague the Minister of Health and Social Services said, our gentlemanly attitude toward each other from time to time, and in that sense I think it really spells the decorum of the House as we would like to see it.

And so, Mr. Chairman, as Deputy Dog - excuse me - as Deputy Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, I choose to take on this momentous occasion on this matter of principle to indicate my support for the Member for Rupertsland on this motion and I will so vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, while others are stating their views, I may as well do the same. I will certainly support the decorum and the attire that we have had heretofore. I visited other Legislatures this past winter and certainly I think it adds to the House in session if people are properly attired.

On the other point mentioned, that certain members would like easements made because of the Chamber being too warm at times, I would suggest to the government that they consider putting in air conditioning so that members need not complain, and I think this would be a far better way of approaching the situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think there are times when we Northerners have to stick together, we're few and far between, and I do think that in reflecting

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) back that the Member for Rupertsland looked just as good in a turtleneck as the Minister of Labour did in his nightcap; in fact I think he looked a lot better. So I will choose this time to support the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? -- (Interjection) -- There's no closing of debate in Committee of the Whole.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word. I'd like to make the argument that a lot of the speakers have misunderstood the fundamental point that I am trying to make. Because I have some respect for my fellow members, and perhaps it's because I have some respect for my own judgment and my own good sense and my own good taste, I have the same respect for every single individual member in this House. What I find appalling about this rule is that its very existence seems to say there are some of us who are idiots, fools, nuts. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that if I don't make this assumption, I must say they are reasonable men all; they are men of good sense and good judgment. I will not come into this House dressed as an idiot; I don't expect that they will, any of them. On the contrary, I expect them to dress with some sense, as I see them every day, and when we are under conditions of committee I don't see anything that wrong with the whole situation, Mr. Speaker.

There is another point. I'd like to address another word to all of us non-establishment types here. Last year I remember bringing forth an amendment to the liquor law. I remember that I was opposed by a considerable amount of leadership in this House on the subject, but the good common sense of a lot of the members who don't have any position prevailed. The truth is that it has been probably one of the best received measures that we put through in the Legislature last session - hard liquor in beverage rooms. Am I right or am I wrong? I believe I am.

So, you know, on the premise that we are reasonable men and that if there is here a fool who would come in his birthday suit, that his electors should know as soon as possible. I ask you to let the attire of each member -- I ask you to allow the attire of each member of this Assembly to be his own personal responsibility. I believe I have that measure of responsibility, I'm that responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.
A MEMBER: Ayes and Nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. The question before the committee is that the recommendation of the Committee to study the Rules that the ruling of Mr. Speaker with respect to decorum and the attire of members in the House should stand, be amended by striking the words "and the attire" so that the motion would read "that the ruling of Mr. Speaker with respect to decorum of members of the House should stand."

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

YEAS, 13; NAYS, 32.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment defeated. The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: There's just one question . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I did not vote on the previous matter; like the Member from Point Douglas, I was paired with my conscience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your concern is duly noted. The next item then would be that the signs - the next item? The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I want to speak on No. 4 on the third paragraph. I raised this earlier when the report of the Committee was being received.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the Member from Morris, please. Order. The second paragraph is what we're on now. You want to speak on the third paragraph?

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, the third paragraph . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, shall we pass the second paragraph first? No. 2, I think could be agreed to, could it not?

MR. JORGENSON: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

MR. DOERN: . . . clarified. Is it not possible to deal with the section as a whole and any part of it rather than to do it paragraph by paragraph? What procedure are we following here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are following the procedure going through it paragraph by paragraph. We have passed the first paragraph, the second paragraph is before us. "That signs be affixed at the entry to the galleries requesting that no cameras may be used in the galleries,

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) no demonstration or applause should take place and silence should be observed, also, smoking should be prohibited." Is that agreed?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word on that paragraph. I think it's not a matter of much debate other than to say that I think it's important that these signs and this type of procedure be established as soon as possible. We have had this report worked out and I think it is measured as essential in this Chamber because we have had the galleries packed with people at a time of intensive debate and I can only think in particular of the auto insurance debate and I think that the public often needs guidance as to what role they can play from the Chamber.

Therefore, I would think that it is something that should be done under the leadership and under the authority of the Speaker who is in charge of the Board of Internal Economy as soon as possible so that people in the galleries know what behaviour is restricted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second paragraph--passed; the third paragraph. The Member for Morris. The Member for Morris on Paragraph 3.

MR. JORGENSON: Oh excuse me, Sir. I just wanted to raise again the point that I raised earlier when the report of the Committee was being debated on the question of the staff of this House using the members' locker room and I hope that it's generally agreed before we pass this particular paragraph that there's going to be no restrictions imposed upon those people who are servants of this House and work in this Chamber in using the members' locker room.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any objection to the point raised by my honourable friend the Member for Morris. The staff of the House and the Pages and others I think -- it was never intended that they should be debarred from going into the members' locker room commonly known as the lounge where the coffee is dispensed. And I think that notation should be made of agreement that privileges of that particular room should extend to members of the staff as suggested by my honourable friend the Member for Morris.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak for a moment on this one. I first of all would like to compliment the government on the changes that they have made in there. It's very fine but I think even today that we, as members ourselves, are not going along with the philosophy behind this. As I understand it, it's a place, should be a place where we can relax and talk and have coffee and be amongst ourselves.

