



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

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

RULES OF THE HOUSE

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Hon. D. James Walding
Constituency of St. Vital



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 5 - 2:00 p.m. , MONDAY, 7 February, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RULES OF THE HOUSE

Monday, 7 February, 1983

TIME — 1:30 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg

CHAIRMAN — Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 5

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Penner and Walding, Messrs Anstett, Fox, Graham, Ransom, Santos, Sherman, and Scott.

APPEARING:

WITNESSES: Mr. André Martin, Director, Translation Services, Department of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources.

Mrs. Hilda Miller, Hansard Co-ordinator, Legislative Assembly.

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

- 1) Interpretation Facility
 - a) User guidelines
 - b) Extension to galleries, loges
- 2) Hansard Translation Policy
- 3) Journals Translation
- 4) Private Bills - Report
- 5) Hansard Interjection Policy
- 6) Rule 35(5) Presentation of Address in Reply to Throne Speech
- 7) Youth Parliament Incorporation
- 8) Rules book format
- 9) Subject matter of Bill 30
- 10) Other matters

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We have a quorum, Gentlemen, and perhaps we can proceed with Item No. 4 that we were on Page 12, Private Bills.
Mr. Tallin.

PRIVATE BILLS

MR. R. TALLIN: The first item your notice should be brought to in this connection is that the time limits for receiving petitions and for presenting private bills to the House has been removed. Now that's a major change. At one stage presumably they had difficulty with these things coming in late. I would think that if it was an important piece of legislation that would likely get through anyway, the House would probably relieve against that Rule, although in the last three years I don't think they have; prior to that they did frequently. But my feeling is that if you are going to receive

petitions, you should be allowing them to be received at any time; if somebody has them in late they can expect that it is perhaps not going to be enough time to get it through the Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Chairman, that we're going to be sitting and I'm going on the assumption spring and fall, I don't think it should make any difference, I think it should be removed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't quite clear on what Mr. Tallin said about the last three years. Was that . . .

MR. R. TALLIN: I think they've extended the time within the last three years.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Have there been any Private Members' Bills which there was a desire to see introduced that were then denied by the lack of extension, or is it just that there was no extension because there was no need for an extension?

MR. R. TALLIN: I think one might have come in if there had been an extension granted which didn't come in.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Did it come in the following year?

MR. R. TALLIN: No, it did not come in the following year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: I'd just like to direct a question, Mr. Chairman. What happens if the bill is not acted upon and the Session terminates? What happens to the fee?

MR. R. TALLIN: Well, that's a question that this Committee should address itself to. Presumably you could have a rule that if the bill is not proceeded with the fee could be remitted, although if it's proceeded with and defeated, the practice has not been to remit the fee.

There is a new section dealing with the advertisements here which was an attempt to make it a little bit more lenient, that is, you don't have to advertise a second time if the bill is left on the Order Paper at the end of the Session, not being dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this? Next.

MR. R. TALLIN: Sections 104, 105 are essentially what are in the Rules at the present time in Rules 106 sub (1), (2), (3) and (4). Section 106 is a simplification of

what the Clerk is required to publish, in that everything that he's required to publish is set out in 107(1) and he wouldn't be required under this proposal to publish in a newspaper. Presently he's required to make this publication in a newspaper published in English.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. A. RANSOM: 107(1): "Every petitioner for a Private Bill shall publish, within 12 months prior to the presentation of the petition . . ."

MR. R. TALLIN: Yes. That was just an arbitrary figure. It could be a shorter period but we had in mind the situation where a person might publish in May and not be able to get it completed for the spring and summer sitting and if the House did not meet in the fall, it might be 10 months or so before he got around again to the time when he could have the bill presented.

Section 107(1) has a misprint in it. At the top of Page 14, it should be "signed by or on behalf of the petitioner and clearly and distinctly specifying the nature and object of the bill", not "clearly and distinctly signed on behalf of the petitioner." But apart from that it's just a conglomeration of two other Rules that are presently there now but it also would permit publication of this notice in a French language newspaper as well as an English language newspaper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH, Assistant Clerk: Just going back to 107(1)(b), third line from the bottom, that should read "majority" rather than "minority".

MR. R. TALLIN: Oh, that's right. 107(2) is the new section which I just mentioned, and it would allow a bill that had been left on the Order Paper for first or second reading when the House is prorogued or dissolved; it could be introduced at the next Session without a further publication of the notice.

If it gets second reading and it's left in committee, the difficulty is that the House may not know whether the committee is still considering the bill or whether it's been rejected, although in practice they would.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with that. I have no problem with it being introduced at the next Session of the same Legislature. If the Legislature is dissolved, I disagree in principle that anything that was before one Legislature can be carried forward to another.

MR. R. TALLIN: It's not carried forward. It can be reintroduced without another advertisement, that's all. It's not carried forward as second reading.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Oh no, I recognize that.

MR. R. TALLIN: It's just that to save the person the costs of the advertising.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Well, you mentioned something about coming out of committee.

MR. R. TALLIN: Well, if it passes second reading it would be gone into committee. At that stage they don't get this benefit. If the bill for some reason or other died on the Order Paper because of dissolution when it was before committee it would have to be readvertised.

MR. A. ANSTETT: For first or second reading only.

MR. R. TALLIN: Yes.

MR. A. ANSTETT: No problem then.

MR. R. TALLIN: 107 is essentially what's in the Rules now; I think 108 is essentially the same too, although we discussed changing that. This coupled two different provisions, one dealing with incorporating provisions in The Private Act, and the other deals with the general provisions of The Companies Act. 109 is essentially what is in the rules at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on 108(2), what is the rationale for having a model bill?

MR. R. TALLIN: I really can't answer that. There has been a model bill there for years. Perhaps it was to assist people in getting started in drafting the bill, but I don't really know that it is of much assistance to people because the part that's there is the part that any solicitor would use as a precedent anyway, I think. It's not very helpful on either committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: The bill is not a bad idea. It focuses attention in part on the main purpose, as I understand it, of these private bills, namely, the need for additional power is not available under The Corporation Act and that's why these bills come forward. If you are going to get those powers, the Legislature wants to know what they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I take it we're not coming back to this section again. I had one concern I should have raised earlier, in 107(1). Would that be appropriate now?

The language in 107(1)(b) may permit the publication in a newspaper published in one official language or the other, which may not be the language which is used by that majority of the persons who would be interested in or affected by the bill. Is that a concern?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: I think Mr. Anstett is asking the Committee, not me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You hadn't addressed the member, I take it.

Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: I notice in New Brunswick where they have a similar provision, it says, "in both official languages." I just offer that as information.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I would not like to suggest that it should be in both official languages. That may be too onerous a requirement, knowing our population distribution. But the prospect that, in certain areas of the province, the publication in *The Gazette* plus the local weekly and, in many areas where there is a large Francophone population, there will be a local paper which is English and another local paper which is French, *La Liberté* or whatever in that local area. There is a distinct possibility that, since the only way private individuals out there find out about a bill which may affect them is by finding out about it in the local paper, that the whole purpose of the advertising could be circumvented by choice of the paper in which the ad will appear. I think it is our attempt to accommodate the other official language in this province by wording it this way, but it may provide a loophole which can be used by someone whose intent is not to let other people become aware of their intent to introduce a bill.

If no one else shares my concern that such Machiavellian thoughts are alive and well in Manitoba, then I will drop the matter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want to use that argument, maybe you should extend it to areas where there are German or Icelandic or Ukrainian papers printed.

MR. A. ANSTETT: No, I only extend it to French because I recognize two official languages in the country, as I assume the reference to French in the Rules is in recognition of French being an official language, not because there is a large minority of the population.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that was not the concern that you raised. If we are to deal with the concern that you raised, then maybe other languages should be able to be used.

Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: I wonder if Committee might consider Rule 111(1) which I think may at least partially address any concern that may arise on the part of members as to whether affected parties have been informed of the report of legislation. There is a safeguard. It would come to the Committee's attention certainly if an advertisement was placed in English in a French only community. I am sure the Committee would take that into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Mackintosh raises a good point. I had forgotten about that provision. I'll let the matter lie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Proceed.

MR. R. TALLIN: 109 is essentially the same as what's in the Rules at the present time; 110 is changed slightly to give directions to the Clerk to give two days notice. Now I think, in practice, this has not been the case in many instances. Presumably, if it's not to be the case, it would require leave of the House to get around it. So you might, therefore, want to consider whether or not you want to have the Rule left in at all. I think in

the past when committees were called on very short notice, as was frequently the case when private bills were transferred from Private Bills Committee to Statute Law Amendments Committee at the end of the Session, the House would rise and they would be in committee and that would be the first time that bill had been considered in that committee and no notice had ever been given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Notice would have been given, but not necessarily according to pro forma. What has happened is the House has been informed that this bill has been transferred from one committee to another, so in a way you are giving notice but not the way the Rules call for.

MR. R. TALLIN: Yes, I am not saying - I just meant that the idea of putting two days notice on the Order Paper and on the board has not been complied with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I have some concern here, Mr. Chairman, that we are treating private bills with greater care when they go to committee than we do public bills, and yet the level of interest in private bills by definition is more restricted than it is in public bills. I wonder why we do not require a notice period for committee meetings public bills and require it for private. It looks discriminatory, if I am a member of the public who is involved in a private bill and find that this provision is waived and the meeting is called suddenly and if I am Counsel or the individual involved in an Act for the relief of, I figure I've been discriminated against, because I don't recognize that they just finished calling six other committee meetings dealing with legislation of a very wide public interest on an hour's notice as well.

Now perhaps we should not have the special Rule which provides the two days at all, because then it just complicates the question of waiver of that notice; or else we should put it in for all bills. But certainly we give the public the wrong impression when we appear to be treating them in a cursory manner with regard to their private bill, when actually we do the same thing with public bills but they are not aware of it. By cursory I don't mean we ill-consider the bill, I just mean we don't provide as much notice as we might like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else? Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the rationale is that since a private bill, by definition, affects only a particular person or particular individual, the Legislature confers either a benefit special and unique to that particular person, it requires such notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the only time we start waiving is when we are getting towards the conclusion of the House. Normally we always have sufficient time to give notice, and in view of the fact

that we probably will be sitting twice a year, I think we should try to adhere to the Rule and I would concur with Mr. Anstett that that kind of notice should be given for public bills as well as for private bills, so that we can get as much democratic participation as possible in order to have legislation aired sufficiently to have everyone's point of view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the members would like to consider that before we come back and discuss this whole matter again.

Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: 111 is essentially what's in the Rules at the present time with respect to those matters. There were several Rules that were deleted altogether and some of them, Rule 116 for instance, the present Rule, deals with voting in committees, has not been included in the revision of Chapter 14. Consideration might be given to inserting a similar Rule in Chapter 9 to deal with voting at all Standing and Special Committees. What that Rule says is, "all questions before a committee on private bills shall be decided by a majority of votes excluding the vote of the Chairman and when the votes are equal, the Chairman shall cast a deciding vote." Now, that's the practice generally, but it seems odd that it should appear in the private bills section and not in the sections which deal with the Standing Committees.

The other one is Rule 121 of the present Rules, deals with the signature of the Committee Chairman on Private Bills; it has not been included in this revision of Chapter 14 of the Rules. Consideration might be given to inserting a similar Rule in Chapter 11 to deal with the subject in respect of all bills. It presently says, "The Chairman of the Committee on any Private Bill shall sign with his name at length, a printed copy of the Bill on which the amendments are fairly written, and shall also sign with the initials of his name, the several amendments made and clauses added in Committee." Now that's the practice in all committees. Again it seems odd that it should be set out in the Private Bills provisions but not in the Public Bills section. It never has given any problem not having it apply to Public Bills. I wonder whether it should be retained at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, both these Rules have been, by practice and custom in our House, applied to committees across the board whether in consideration of Bills or whatever, consideration of Annual Reports by Public Utilities and Natural Resources, the same procedure of signing the report and same procedure with regard to votes in the Committee is used.

Either we can say that by tradition and usage we have been doing that, and we don't need to put it in the Rules for Private Bills so it appears to be excluded from others, or perhaps for the benefit of many new members with a fair turnover every time there is an election, it might be better to spell out some of those basic points and put them right in the Rules. But I would put them in under Public Bills as you suggest, after 88(1) possibly.

MR. R. TALLIN: Well the signature on 88(1), the other one deals with voting generally and might go better in Chapter 9 where it deals with Standing and Special Committees.

Now the model petition is appended because there is a very minor change in it. The only change is in the petition that's in the Rules now, it says, "here state the object desired by the petition in soliciting an Act." Of course not all petitions are directed towards Acts so it's just, "here state the object desired by the petitioner." If it is to have an Act then it would indicate what he wanted in the Act.