And yet the members themselves, I notice, are inviting their friends in and sitting there and having coffee. I know the other night, I checked and out of twelve people there were seven that shouldn't have been in there and any time that I have checked, there have been more people that shouldn't have been in there than there should have been and the members, the individual MLA's are the ones that are really the culprits that are behind this. You see them bringing their friends in and yet we have another room beside it, our own room where we can take our visitors and sit with them and take coffee in there if necessary.

It would be nice to see this as an exclusive place where members and the staff and the Press can sit and be free to say what they want and know that it's really not misinterpreted and out of this big building we should have at least one place where we can be private amongst ourselves and mingle and have the freedom of personal liberty that we can't take outside of that room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak about the same matter that the Honourable Member from Churchill brought up. I think there's a little bit of confusion about the function of the members' locker room. I was under the impression that one of the functions was to enable MLA's to get together with constituents and to talk to constituents and deal with their problems, and I understand that one of the reasons why the members' locker room was fixed up as it was with little tables, with a few chairs around them, was to enable MLA's to talk to constituents. Now perhaps my conception of the function of the room is entirely wrong, but I would certainly like to have the function of that room clearly established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Well, Mr. Chairman, just to be brief on that very point, I would think that it's a lounge for members but it seems to me from time to time we have possibly a son or a daughter or a sister or a brother or a wife come in and it seems

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) to me that the Member for Churchill, when he says there was twelve people in there, five that should be and seven that shouldn't, now possibly if that was my wife or his wife he would look at it differently if he knew the circumstances, and I think that the lounge is there for that very reason. We're in here -- (Interjection) -- All right, when I sit down you get up. When I sit down you get up and when I shut up then you start talking. When I'm speaking then you -- (Interjection) -- All right. Okay.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, there's times when people come in from the constituencies, particularly rural, and they want to come in and they want to speak to their member over a cup of coffee. It's nothing that has to be kept silent from other members, it's something that they can speak openly about but they want to have a cup of coffee. It means going down from this Chamber to the basement, and I think that it's not necessary for a member to be absent from the House here for 15 or 20 minutes; it's unnecessary if he can go into that room and make use of it for five minutes and there's lots of room in there. I've never walked into that lounge yet and found a problem getting a seat to sit down in and for that very reason, I would like to move an amendment to say "use of the members of the House and their guests".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the member moving that as an amendment?

MR. MOUG: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Charleswood moves an amendment which would now make this particular paragraph read that "the members' locker room be reserved for the exclusive use of members of the House, their guests and members of the Legislative staff, although Members of the Press may be allowed."

Now it was agreed that the members, it was my impression that we had agreement that the intention of this paragraph was not to exclude the members of the Legislative staff so that what is offered as an amendment is that the locker room should include members' guests. The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: If I may make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, I think where the old section could be reworded to read "the use of the Members of the House and their guests, the Legislative staff and the members of the Press Gallery."

Sir, if I may be permitted to speak on the amendment proposed by my colleague from Charleswood, I quite agree with the position that he has taken. It would be, I think, unreasonable to expect members who do have guests who come in from some distances -- and there are times when they do come in here when the cafeteria downstairs is not open -- I think it would be a little bit unreasonable to expect them to come in here and have no place to meet with their member if that's what they choose, and I quite agree that I have never gone into the locker room at any time since it has been redone where there were more people in there than the restaurant could accommodate and I don't think that that's going to happen as long as members use their discretion as to how many people they will bring in from time to time.

But I think it would be a mistake for us to attempt to confine it to the use of the members and not include their guests if at times they have guests that want to come in and talk with the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may, there seems to be general agreement pertaining to the members of the Legislative staff and the Press. So the matter under discussion then would be the inclusion or exclusion of guests in this particular paragraph. The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would agree with the intent of the amendment as presented by the Honourable Member from Charleswood and also as explained by the Honourable Member for Morris. But I think that there's a loophole here, a very large loophole. If we say "guests" what's going to happen? I would like to see guests defined somewhere or other. The Honourable Member from Morris says that as far as he's concerned he doesn't remember that there's been any abuse, but I certainly remember that there's been abuse in this room and not too long ago.

I'm talking about last year and in the heat of the debate of the Bill 56 I think it was a darn shame what the things that happened there where the First Minister of this province and the Attorney-General and others were threatened right in that room -- and I don't want to start debating the Bill 56 of course -- but I think that we all remember in the debate and the heat generated in that debate that I'm darn sure if somebody would have said all right, some of these agents and so on shouldn't be in there, I could just imagine that people would say, Well they're a guest of mine, or you'd sign a guest the same as you're going to sign somewhere that

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) you're going to go to a legion or something and sign me in and . . . so I don't think that this is what the Member for Charleswood means.

There's been abuse; I don't think this should ever happen again that you're going to be threatened. At least wait on the steps of the Parliament Building but not right here in the Chamber where you couldn't even go for coffee because everybody else was lined up before you. This is the members' lounge and therefore it should be used for the members, and that I think that includes their guests of course. I mean some of the people their family comes in and if they want to take the chance themselves there's nothing too secretive that they're discussing and if they don't care if some of the people hear them, I think it's fine.

But I would like to see, I mean we can all start with good intentions tonight but we have another debate like we had last year where you're practically - it's not a debate, it's a war, you're going to - just as you have somebody on your side or something you're going to say, Yes they're my guest. And I think that it was disgraceful what happened last year where the First Minister and the Attorney-General, it doesn't matter who, any members of this House were threatened a few steps from this Chamber.