The form of Notice of Petition to the Assembly is new and I put this in as a suggestion, because everybody who wants a private Act phones either the Clerk's Office or our office and sometimes both, to ask what kind of a notice do I put into the newspaper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: On Appendix A, Model Petition, two minor points. the third line from the bottom is obviously a typographical error, "in duty bound your petitioner will ever pray." But further to that, I am not one to upset tradition unnecessarily, but can the Legislative Counsel advise me why we're still using such archaic spellings as are used in the spelling of the word "sheweth" in the preamble?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: I can't explain any reason why we still use that archaic spelling, apart from the fact that it brings people's attention to the fact that parliament is an old and traditional operating institution. I would suggest it be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you finished, Mr. Sherman, or are you going to query the "humbly prays" part?

MR. L. SHERMAN: I would think that the message is conveyed pretty vividly in the language and you yourself, Mr. Chairman, have just referred to the term, "wherefore your petitioner humbly prays." My question simply had to do with that spelling, that's all. It's irrelevant; it's not important. I just wondered if Mr. Tallin had any insights into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: You know, it's a little funny but then, on the other hand, here we are trying to make these Rules as livable as possible and up-to-date as possible. I see nothing wrong with changing the occasional word to ordinary Queen's English that is current at the time because, if we don't, that is one of the reasons why so many people say that the Legislature is not functioning in the present day, simply because of the language we use. I think it's a part of our communications problem that we create if we don't make it easily understood. I think the legal profession has to do the same thing and so do we when we create new Acts, that they are written so that the ordinary layman can understand them and not think it's gobbledegook, which sometimes it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that another thing you'd like to consider before we meet again?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, there's an awful lot of praying in that petition, Mr. Chairman.

HON. R. PENNER: The notion that this group or that group is in regular conversation with God is to be encouraged.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Rely on me to stand up for the church.

HON. R. PENNER: Rely on properly ordained men of the cloth.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's right.

HON. R. PENNER: Women of the cloth, as they latterly became.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I want to see what the bishops have to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that completed?

MR. R. TALLIN: That's completed, I think, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else on this topic before we agree to go away and consider it further?

If not, can we move on to Number 5 on the Agenda? This is a continuation of a discussion that, at the last meeting, Mr. Mackintosh, you were dealing with this. Anything to say on that?

HANSARD INTERJECTION POLICY

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: No, the information contained here is really in response to what the Committee had requested last meeting. I have nothing more to add.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just before we make any overly hasty decisions on what we're going to do, I just commend to the consideration of Committee the colourful exchanges and accusations that were contained in informal debate on the morning of December 17th and I reported on the bottom of Page 21 of the second transcript from Hansard that is before us, that is the transcript that contains the interjections. I would just ask Committee members whether they would like to see that kind of colourful participation and dramatic combat eliminated from the records of the debates of the House.

A MEMBER: What are you referring to - about "some members"?

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'm on Page 21 of the second package from Hansard, "some members."

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your will and pleasure?
Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the indication in Paragraph 2 of the background paper is that the time required to transcribe and proofread an average sitting if all audible interjections are incorporated, would be about 30 percent. I guess my further question from that to staff, who I gather have been consulted on this question, would relate to their access to the word processing equipment.

By way of explanation for my question, Mr. Chairman, I understand that several years ago, after the word processing equipment was purchased and established down in Room 28 and Room 30 in this building, the equipment was justified on the basis of Hansard use but very quickly other uses, to put it bluntly, usurped Hansard's use of that equipment from roughly 8:30 in the morning until 4:30 in the afternoon. Hansard doesn't have access until after normal government office hours for purposes of transcription.

I guess my question would be this: If Hansard had use of that equipment all day long, could they, without any dramatic increase in staffing or time, because they would then have access to the equipment, accomplish the meeting of all audible interjection requirements within the time and with the equipment they presently have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: It would be my opinion that while it may solve many many problems that we have in Hansard, I don't think it would solve this particular problem because the staff would still have to - I mean you can't have the present staff working longer shifts than they presently work and I think in order to have a 24-hour turnaround, and given this experiment, we really would be looking at a third shift which really is an increasing cost, not so much access to the machines, we're talking about more staff time needed, more person hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Remnant.

MR. W. REMNANT: I think perhaps if I can elaborate a little bit on that, Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect of this that the committee members may not be aware of and that is, where you're attempting to record interjections the time required to do it is stretched out because the Hansard people are faced, in some cases, with deciphering a remark which has to be listened to three or four times before you can figure out exactly what was said for one of two reasons: either the member making that interjection was sufficiently far from the interjection mike that he is not very clearly picked up, or you get two or three remarks that are piled on top of each other on the tape and you've got to try to unscramble what's on that tape. That's, as I understand it, one of the difficulties which contributes to the extra time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. A. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin by making one concrete suggestion and that is remove the interjection mikes. This is the first time I believe that I have ever seen them properly identified as

interjection mikes. I was always sort of told before that they were necessary to be certain that there was a backup to get the proper context or the proper wording of what was being spoken. I think if those two microphones were simply removed, then you're going to pick up from the microphone of the member being recognized to address the Chamber. They are automatically going to eliminate a great deal of the problem right there. I see no reason to have those two microphones there, especially since as it's pointed out here, they tend to pick up conversations only from the area in front of them that the Premier and Leader of the Opposition where frequently there are discussions taking place between the Premier and Ministers or House Leader and Opposition Leader, simply making the task of the Hansard staff more difficult.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Well, I think the problem is a little deeper than that. It's because of the new system that we have and we have no audible presentation in the House so that the member himself will be the only one that can speak and the Speaker could have control of the speaker by being able to cut that one mike off to the speaker that we have this particular - and the word escapes me - but I believe we are having more problem because the new system simply doesn't conform to what we really expected it to do. At one time there was only one group of mikes, or the particular mike for the person making a speech, that was open. The interjections then, if they were loud enough and if they were replied to, were picked up by that one mike and there was no diffusion of half a dozen mikes carrying information at the same time. As well, we also had a speaker system so that when the microphone was cut off everyone knew that there was nothing going on tape. Now, your normal voice is all that you need and really, unless you're looking at your lights and the others who aren't aware of it don't know whether your mike is on or off, and the voices carry and keep on carrying and the conversation starts to flow back and forth instead of into the microphone where it's supposed to be directed and at the speaker where it's supposed to be directed. So the control is getting lost by the speaker as well as the members themselves. I think that's part of our problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me make it clear before anyone interjects that this is a personal opinion. Having said that by way of caveat and caution and a great deal of timidity, having looked through the transcripts provided to us, I'm confirmed in my view that the attempt to record interjections is vain, futile and doomed to disaster. What we get is little bits and snippets of phrases that are perfectly meaningless that encumber Hansard with remarks which make it seem that honourable members other than the one who is speaking and sometimes I regret the ones who are speaking are nincompoops at best and morons at worse.