So I agree, as I say with the intent, certainly, I'm sure that the members that spoke I think that they would agree with me also, they don't want to see a repetition of this. So I would like to see -- to be honest with you this came so fast that I haven't got the solution, but I wonder if this could be left to the Committee to try and arrive at something but to cover the intent of the last amendment. I wonder if the mover would be in accord with that or somebody might have the solution here tonight?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of my MLA. He doesn't know it yet but I live in Charleswood temporarily. I think that the problem raised by the Member for St. Boniface is a serious one and I'm not sure, you know, how we can deal with that particular aspect. Even now there are certain lobbyists and hangers-on that are irritating to have around sometimes. But I think that the main purpose of the lounge is, from my point of view, was to have guests and friends - a place to sit with them when they happen to be in the Legislative Building. So that's why I'd like to support this amendment for those people who say, Well you can use the other members' lounge or the one that says Members' Lounge on the door. I guess I could accept this if they would fix it up in the same fashion as the coffee shop room is fixed up, then I would accept that. But at the present circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I would support the amendment by the Member from Charleswood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to answer the point that was raised by the Member for St. Boniface. And it's quite a valid one, I quite agree with him that no one wants to see the locker room turned into an arena for . . . , but I do think that the whole matter can be dealt with by simply suggesting that the members who do invite guests are responsible for those guests, and if your guests become a little bit unruly then it's your responsibility to move them out of there, and I would think that if every member who invited guests in there took that upon himself to make sure that they were proper guests, there would be no problem.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm rather leary about accepting the amendment that is before us. Some have claimed that the room has never been crowded yet and that there is ample room, but I think the party that said so should also keep in mind that members were of the opinion, because of reading the report, that we were not supposed to bring our friends in and I certainly have not asked my friends to come into that room during this session and I'm sure this must apply to other members. So for this reason I think there has been ample room, but once we all ask our friends in when they come to see us that place will be crowded, I'm quite sure. I'm just wondering whether we will be able to keep this thing in hand and whether it will not go out of hand once we open it up. As the Member for St. Boniface says, there should probably be a definition, but I can't see how it can be properly defined when we start inviting the public in when they come to visit us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I simply rise just to say a word on this. I see no difficulty in supporting the amendment, but on behalf of the committee that developed these amendments I'd suggest to you, Sir, that is in there because the members indicated, not last year but down through the years to my knowledge, that they didn't have the privacy that they

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) thought they would like and the committee, in developing this amendment, had in mind the room next door which is quite large, and that it is known as the members' room where you would sit down with a constituent and so on. So it was done with the thought of giving the members the privacy which they indicated to members of the committee that they desired and this is the only reason that it's there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, just follow up. I appreciate the thought behind the mover of the amendment but I ask him to consider the directives that were given to the Committee on the Rules of the House which dealt with the very point that was raised by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Rhineland. It was found that the room was not large enough if everybody invited their friends in and that there was no place where the members could sit down and discuss matters of state without detractions and that was the reason that the committee -- personally I have no hangup, I very rarely go into the room at all, but I do know that in the past the room has been jammed with people somewhat to the inconvenience of the members of the House and this was the only area that the members normally would have as their own. There is the room next door for meeting constituents and surely it's not too great a hardship to take a cup of coffee in there when you want to meet with your friends. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, I have no hangup on it. The only reason that this item is here for the consideration of the House was because there was a request made to the committee that was established to try and solve the problem that existed in what we call our locker room, and changes have been made to the decor of the locker room to accommodate the feelings of the members of this House who stated in the Assembly that there was no place at all really that could be construed as being a place for the members of the House itself.

Now, we've made our recommendation from the committee that this should be reserved for the exclusive use of the members and then the Press, and now in agreement with the Honourable Member for Morris, the staff, but if the amendment passes as suggested by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, it, in effect, Mr. Chairman, leaves the situation the way it was before the committee gave it consideration, because who is going to decide what individual is or is not a guest of a member of the Assembly? Personally, as I say, Mr. Chairman, if we just leave it the way it was, that's okay by me. I'm not worried about it at all. But I do want to point out to my friend from Charleswood that that was the basis of the recommendation because the members of the House wanted some place where they could go and sit down and "chew the fat" or do whatever they liked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Chairman, in consideration of what the Member for Rhineland said, I would question how many times basically in the last three sessions, including this and the past two, has he ever gone in there and been deprived of the privilege of a place to sit down? It's never happened to me and I think I spend as much time in the coffee shop as anybody else does. It's a thing that's going to have to be policed. Are you going to have somebody walk in there and say, I know you're not a member of the House, you're not a member of the press; stay out of here. For the first two weeks that the House opened the staff had this problem. They would walk up there and the man who was in charge of the lounge for the day, he had to take their quarter, go over and get a coke and bring it back and given them their change. They couldn't step across the doorway. I thought that the Member for Morris had got this straightened away and apparently has, because I see they are able to go in there now, Page Boys and staff of the House here and those closely related to this room.

But I think that the Member for Morris has the answer, that if anybody's in there they have to be represented by a member of this House and the member for this House has to be responsible. I think it's very simple, that you don't take half a dozen people in there and walk out and leave them sit, you just do your certain little business with them and it's over. I think it's simple and reasonable that they should be allowed in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, there might be a way to deal with this problem, I would guess, to have members sign in their guests and it would eliminate those who sort of were in there under different circumstances. Or another solution might be, as I suggested earlier, to fix up the other room in a similar manner. I'm somewhat hesitant myself to say that's an exclusive room. I know that if I came here as a member of the gallery and wanted to have a coke, I would feel that I had the right to have a coke in here too. I think the problem is

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd.) probably a shortage of facilities more than the privileges of the room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just one word. Might there not be some misunderstanding arising over the interpretation of the term "exclusive use", and might not the exclusive use include and imply the right of members to include their own guests as one's exclusive use of his home would do, and if interpreted in that light, it would accommodate some of the anxieties that have been introduced into the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question? The amendment would be: "that it be expanded to include guests".