"You're cruising for a bruising, Al." Great. Then, out of nowhere, "the Conservatives." What does that mean?

"He's got a beard, he's got a licence to touch his beard." What does that mean? "He's thinking here to that hairline." Probably never said and if it was said, whoever said it regrets it, and it's incapable of being translated into the French language, and on we go with this kind of stuff. What do we need it for?

I made a point that wasn't agreed with. It wasn't the first time that I made such a point, nor will it be the last time. It seems to me until something else happens and I'll speak about that briefly in a moment, that if I'm on my feet - and you don't have to be some star orator or debater - if someone is on his or her feet speaking and an honourable member opposite says something which the member finds particularly offensive and wants it recorded for posterity or for future reference to some committee or some claim of privilege, then that member should simply pause and say, "I heard the Member for Lakeside or Springfield, as the case may be, say the following. Would the member confirm that that is what he said? I want it recorded." Get it on the record; deal with them or deal with it later.

I think that's really what I want to say, in substance. When we have a chance to look at the Rules in greater depth, perhaps in the late spring or summer - I've heard some very good things about this new policy in the House of Commons of 20-minute speeches and 10-minute questions and answers that follow, and it holds down these interjections because if you have something that's burning in the guts or kishkes as Peter Fox would say, you know you're going to have the opportunity after Bud Sherman sits down to get up and say, I've got a question for the Member for Fort Garry. He made this statement would he clarify or doesn't he realize that he made a contradictory statement five minutes ago, or whatever you want to say. I'm advised that has improved the quality of debate in the House of Commons immensely. I hope we do that or at least look into it.

In any event, in the meantime this record, it seems to me, speaks for itself and it speaks of the utter futility of trying to capture interjections in a meaningful way whether you have one interjection microphone, two or 20 - (Interjection) - right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you finished?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to say that I have a great tendency to agree with the Honourable Attorney-General in this matter.

It seems to me somewhat incongruous that, just earlier today, we spent a considerable time dealing with what should go into Hansard with regard to transcription. In some cases, it was felt that the words of the immediate interpreter were not enough, that the translator should have the opportunity to look at it to see whether or not it was actually correct. If we are going to that type of Hansard, it seems rather strange that we would want a whole bunch of remarks in there whether they be relevant or not and whether or not they will be translatable. So it's my feeling that interjections, by and large, unless they are very, very clearly defined and part of the debate should not be included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we have before us two very illuminating packages of transcripts from Hansard from Friday, December 17, 1982, and I think they are helpful in resolving the discussion on this subject the last time the committee met, I have always been one who felt that the flavour and climate and tenor of the House included interjections insofar as it was reasonably possible to report them and record them, and that accurate conveyance of that climate would suffer somewhat if there was a decision taken that no interjections were to be included in the Hansard reports.

However, I must say that there is no comparison between the two transcripts before us. The one that is free of interjections is clear and crisp and relatively intelligible, as intelligible as any democratic debate, I suggest, is likely ever to be, and the one that does contain the interjections is badly marred and confused and disrupted by their inclusion. I think Mr. Fox really puts his finger on it. The equipment that we are now dealing with renders it at least unattractive, if not undesirable, to try to include any but the most obvious and the most clear interjections.

It seems to me, and I haven't been in this Assembly all that long but in the time that I have been in it, going back a few years it seems to me that we used to have in Hansard, interjections included and contained that were useful. They contributed something to the impression that the reader got of the debate. They were clear and they were concise and, in many cases, they were relatively clever ripostes and I see nothing wrong with that in a debate and I see nothing wrong with that being included in the record of a debate. But something has happened insofar as the development of sophisticated electronic equipment is concerned, which now makes that apparently almost impossible. You can't pick up just the clear riposte. You pick up the whole jungle, all the noises of the night and it makes the record, not unintelligible, but certainly unattractive. I would tend to side with the impression and the attitude that's been expressed thus far by Messrs. Penner and Graham and Fox, that we should be looking at a cleaner transcript without interjections in the main. I don't think we should eliminate all interjections if there is one clear, contributory one, but in the main we should probably try to do without them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: There's one that will fit in here that is typed in as part of the transcript and it isn't, but I don't know if anyone else has found it yet or not. It is on the first taping on Page 18. Mr. Penner is speaking. They've interrupted there and the typist has typed this as an explanation of what is going on.

"The interjections in this tape were put in after the tape was done because they were not loud enough to be done at the time the speaker was speaking. You are so conscious of what the speaker is saying that you do not hear the background unless something is drawn to your attention and you can't play a tape with the 'All' - I take it that's the interjections mikes, "on all the time because it is too noisy unnecessarily."

I think that's hitting a nub. You're not going to be having one person typing up interjections and another

person typing up text and going back over the interjections looking for interjections to put in. The intent of what we were raising last time was, where there is something that is clearly audible and intelligible, then you should be able to pick that up I would imagine from the one mike of the speaker quite frequently, that where something like that is drawn to their attention, then that typist can then switch to the other channel to get a clearer understanding of what was said if it is obviously that loud an interruption in the proceedings, or if there is a pause in the proceedings of the House or that person's speech because of some uproar in the House.

I still think that's a reasonable policy to be suggesting that where the person is interrupted or where the flow of the speech is altered such that the person loses the flow or pauses in his speech to not necessarily react to an interjection, but in recognition of an interjection where they can't obviously both speak at the same time or they would have to raise their voices to shout over the other person; in situations such as that, I do not see why the recorder couldn't go back and include interjections from that point.

What they have obviously done here is the Hansard was typed up from that day which is showing in the second copy, if you wish, and then it went back in for this exercise with the "All" mike on or the "All" button or whatever the interjections punch trying to pick it up. Is that correct as what transpired or how did the first one come? Did the first one all just come off noises the typist picked up from the speaker's mike?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mrs. Miller could take a microphone and answer the question.

Mrs. Miller.

MRS. H. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the first one was typed with our regular interjection policy and that is what we could hear or, not what we could hear, but if it evoked a response from the speaker or drastically changed the flow of conversation. The second one was typed with as much as they could pick up, what they could hear. That one particular paragraph only meant that one tape they typed, they couldn't sort of pick up anything clearly there. On Page 18, the one . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: That's the end of that tape.

MRS. H. MILLER: Just at the end of that one particular tape. This exercise involved, I think, 11 tapes. It was a very short sitting.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you made mention of the first and second. I take it you were referring to the second and the first in the reverse order. The first one presented to us here is the one with all the interjections in it. This second one is the one that is done the same as what the present practice?

MRS. H. MILLER: No, the first one is done with our present practice and the second one is with the interjections put in.

MR. D. SCOTT: Okay, I'm sorry. Mine is just the opposite.

MRS. H. MILLER: Oh, I'm sorry, okay.

MR. D. SCOTT: The way this one is put together.

MRS. H. MILLER: If you notice there are not that many pages in typing difference for that amount of time. It is mostly in deciphering and understanding or trying to make out certain members.

MR. D. SCOTT: But did you not go back and try to get as much of the interjections as possible down on this as a clean demonstration or a clear demonstration of what one extreme is versus the other extreme?

MRS. H. MILLER: On the second try they did go back.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes.

MRS. H. MILLER: And it takes more time to go back and to listen.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, so the one with the interjections in, that was done up by going through with the interjection mikes or listen to the interjection mikes?

MRS. H. MILLER: It was done up mostly on the "all", but it's very distracting. Every member has a microphone which is switched off and on as they are speaking, and then of course as you heard the interjection mikes are on all the time. If you listen to "all" you have everything and it's like trying to pick up one word out of 50 people speaking sometimes.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, the "all", I'm still not clear on what the "all" is. Is the "all" all 57 mikes?

MRS. H. MILLER: No. It's four channels; we have four channels.

MR. D. SCOTT: Two interjection mikes.

MRS. H. MILLER: But they are only on one channel.

MR. D. SCOTT: Okay.

MRS. H. MILLER: And then we've got one channel for the Speaker and then one channel for the recorder, and soon to be one channel for the French translation, but "all" means all four of our channels are on. That means they are listening not only to the speaker, they're listening to the interject and they're listening to the recorder because many times the typist cannot see who is speaking and when the tapes switch the recorder will come in and say, Mr. Scott, so that they know who is speaking because in the middle of a tape they just don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Well, I was just going to comment on the first series on Page 20 where there was one interjection. This is, I guess, under the latest system, but the interjection comes a little late because I would assume The Survivorship Act is what Mr. Penner presented and the interjection must have been - we're all going to on

this one, it would refer to survivorship. Yet, in the meantime, there was typed in: Motion presented. Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Attorney-General. Then comes the interjection so it's out of place. It really doesn't fall into where it should have. I didn't hear the tape but I'm assuming that's what took place. Why would Don say, we're all going to unless it was related to survivorship?

MRS. H. MILLER: I can't really say I haven't listened to the tape.

MR. P. FOX: I'm just saying that if we're going to keep the injections under the present system at a very low level they will sometimes fall in the wrong place where they have no meaning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?
Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I somewhat reluctantly have to concur with Mr. Sherman's analysis of the two transcripts we have in front of us today. Nevertheless, I have some concern that the second transcript in my package, which is the one with the much smaller number of interjections, does not reflect what we have been seeing in Hansard in the last couple of years. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it reflects what we saw in Hansard three or four years ago, and that the last couple of years we've seen a diminished number of interjections shown in the transcript. I'm not sure why that is. In fact, I suggested the last time we met that, in effect, there has been a change in policy with the new equipment, and we have not been getting as many interjections as we used to. It may well be that suggesting that we get all the interjections that we now electronically pick up will produce a very ugly mishmash in our Hansard as Mr. Sherman suggests. But the level of interjections that were recorded and transcribed in the middle '70s was such that it contributed, in a meaningful way, to an understanding of the debate that was going on in the House, and it was that level of interjections that I suggested last fall we should maintain and I still feel that way. I certainly don't want a Hansard which resembles these 22 pages that we have here as a sample of December 17, and I don't think anyone here on the Committee does.

On the other hand, the second section resembles much more of what I had in mind and what I remembered from the middle '70s. But many of the transcripts we had last spring in which I recall a fair amount of exchange going on in the Chamber showed no interjections whatsoever when Hansard was produced and I think that's why many members were concerned about the interjection policy and where we were going. It's not good enough to say that only when the speaker replies or when the speaker is interrupted or the flow of the debate changes because oftentimes that's the very thrust of the debate. The interjection and the remarks of the member are both relevant at that particular time.

I certainly don't want to see those 22 pages as the norm, but I also don't want to see some of the debates we had last spring in which there were fair exchanges in the House which were not picked up. I don't think

the policy is clear and that's where I have some confusion.

In looking at the background paper we had for last September, I recognize that picking up all remarks and interjections with the new system creates this mishmash, but when that policy was instituted in '72 that created a very readable Hansard.

Now with the new system we have a problem. I think we may well end up being overly restrictive if we follow the policy that's outlined on that background paper which I take it is really the question that is before us today as to whether or not we want to adopt that policy which was outlined to us back in September as a compromise between capturing everything and taking no interjections at all. I don't know where we draw the line but certainly we have enough material here and if this set of transcripts proves anything it proves that we can get far more than we need, that the equipment and the staff are imminently capable of giving us far more than we want. But certainly that also means that they are capable of putting into the transcript virtually everything that's relevant to the debate without engaging in becoming editors of which transcripts are relevant or not now. What sort of guidelines you use to determine that, perhaps, is where we should be addressing our remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. A. RANSOM: How much is it necessary now to refer to channels outside of the member's own microphone, what the member's own microphone is recording?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Miller.

MRS. H. MILLER: Quite a lot I should say.

MR. A. RANSOM: Is that because people aren't speaking to the microphone or wandering all over?

MRS. H. MILLER: No, if there is only the one speaker and there is not a lot of background noise, you would not have to refer too often to all mikes. It's only when there are a lot of comments being thrown around in the House that they have to keep switching around to try to get a clear picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, where you get a clean shot, I think it's in most cases desirable that it be included in the transcript that finally appears in Hansard. Of the two packages that are in front of us right now, one of them has interjections in it and one doesn't and they're in apparently different order in the way that they're put together for the packages in possession of some members of the Committee. So in some cases, it's package number 1 and in others it's package number 2, so let me refer to the 22-pager which has the the interjections in it.

I don't think that posterity or history is served in any way admirably by the kinds of interjections that are recorded on the bottom of page 21, following the Honourable Mr. Lyon's intervention in which he asks,

"Can't you get your act together sooner than that? What a bunch of incompetents." Then some members go into an exchange of calls back and forth across the Chamber which are recorded in part or in whole and which really contribute probably very little to the record of the day's proceedings.

Perhaps that's not an excellent example to take because there was considerable feeling over the date that was selected for the resumption of the Session but it can serve as an example of the kind of disjointed and prolonged and barely intelligible interjection that can find its way into any page in Hansard if we follow a system where every interjection is recorded.