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment would read then, "that the Members' locker room be reserved for the exclusive use of Members of the House, their guests, the members of the Legislative staff and the press."

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just on a minor point, since there are no lockers in evidence any more it seems to me we need a new name for that room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next paragraph: That a Committee of the House, composed of members of all faiths in the House, prepare a new prayer. The Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): The Minister of Labour asks whether I am a member of the faith. I'm a member of the House at least and have privilege to speak.

I think it's two years ago that I raised the question about the prayer and I am quite in agreement with the statement as it is shown here in this report, but feel that I should elaborate a little bit but hardly expect that any of the members need any persuading.

A couple of years ago I said in commenting on the prayer that is used every day that it was archaic in terminology and reference and hardly reflects the spirit of the day in which we live. I didn't quarrel with the opening words of the prayer where it says, "Oh eternal and almighty God," but what comes after that I have very strong reservations, where it says "by whom kings rule and make equitable laws". There was a point in history when people questioned the divine right of kings and their status was changed as a result, but we here in this House continue to say "by whom kings rule" and I question that statement that kings make equitable laws or that they necessarily are equitable or would be equitable. I suggested that the phrasing of the prayer be changed to something more in accord with the democratic outlook and thinking which I believe this House represents.

I looked up a definition in a book called "A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics" on what "divine right" means, because this prayer that is now used reflects or indicates that we accept the divine right of kings. It says here in this definition: "A right alleged to be derived from God, hence giving absolute authority to the holder.

"The doctrine that a king derives his authority from God has been widespread. The code of Hammurabi, (That's the ancient Babylonian king, for those who haven't read their history) represents the king as receiving from Shamash (the sun god of Babylonia) the laws which he promulgates. The deification of kings and emperors was a familiar phenomenon in the ancient world. The Mikado of Japan was regarded as endowed by Heaven to rule.

"In Christianity the doctrine of divine right found religious expression in the conception of the infallible authority of the Apostolic Church, which derives its divine commission from Christ. The pope, as vice-regent of Christ has an authority not derived from human consent." I'm continuing to read the definition.

"During the Middle Ages political authority was believed to rest upon a divine provision. 'The powers that be are ordained of God.'" (This was in quotation marks.) "Later with the emancipation of nations from ecclesiastical control there came naturally an exaltation of the direct divine authority of the ruler. The Stuart monarchs in England by their stubborn insistence on unconditional divine right provoked the revolution which initiated parliamentary sovereignty. The absolutist assertion attributed to Louis XIV, 'L'Etat, c'est moi' met its overthrow in the French Revolution. The doctrine continued into the 20th century in the dynasty of Russia and Prussia, but with the Great War of 1914 was completely discredited." This is a statement indicating what is meant by "divine right".

If any of the members have been watching the series on King Henry VIII, who was regarded by himself and others of his time to have ruled by divine right, will have seen in that

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) series that was shown that he was anything else but ruled by divine right, and I feel if the Speaker himself has watched that series that he must choke on his words when he reads in the opening prayer, "by whom kings rule and make equitable laws". In our day such a concept is complete nonsense and should certainly be deleted from the opening prayer in this House. It is incongruous and inconsistent to continue the use of terminology which is as outdated and as archaic as that which we are now using.

Two years ago when I raised this matter in the House, I drew up a form of prayer and submitted it to certain individuals and it was suggested to me that I send it to the heads of different denominations in the city, which I did. I sent it to the local Anglican Bishop, the Roman Catholic Cardinal Flahiff, one of the leaders of the Lutheran Church and one or two others, and with one exception they all indicated approval of this prayer that I drew up. Right now, in moving from the office that I occupied for a few months, in the confusion of moving things I have lost my copy of that prayer, and if it is not found you will never realize what a gem it really was and how much has been lost, but I sent a copy of it to the former Speaker and I hope that he has a copy of it somewhere in his files.

I said with one exception it had been accepted. The one exception was the present minister of my church. He felt it could be improved upon or changed in some way, but my personal choice in this matter would be to follow the recommendation of the committee as it is set out, to name the members of various faiths to come together either to draw up a prayer or to approve of a prayer or to invite local ecclesiastics in to draw up a prayer which in their wisdom they may feel is suitable to the times in which we live and work, or to do as the item in the recommendation in the report suggests, that members of faiths in the House prepare a new prayer.

When I raised this question earlier, I listed the different church denominations that I represented in this House and I named several, and some may be surprised at how many differing points of view are represented by the membership of this House. I said that the members here included Baptist, Lutheran, Anglican, Jew, Mennonite, United Church, continuing Presbyterian, Ukrainian Catholics, Greek Catholics, Unitarian, Roman Catholics, unbelievers, Atheists, non-subscribers, dissenters -- and did somebody say Greek Orthodox? That's one that I forgot; I'm sorry. But if we get representatives of each of these faiths to draw up a prayer we will certainly finish up, I hope, with something that will be truly representative.