In Ottawa, I understand that where there is an uproar and where there is a series of calls and exchanges and criticisms back and forth across the Chamber, Parliamentary Hansard usually deals with it simply with the notation, "Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh." Well, that may be rather a quaint expression. It might fall into that archaic category that I was questioning earlier. But it has got a purpose, Sir. It is now accepted and interpreted and understood by every Member of Parliament and everybody who follows Parliament, and everybody in the Press Gallery that that represented something of an interruption and something of an uproar, without going into all the half-statements and half-truths that get hurled back and forth during the uproar. Perhaps if we could be looking at something like that where there is any uproar there be some kind of terminology whether it be, "oh, oh," or "sheweth," whether it be "humble uproar" - that would take care of part of the problem. Then let the clean shots where there can be one, a clean riposte as I say from Mr. Penner, or from Mr. Ransom, or Mr. Enns, or whomever find its way into Hansard. I think that the Hansard reporters and recorders would certainly be able to make that differentiation.

I think the difficulty here is that we're into the kind of equipment that implies that picking up interjections means picking up all interjections, and that obviously is a system that has to be modified now in the light of the equipment with which we are working. If there could be some terminology adopted and through custom assumed to be representative of some kind of informal, unofficial, noisy disputation we could get away from having to record all the half-complete and disjointed remarks in themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think following up Mr. Sherman's good treatise on situation here is that where there is a clear interjection, where a person is identifiable and I suspect a good number of them are identifiable - certainly the people who are working in Hansard after a very short amount of time should be able to identify our voices and it's obvious that it can be done because there are several interjections here with people's names attached to them - in that where a person's voice is clearly identifiable on a clear riposte as Mr. Sherman called it, that that be included in Hansard. Where there are just interruptions of a more mild nature that the first paper or the 19-page paper which just has the word "interjection" in brackets, that that be used and where

there is a general uproar in the House, you get into, "Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh," or something along that line. So the transcribers at least have some guidelines to follow of what they should be trying to pick up. Where there is a clear interjection, identifiable by a person, it should be recorded; where there is just a general uproar that some honourable members or otherwise if it has disrupted the speech of the person speaking you could use your just in brackets "interjection."

I would think that would be a reasonable compromise and it would also be something that the staff could understand and could follow. That way I think we could satisfy both sides of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Scott is pointing to the right direction. Where the interruption is audible and it is deciphered immediately, it can be put if it's a complete sentence. But if it cannot be deciphered or cannot be understood, then all we need to do is write, "interruption" or "oh, oh" or "really" or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: I think we are coming to a middle ground and if I can suggest then that a policy similar to what was suggested in September be adopted with the addition. In other words, in addition to where a remark elicits a response from a member having the floor, significant remarks relevant to the debate be included. I believe that's an interpretation of what the Committee is coming to recommend and as well where there is a general uproar, the words, "Honourable Members: Oh, oh. Would that satisfy the House, do you think?"

I must add that it's not that different from current policy, in that except insofar as will now be a little more liberal including some more interjections, I think, than we had. But perhaps it's a middle ground that we can all agree on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, some years ago, I hired a young fellow to work on the farm for me. He's a very good worker, an excellent worker. One day, I left him to sort the potatoes, put the big potatoes in one pile and little potatoes in a little pile and I came back four hours later and he still hadn't done one bag. He was eager to work, but it was the decisions that bothered him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would someone like to summarize the changes that you want to see in the present policies so that Hansard is clear what they are to do?

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: If they will accept my summary, I'll reiterate what I had said earlier. Where there is a clearly audible interjection and the person is identifiable, that the interjection be printed; where there is a general uproar in the House, that the recorder not try to

decipher what 30 different people are trying to holler at one another, that just be recorded as, "Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh." And where there are other interjections that break the flow, but are not as significant to the debate or which are just an interjection, that just the word, "interjection" is continued to be used there as was on the shorter paper here tonight. Is that clear enough?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we clear as to the difference between the first and the third of those items that you gave us? The first one was that it be put in; the third one was that it not be put in. Now what's the difference?

MR. D. SCOTT: I am just trying to use some examples here. I don't know - from the examples that we have here, "A Member: You're cruising for a bruising, Al." The member is not identified so that would go in as a brackets interjection where the member is not identified. Another one above there, "A Member: No . . . speech." That would go down just as an interjection where they are not clearly identified.

Where someone is clearly identified and there's someone in here tells them to - take Donny Orchard's - half the comments here just have "A Member." "A Member: Especially while a captive." That would just go in as an interjection. "A Member: . . . wild in my dreams." That would go in as an interjection. "That's probably Gene Autry over there," identified as Mr. D. Orchard, that would go in under his name. It was clear who had said it and that's the way it would stay. Just above that, "A Member," that would go in as an interjection.

So, if you follow through here, wherever it says, "A Member," and it's not identified, then that would just go in as the "—(interjection)—" in the flow of the speech.

HON. R. PENNER: What if more than one member says, "Oh, oh"?

MR. D. SCOTT: On Page 21 of the 22-page draft.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, members in this House have, for years, complained about Hansard not being on their desks soon enough. We have been told by staff that if we are to comb through these interjections that it will add 30 percent cost and time in the production. I think that what we're talking about is whether or not we want to have our Hansard on our desks the next day or the day after, with or without the interjections. Because, if we have to ask staff to go back and play it back and play the interjection mike to see whether they can identify it or not, it will be time-consuming; it will be costly. And I think that, for the advantages that you're going to get out of it, I don't think the cost is worthwhile. I would think that we should record only the remarks that are heard on the microphone that have been identified by the recorder and that's all that should go into our Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I think we may be, by the proposed formulation, laying an impossible trip, as the saying

goes, on the Hansard recorders. They are asked to make a judgment. Mr. Ransom raised this point by way of an interjection a short while ago. When does an otherwise - apparently to the speaker - intelligent interjection, a riposte, to be preserved for time immemorial become merely an "oh, oh." You are asking the Hansard recorders to make judgments. I wouldn't want to be in that position. It may be that with some luck, we might try it. We've got nothing to lose by trying something, I suppose, and coming back and having another look at it, that if you asked the Hansard recorders to include only those things which were intelligible statements and had a noun, a verb and whatever else is required - I guess that's all you require really for —(Interjection)— But otherwise, I don't think that, without very, very clear guidelines, the Hansard recorders should be asked to play editor because they're going to be under considerable pressure. They might be criticized for picking up some remarks and not others and I wouldn't want to see them put in that position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think both Mr. Penner and Mr. Graham hit the nail on the head. The more discretion we place upon our staff, the more difficult their job becomes because someone will always be dissatisfied. I think we should try and make it as simple as possible for them and Mr. Penner has to some extent elucidated that which is audible - Mr. Ransom suggested the microphone of the speaker itself. I would be inclined to concur but if it's from across the aisle, it may not always get on that microphone. So sometimes it may be necessary to check the "all" microphones or whatever you do. But I would suggest I would place not as much discretion on the staff. Give them some guidelines so they can work within those. That which is audible, that everyone hears, they should be able to hear too.

The real nub of the thing is that if we want to maintain some decorum, and I think the Rules Committee should be looking at that for themselves, for their own benefit and also for the assistance of the speaker, we should all work towards that and stop some of this nonsense chatterbox, and I don't want to say it but it's crap - that's what it adds up to. So let's not do it if we want to have some decorum in that House. I think it's partly self-discipline that we all have to start practising and the Speaker has to start bringing it to our attention as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a great deal of difficulty with where we are headed. I think we should remember there was a time, and I sat through it myself as a Clerk sitting in for Ray Sly when he was a recorder - he was away sick a few times - that we didn't have more than one track. What, in effect, happened is the recorder wrote down on the envelope - we used large envelopes for the tapes in those days, a whole different system. If someone made an interjection, it was replied to; if it seemed relevant to the debate, Ray wrote it right down on the envelope

just in case they missed it. He, in effect, was an editor right in the House and he determined to a large degree what went into Hansard and what didn't by the things he noted on the envelope in terms of where he spelled out interjections and speeches and whatever, sometimes writing them down. So we have had that function and it worked very well for many, many years. I see no reason why we can't continue a system which allows a limited amount of discretion because Hansard recorders, whether we like it or not, are listening to our speeches all the time. They become very familiar with what's happening in the House. They know whether something is just kibitzing across the floor or relevant riposte that's geared to the debate and important to the debate and has some relevance in terms of the public issue that's being discussed and relevance to the public in the future in terms of reading about that debate. I would be very nervous if we said that we were going to eliminate all of that. I suggest that's not what I am hearing but if we lean too far towards that goal, then I think we're going to do a disservice to posterity in terms of what they're going to find in Hansard.

I don't want to see a Hansard like this 22-page edition, but on the other hand, all of those remarks that are responded to, it's suggested in the policy that we have in front of us, if they're responded to and the interjection is picked up, it will be recorded. The only modification I think that's being suggested by Messrs. Sherman and Scott is that if that remark is relevant to the debate, it be included. Well, how are you going to measure that relevance? That's really the nub of our concern. I don't think anyone is suggesting that everything that's picked up by a sophisticated electronic system should go in.

I am not convinced that it's that difficult to exercise some judgement on the part of Hansard. That's what we have Hansard editors for. They've been doing that up until a couple of years ago, from the beginning of Hansard. It was good enough for 28 out of the last 30 years since we started recording, and 20 of the last 23 years since we started transcribing Hansard. I see no reason why we can't continue that policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Chairman, I think there are some advances in technology that apparently are not functional, but productive of some dysfunctional consequences that we never anticipated. In the past, when only one had the floor and only one mike was in operation, obviously enough the interruption would not be recorded unless it was caught by that particular mike. Now that there are so many technological mechanisms at work it leads to confusion because of overlapping remarks. Unless we can go back to a simpler system, I would say we record only those statements that are intelligible. Otherwise it would be full of sentences or phrases that are meaningless.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Ransom's point of using primarily the speaker's mike and if something can be picked up on the mike that the person who has the floor is speaking and if that can be

identified, if the Hansard transcriber then wishes they can switch over to get it clear on the interjection mike. I think that's quite possible and it would not happen in three-quarters of the interjections that are on here. That would not happen. Three quarters are "A Member" and they are nonidentifiable. If a comment is audible on the mike of the person who has the floor, and if that person is identifiable, if they just hear a noise and they can't identify it, I would just skip by it and stick, if anything "(Interjection)" in, maybe not even that. I think we can work to a compromise situation such as that where there is some discretion. Most jobs have some discretion and it may make the job a little bit more interesting as well - not to say that all our speeches are just titillating, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't hear very much there that's any different from the present policy. If it is to be changed, I would like to know so the Hansard is quite clear what the changes are to be in the present policy. What you've explained is what is done now.

MR. D. SCOTT: No, I have not. I have not seen one interjection, Mr. Chairman, with all respect, in Hansard for quite some time with a person's name identified to it. That's what we're asking. You know you keep going back and saying, everything's the same as what we're doing. What's the sense of having a Rules Committee meeting if everything we do and every policy we come to you come and say, it's the same as what we're doing.

What we're asking for here is a clear interjection, even the one of the 19-page edition here is more than what we get in the House normally. What we are asking for is in the middle of the road. We don't want, obviously, the one with all the interjections in it because that really muddies up the record for anybody trying to go through it and a lot of statements that no one wants for posterity's sake. It is just the point of the responsibility of those of us who are in the House to be heard and to be understood. Whether we have the floor or whether we are interjecting in a rude way - if we are going to be rude - and it is clearly audible and identifiable as to who was making the statement, why that can't be picked up and that person be accountable for their statement in the House?

That's clearly not what is happening now, Mr. Chairman. This is one of the things that we are trying to address in the decorum of the House and hoping that this will lead to a higher decorum of the House. What Mr. Fox said a few minutes ago is that it is up to each of us to try and clean up the House that much more. I think that this will serve in a mechanical way to do that but it is obviously the psychological way that most of us need to address far more acutely in the decorum of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, to the same point. I have said several times that I have seen a substantial change in the last couple of years. The background paper we had in September admits that the current practice does not follow the policy outlined in '72. We know why they were forced to do that. That was because of the change in the sound system. But, we also know

that there are many instances, particularly last year, where individual members have referred to comments made by other members across the floor of the House; I've done it myself, referred to something said by a member across the floor and replied to it. Even identified the member myself who made the remark, much as Mr. Penner says we should do to avoid any conflict over interjections, and yet in the text of the speech in Hansard appears the word "interjection" without the language used, without the text of the member opposite's interjection, without identifying that member and only later on in the remarks continuing by the member who has the floor is that member identified by that person on tape.

It is obviously quite clear with the sound system we have, that Hansard would have picked up both the name and the text of the remark coming from the individual opposite. I can give you several concrete examples of where that happened, where the individual opposite was directly in line with the interjection mike and myself. It would have been impossible for me to hear the person clear as a bell and for it not to have been picked up on the interjection mike.