That's all that I wish to say on the prayer, Mr. Chairman, but if I might just raise one other little item which is not listed in any of the recommendations and that has to do with the -- I wish to add to that list I just read not only the Greek Orthodox church but also the Salvation Army. I have been reminded that I have been remiss in not including it.

This other item, Mr. Chairman, if I may, has to do with the installation of a buzzer instead of a bell, and I feel and others feel the same way, something has been lost. There's something impressive about the bell when it rings. There's life to it, there's a sense of urgency, it calls people into the session, the meeting, and when the bell rang the members responded.

By comparison, the buzzer is more like a long drawn-out birth which means, in many ears, very little and I'd like to compare it with the change that was made in the steam locomotive whistle when it gave way to the diesel horn, if you call it that. The steam whistle gave way to the monotone of that diesel signal. There's some interesting stories about what has happened up in northern areas since the diesel locomotive was introduced and the horn was substituted for the steam whistle. I'm a northerner.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . answer a question for me. I wonder how he can relate the locomotive whistles to the prayer that is designated in this item.

MR. PETURSSON: Very easily, Mr. Chairman. Very easily. When the session bell rings at the opening of the session, it's calling the members to prayer and we respond. We responded much more readily when the bell rang than when the buzzer sounds. But I was making the comparison between the buzzer and the diesel motor horn on the diesel locomotives and there are stories that have come from out of the north - I'm not going to prolong this very much - but there are stories that have come out of the North about Oh, yes some have called the horn on the locomotive as emitting a sound that is very much like that of a love-sick moose and there are stories about the bull-moose in hearing this sound chasing a diesel locomotive down the track only to see it disappear over the horizon leaving him alone in the wilderness on the track and all out of breath.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)

I haven't noticed that the buzzer here does anything of that sort to the members. They move much less rapidly when it sounds and it doesn't penetrate the walls the way the bells did, and I do wish that the bell could be introduced again and brought back revived. It's a part of the tradition and we talk about when the buzzer sounds we say the session bell is ringing or the bell is ringing whereas it's only the buzzer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

. continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in what the honourable member had to say in connection with prayers. I visited the North Dakota Chamber earlier this year and I find out there they have the practice that the churches, one of the clergymen of the various churches comes in every day, each day and performs prayers for the sessions and they rotate and alternate between the various churches on different days. I thought this was rather a unique way of doing it.

I also visited the Alberta and B. C. Chambers and in British Columbia they have someone else saying prayers other than the Speaker. I don't know whether this is more effective and that the results because of that are so much better. But certainly B. C., I think is an example in many ways and I think it was in Alberta where they had two prayers. So whether that makes any difference, I think one prayer is sufficient. But I thought it didn't hurt mentioning this and whether our Speaker likes to carry on the way he has and that he performs this duty. I've never asked him. He certainly has never complained so I take it that he is quite willing to perform this duty every day.

On the matter of going along with the recommendation here that a Committee be set up, I just hope that when this comes about that they can come to an agreement and that they will have a good prayer as a result.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, doubtless it was an oversight on the minister's part or I may have missed the reference when he was outlining the number of religious persuasions and faiths represented in this Chamber. I did not hear any reference to the Hebrew faith in that list. I would remind him and I know he would be the first to concede that any attempt at redrafting or redeveloping any kind of exhortation to God to be used in this Legislature should take into account all the faiths and religious persuasions that are represented here and I know that was the intent of his remark. Certainly in a cosmopolitan community like ours, any committee charged with that kind of role should enjoy prominent representation from the Hebrew faith, in my view. I think that we invite perhaps unnecessary difficulty when we charge, as this recommendation does, the Legislature and the members of this Assembly with the responsibility for devising and developing a prayer of this kind. I rather like the Minister's suggestion that perhaps it should be done from outside at the request of a Committee of this Legislature by a Committee of divinity and rabbinical scholars who would be able to bring perhaps a more academic and less partisan view to the subject.

One has to keep in mind that we're talking here about future members of this Assembly as well as present members. We're talking here about all faiths, which I presume can be interpreted as meaning all persuasions and all points of view having to do with religious questions so that would include people who perhaps would not categorize themselves as holding to a formal faith but would have, by their conduct and by their daily lives, a possession perhaps of a greater religious sense than many of us do who follow formal sectarian lines.

In any event the newly developed prayer if it should come should be ecumenical and non-sectarian and I know the Minister had that in mind, I fully agree with the sense of his remarks. I would like to see him and the Assembly consider having it offered to theological scholars outside this Chamber as a challenge rather than trying to achieve the objective from members within this Chamber who might find it difficult simply because of the psychological climate in which we operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a question of order. Perhaps somebody can be of assistance to the Chair. On the premise that the committee cannot do in Committee what the House cannot do while sitting in the House, in that only that the government can move something which might entail the expenditure of funds and would necessitate a message from His Honour, does this particular recommendation of the Committee in some of its ramifications involve the expenditure of funds if the task is not completed within the time this Legislature sits. So the question is - the Chair is really in a dilemma at this particular moment to whether this is in order or not for this committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Well Mr. Chairman, if I may just comment on your point and it's a very valid point. May I suggest this as a methodology that if the recommendation is passed by the House now, the Committee of the House would be established hopefully to meet during the current session and if that committee then considered the matter of such importance that they would want to meet during the recess, all that would be required would be for the committee to make a recommendation to the government for permission to meet during the recess and to

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd.) engage experts in the field of prayer and faith, for an expenditure of money. So I think it could be accommodated that way without a message from His Honour at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): The honourable member's question whether I had included members of the Jewish faith in the list that I read a few moments ago, it was fourth in the list. Baptist, Lutheran, Anglican, Jew.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, for the general information of the House, the prayer that we have now, as I understand it and I think the Minister of Labour could probably enlighten us, it was developed by members of the House in which all faiths were represented and the Honourable Member for Wellington said that it was archaic and that it was outdated and it was so on and so forth and I've heard his plea before and I give him due credit in his endeavours, but I suggest to him that there's nothing wrong with the prayer that we have now. The Lord's Prayer has stood the test of time and I think this one can continue to do so too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . passed.

MR. PAULLEY: May I indicate, Mr. Chairman, the next item dealing with the accommodation in the galleries is under consideration, I'd suggest that in the report by the Board of Internal Economy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: -- passed. 5. Rule 19(1) . . . The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, Mr. Chairman, in order that this is clearly understood that I may be permitted to read from the rules of the House at Ottawa so that the full significance of the recommendation is known. Rule 15 (3) of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons dealing with ministerial statements is as follows: "On motions listed in Section 2 of the Standing Order dealing with the presentation of a motion" that is -- excuse me -- the ordinary daily routine business of the House states this: "A minister of the Crown may make an announcement or statement of government policy. Any such announcement or statement should be limited to facts which it is deemed necessary to make known to the House and should not be designed to provoke debate at this stage. A spokesman for each of the parties in Opposition to the government may comment briefly subject to the same limitation, the limitation being to provoke debate."

The purpose of this, Mr. Chairman, is very obvious, that there be no debate; the statement should be brief, limited to facts and that a spokesman -- implying just one -- from each of the parties in Opposition to the government to comment briefly, subject to the limitation of not provoking debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I raised this matter in speaking on the report earlier. In past years I and the Leader of the Liberals have been responding when statements of this type were made in the House by Cabinet Ministers and I feel that this year the Speaker is taking exception to this and I am not in accord with it. I feel that this is too restrictive, I feel that we should have the right to respond whether it's favourable or not and I think we're taking away some rights from the Opposition and not allowing this to come by. And certainly this has never taken up too much time. The time for these responses has been very limited but I think they're essential and I would ask that the government consider when we discuss the rules now that this privilege be extended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify a point for my honourable friend. This is the recommendation of the Committee on the Rules; it is not the government that is doing it. This was after due consideration by the Committee on the Rules and it had as its composition, members of all sides in the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: -- passed? The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, by the recommendation it seems to me I was in agreement with it but I have had some second thoughts on it -- (Interjection) -- No, no this recommendation was considered after the event that you're talking about, I believe. Anyways the point I want to make is that we're enshrining the rules the point that a Minister can make a statement at a certain time every day during the Orders of the Day but that others cannot make a response or even ask a question, if I understand this. Presently under the setup that we have now, a Minister can make a statement -- I don't think it's ever been denied -- he rises anytime before the Orders of the Day and any member can rise and ask a question. Perhaps by our present rules he can't make a statement but he can make a

(MR. G. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) question. Now, is my understanding correct, Mr. Chairman, that if this rule is adopted that there can be no questions on a ministerial statement other than a statement by the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to this particular item, since I've been one of those that have been strongly advocating the adoption of this rule because of the kind of confusion that has been existing for so long and because of the difficulty that the Speaker finds himself in almost invariably when a Minister rises to make a statement of government policy. This in no way prohibits a member of the House from asking questions on the ministerial statement when the Orders of the Day are reached. What it does do is isolate ministerial statements from the question period and here's where the confusion has arisen, here's where the difficulty for the Speaker has always arisen; and the attempt here is to enable a Minister to make a statement of government policy, which is a perfectly legitimate part of the procedure of this House, and a very proper one, affording the recognized Opposition parties an opportunity to comment on it, and then when the Order of the Day arrive, anybody, anybody in the House then is at liberty to question the Minister on that statement. There is no intention here or desire, or will there be any prohibition on the part of any member from asking questions on a ministerial statement when the proper time arrives. The whole intent is to isolate the question period from ministerial statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I was definitely not speaking of putting questions. I was speaking of responding to the statement that was made by the Minister concerned. There is a difference, there's a very substantial difference. I feel that this right should be extended to all parties of this House, whether they're recognized under the rules or not because the requirement of a party having four members is an arbitrary ruling and need not apply to this particular instance if we decide so, and I feel that this should be extended to us.

The Member for Morris now more or less goes along with the government but he better take heed because some day they might find themselves in this position and then they would probably take a different attitude. Therefore I would appeal once more to the members of the committee to accord this to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may. In effect what my honourable friend is saying is that we do not recognize parties in this House. This is the basic point of my honourable friend and if we extend it, to, in all due respect to the Member for Rhineland, that anybody can make a statement in reply or comment, let's make it a comment, on a ministerial statement, how can we preclude any other member, because we are all individual members of the Assembly even though we have some unity within a party. Now if we accept the contention of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, Mr. Chairman, then we defeat the purpose of this; just merely to make a statement or a brief comment on the statement, and there's nothing to preclude, as the Honourable Member for Morris mentioned, for individual members, be they members of a recognized party or otherwise, from raising questions on Orders of the Day; but the main purpose of the recommendation is that there be on the Routine Proceedings of the Day, a place for ministerial statements. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, you know, as I'm sure most of us do know, that it has been the habit, not only since the present administration took over the reins of government but previously as well, that interspersed with a lot of other routine proceedings, a Minister would get up and say, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement. By doing it this way and tidying it up, we'll have a Routine Order of Proceedings so that at that time, and only at that time, statements can be made.

So I suggest to my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, it's not an endeavour to curtail the rights of anyone within the House but it's to tidy up the procedures within the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just add to what the Minister of Labour has said. My own experience is certainly limited by comparison with him and my colleague the Member for Morris, but I can attest to the fact that the procedure as proposed in Recommendation No. 5 is the procedure that's been followed in the House of Commons for years and there has been no difficulty on that score. I would say to the Member for Rhineland that he need have no fear that his ambit of questioning opportunity is reduced in the House by any such recommendation or any such change. In fact, I think it's probably extended. I think it's probably

(MR. SHERMAN, cont'd.) extended because he is protected, as I am protected and every member of this Chamber is protected by the Order of the Routine Proceedings and if the Member for Rhineland will scan that Order he will see that the ministerial statement proposed in isolated form precede by some several steps the stage of the proceedings that call for Oral Questions and under the present system one has to be rather quick-witted to respond to a ministerial statement on the spur of the moment. Under this system one has a little longer in which to think about questions he'd like to ask the Minister, so I think, far from inhibiting the member and other members and myself, it extends our opportunities for questioning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I trust the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is casting no reflection on the alacrity of the wit of the Honourable Member for Rhineland when he makes his remarks.

MR. SHERMAN: I was speaking from personal incapacity only, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Before I let this thing pass, I just want to voice my objection and voice it very strongly that I feel that this is a right that should be extended to all groups in this House. That's what the motion read that the Honourable the House Leader read out from the Ottawa rules. It refers to "groups" and therefore I still maintain that I, as a member of this House, and representing a party here am entitled to express myself and make comments on statements of this type. No doubt they think differently and will naturally try to over-rule me when the time comes. I feel that this is a right that is being taken away from us this year. I think this also holds true for the Member for Portage who is representing another group in this House and I don't think this should happen.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just want the record clear that the rule that is being proposed is the existing rule and was stated by the Speaker to be the existing rule. It is merely now being set out in the Rule Book and there is going to be a separation. That's the real issue, that it will be listed as ministerial statements, but the rule with regard to members speaking and parties speaking is not being changed. It's the same as it ever was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: -- (passed) -- (Interjection) --

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, the second paragraph of 5 just merely places the statement in the Order Book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6. That Rule 19(2) be amended to provide the allocation of time for Private Members' business whereby one hour a day between -- shall I dispense with the reading of it? The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this item, I have spoken to my honourable friends concerning it. There has been some re-thinking of this issue, not as to principle but as to application. We look at the Order Paper on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday and we're talking about an hour on each of those days, at the end of the day from 4:30 to 5:30 as Private Members' Day, and looking at the clock some day during an ordinary day, we see the Question Period sometimes going till 3:30, the Orders of the Day being put in taking us very close to 4:00 o'clock, which would leave very short time sometimes and in fact I would say if we went back into history you'd find no time for government business. So what we would like the members to consider, and if they can't give us an answer now, we'd be quite happy to have the matter stood over, is that we talk about the last hour of every day rather than 4:30 to 5:30 on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday; so that it would be 9 to 10 on Monday, 9 to 10 on Tuesday, 4:30 to 5:30 on Wednesday, 9 to 10 on Thursday and 4:30 to 5:30 on Friday, which would mean the last hour's debate in each day rather than breaking up every day's government business with an hour of private members in between.

Now, in fairness to my honourable friends we all spoke this way when we were at Rules Committee. We've since looked at it and have had some thoughts about how it would work out in practice, and if honourable members would prefer to have that sit with them a little while, perhaps we should go on to the next rule. If they wish to respond now, of course that's quite agreeable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In light of the Minister's statement is it agreed that we proceed beyond this point and have this brought up at a future date? The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my mind is quite clear on this and I would like to see this section thrown out. I would like to see it remain as it is. I've said so on an earlier occasion because I think what would happen is that - as has been pointed out by the leader now - that sooner

(MR. FROESE, cont'd.) or later we'd be relegated to that last hour of the day and who wants Private Members' Day in the wee hours of the morning once we go beyond the 80 hours.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, let's be quite clear. I think that again all parties were hoping to make for a better Private Members hearing than we are having now. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland were here on Friday afternoon last . . .

MR. FROESE: I was here.

MR. GREEN: . . . and if you had observed the entire afternoon and felt that that was a good lively discussion of Private Members' resolutions, and I presume that the same thing could happen tomorrow afternoon, then I am wrong. The Committee looked at the Private Members' time and felt that if it was compacted into an hour but took place every day that it may be that it would have much better hearing than it's been having over the three hours that is used on Tuesdays and Fridays. We are now merely looking at the recommendation trying to apply it in practice and are a little worried that it would mean that on Mondays, Tuesday, and Thursdays there would be almost no government business or you'd have a very short period of government business before the Private Members' time, whereas the period from 9 o'clock till 10 o'clock at night is certainly not the wee hours of the morning. We're at 10 to 10 right now and we are discussing something fairly substantial.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, my position on this particular matter is pretty well known. I perhaps am one of those that have been advocating a change in the manner in which we deal with Private Members' resolutions and Private Members' bills because I think the way we deal with them now is a waste of time. The Member for Rhineland perhaps, I don't see too many of his resolutions on this Order Paper and maybe that's the reason why he likes it that way. I can assure him that those who think they have ideas to present to this House are prevented from presenting those ideas in a way that they get the kind of attention that they should get simply because of the manner in which we deal with this. I've gone through this matter before when I first went to the House of Commons. The Private Members' were even worse than this, they dealt with them all day and it was a completely wasted day for many many members who had no interest in a particular subject. I lived through the change in Ottawa and I can assure my friend from Rhineland that despite the misgivings of some members of the House when the rules were made, after they were adopted there were no misgivings at all, after the rule change was adopted everybody had an opportunity to present a resolution or a motion before the House and get it properly considered and the members who present it get a proper opportunity to present that motion. Here, as it stands now, a member could be sitting in this House three or four weeks at a time waiting for a motion to come up and he never knows when it's going to come up. Under the proposed change you'll know precisely the day that your motion is going to appear. You know when it's going to be debated and you don't have to stand around and wait for days on end to take part in a debate that you're not sure that is going to take place.

The fears of the House Leader that it might shorten the hour of government business may be under the circumstance a justifiable one. Maybe I would suggest a compromise. Let's consider sitting - instead of from 2:30 till 5:30, let's consider sitting from 2:30 till 6 o'clock. That would cut off a half of the government's hour but it would also add another half hour that we don't have yet. That is the procedure that is used in the House of Commons. The House sits from 2:30 till 6 rather than 5:30. That gives a bit of an opportunity for a Private Member's hour. -- (Interjection) -- 5 to 6, yes. That may be a suggestion that could be adopted by the House.

Contrary to the fears of the Member for Rhineland who seems to develop unwarranted fears in almost everything, I think this is one of the suggestions that should be adopted because it's one that's going to make for a far more progressive consideration of the Private Members' resolutions that come before this House, a much more orderly consideration of those resolutions and give an opportunity for perhaps a little better coverage by the news media.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has thrown out another suggestion. All I would ask him to do is to consider what we have said here, perhaps stand the item over and we'll certainly consider what he has said. We are trying, whether the Member for Rhineland can accept it or not, we are trying to make it a better Private Members' period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, every time when we deal with the rules in this way, that the Committee sits and brings in recommendations, every time I've seen our rights being curtailed and this is why I have this apprehension. I'm not too sure whether the Member for Morris won't find himself one of these days in a situation that he wouldn't like so well because -- (Interjection) -- Well this is not Ottawa, this is Manitoba -- and whether we are not going to just lose part of our Private Members' time rather than gain. I'm quite agreeable to having this particular item stand for the time being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 7. The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, there has been a suggestion that this be deferred for consideration of the point raised by the Honourable Member for Morris - between 5:30 and 6 o'clock. May I suggest that -- (Interjection) -- 5 and 6, Yes. May I also suggest that we might consider what I believe is a comparatively new rule in Ottawa where consideration is given to matters of private concern beyond the normal adjournment hour in the evening, that is sort of, I believe they call it emergency -- (Interjection) -- that is right, the Honourable Member for Morris says it's called the late late show. Now it might be that when we're considering the suggestion of my friend from Morris, that that point might be considered as well. How it works out I don't know. They tell me that normally three or four members out of the total complement of the House of Commons sits back for the late late show, namely the mover and seconder of the resolution and I presume Mr. Speaker has to stay back, too, so that makes three.

MR. JORGENSON: If I may just speak on this for a moment. The purpose of the late show in Ottawa is to give an opportunity for a member who has asked a question on the Orders of the Day and felt he didn't get a satisfactory answer from a Minister - which wouldn't happen here of course - if he felt he didn't get a satisfactory answer from the Minister he could request that that question be moved over to the late show which would compel the Minister to sit in the House that night to answer that question, and they had a tendency to encourage Ministers to give proper and complete answers to questions so they would not have to sit in on the late show after ten o'clock at night.

MR. PAULLEY: I like your reference to proper answers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the debate on the Throne Speech and the debate on the Budget Speech should take precedence over Private Members' business.

MR. PAULLEY: We do that by leave now, but just put it into the Rule Book so that we don't have to have the leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7 -- passed. 8. That Rule 19 (1) be amended by adding "Oral Questions" following "Introduction of Bills". The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to remind you that Rule 8 on Page 4 has to be read in conjunction with recommendation 3 on Page 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw members attention to Recommendation No. 8 on Page 7. (Passed)

No. 9. That an addendum be prepared to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings explaining the "points of order" and "matter of privilege" (Passed).

No. 10. I would direct members' attention to Recommendations on 10 and 11 on Page 7. No. 10. That Rule 26 (3) be amended by deleting the words "leave of the House to proceed" and substituting therefor the words "the support of the House", and that Rule 26 (4) be amended by deleting the words "asked for leave" and substituting therefor the words "received the support to proceed", and that Rule 26 (5) be amended by deleting the words "leave" and substituting the word "support". The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier on this point . . .

MR. GREEN: I wonder, the Member for Rhineland I'm sure has much to say and he won't be able to say it in two minutes, so perhaps the Committee should rise and we could remember that the Member for Rhineland is first next committee day. I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Corporate Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I just may remind the House, or the Committee, that there is a further change to the recommendation of the Committee that sat a year ago as appears on Page 7 which proposes the adoption of the Ontario rule dealing with this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The attention of the Committee was drawn to this fact. I would remind Committee members that one of the rules of the House is there's no smoking when the

(MR. CHAIRMAN, cont'd.) Mace is on the table. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 o'clock and the House is adjourned and will stay adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.