I am suggesting that the policy that it's suggested we should follow is not the current practice, that in effect we have the word "interjection" very often, even though the member responds to the remark and even though it is possible to identify the member. I don't know why that's happening that way but that's what's happening in Hansard. I think that is why some members here in this Committee are expressing some concern. I think there is a wish to have members identified when the remarks are attributable to those members and particularly when the member who is speaking continues on in his or her speech, makes reference to the interjection, makes reference to the member by constituency and yet the text of the interjection and the name of the member do not appear in Hansard. I think that's what's concerning some members about both the current policy and the general reference to the word "interjection" that's in the proposed policy.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, how much would it cost to rip out this sound system and put the old one back in?

The last comment, Mr. Chairman, was not an interjection, that was made by Mr. Sherman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. What is your will and pleasure?

Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: Is it agreed perhaps that audible, identifiable, significant interjections relevant to debate should now be included? Can we try that? Okay. So we'll add that to the what is really the current interjection policy. It loosens it up a bit but we can see and if we run into any snags, the members I'm sure will bring it to this Committee's attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, can I ask how much extra it's going to cost us in the delay in printing Hansard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No one seems to be able to answer your question.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: Perhaps there aren't many interjections which are all audible, identifiable and significant to debate, so perhaps there might not be that much of a change. I can't give an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Remnant.

MR. W. REMNANT: If I might, it would seem to me that work is already being done on interjections. They are being reviewed and with those fairly clear-cut criteria, it would seem to me that the task is not going to be any more difficult or time-consuming than it already is, possibly a little easier. I'm not certain about that, but that's a feeling I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Yes, just one last word and that is, that I think if we utilize our self-discretionary discipline on ourselves then the really cogent remarks will stand out loud and clear, whether they're interjections or interruptions or whatever, and it'll be that much easier to identify and that means raising the decorum of the House itself with the aid of the Speaker and the members. And as an interjection, I don't know if anybody heard me.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What we need, Mr. Chairman, are interjection mikes for this Committee table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're in the centre of the table.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are they on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just having those words written down so that you and Hansard will be aware of them. Where there is an interjection that is audible, identifiable and significant and relevant to the debate, they will be in future added. Is that your will and pleasure? (Agreed)

Mrs. Miller, have you got that down? Good. Right. Does that complete discussion on that item? Good. Moving along to Item 6.

Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I have a question for clarification.

The current policy, as I understand it, is as follows: an interjection is only put into the text if the speaker who has been interrupted replies to it; otherwise it's indicated in the text in the manner as shown below which shows just the word "interjection." Now we're adding this phrase that Mr. Mackintosh proposed to that statement of policy. We're not adding that to the three-paragraph statement of proposed policy which had been proposed by the Hansard co-ordinator at the bottom of that same page. Am I correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't got the paper that you're referring to.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The background paper supplied at our September meeting showed the previous Hansard policy, the current practice and a new proposed policy.

I am assuming that this change is being added to the current practice, rather than to the proposed policy, which has met with some resistance. Just so I understand what the whole policy is. I understand what the addition is; I want to understand what it's tied to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. MACKINTOSH: As well, I understand that where there is a general uproar, the words, "Some Honourable Members: Oh, Oh" will also be added to the current policy. So there are actually two additions to the current policy which is, interjection is put in when there is a response.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Right.

MR. MACKINTOSH: Okay.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you.

RULE 35(5) PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THRONE SPEECH

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Number 6 on your Agenda. Do you wish to continue the violation of the Rule or change the Rule so that we conform with it?

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to hold this ruddy thing up. I think we've wasted far too much time. We had what I thought was a consensus back when Mr. Sherman spoke almost an hour ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Item 6.

MR. D. SCOTT: Okay. Sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, has there been a request from the Executive Council to have this Rule changed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would it be improper of this Rules Committee then to suggest to the Executive Council that they follow the Rules of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it a practical thing to do? Is it practical and desirable? If it is not, then maybe we should change the requirement.

Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't think, to my knowledge, the whole Executive Council has attended with the Mover and Seconder for the presentation of the Address and Reply in the past ten years. Now certainly members of the Executive Council and I think the Premier always has attended, but I'm not sure that the - I stand to be corrected with regard to the last couple of years - but certainly in the past, the Mover

and Seconder and the Premier usually attended for presentation. Now I think it's a ridiculous provision to require that every member of the Executive Council and the Mover and Seconder attend for that presentation, and I think it should be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?
Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: You know, I think if there is no strenuous objection to changing it, we should change it and move on with other business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: I was going to suggest the same thing, and the other thing I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that you can't have all of the members of the Executive Council at any one time. There is always someone away for some reason or other, so they would probably never be able to present it. So let's make it practical. We are trying to make this Assembly work as practically as possible, as easy of procedure as the members can find and so the public can understand. So let's not put obstacles in our way by having rules which cannot be conformed to. So I would suggest we change it and carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to remove the underlined words there, "such members of the House as are of the Executive Council"? Do you simply want to recommend they be removed?

Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: We want to remove the word "and" as well, I think. Mr. Chairman, I see no problem in requiring the First Minister to attend with the Mover and the Seconder. Since it is a statement of government policy, I think the obligation on the Premier to present the House's approval, along with the Mover and Seconder of the Government Statement of Intentions, is appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And if it is not?

MR. A. ANSTETT: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And if he does not?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Then he is in violation of the Rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: Could you not say the First Minister or some other member of the Executive Council on his behalf, and the Mover and the Seconder?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, that's my intent. It doesn't have to be him, but certainly someone should be representing the Executive Council at this presentation because the Mover and the Seconder are not usually of the Executive Council, by definition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you draft such words as we need in there? Is there anybody else on the same topic? Agreed? (Agreed) Good.

Number 7.

YOUTH PARLIAMENT INCORPORATION

MR. H. GRAHAM: By petition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. The request came from the Youth Parliament, from their solicitor, and it was suggested by Mr. Tallin that it should come into the House as a Private Member's Resolution to give the House's approval for this. We were wondering whether it would be quicker and shorter, if this Committee so agreed, to have it incorporated in the report of this Committee and, hopefully, adopted by the Chamber. What's your will and pleasure?

Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The request for incorporation, I take it, is possible without a private member's bill. They are not asking for any special powers. Mr. Tallin is nodding his agreement. Then I am not sure that I understand why the Legislature, this Committee or anyone here is required to approve. The only relationship we have with the Youth Parliament is the loan of the facilities, which is done by Mr. Speaker. I think, as well, each of the caucuses meet with them or have lunch with them or something during the period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They approached the Director of Corporations, or whatever the appropriate person is, to become incorporated as a nonprofit, charitable organization. He told them that they could not use the word "parliament" in the title unless it was agreed to by this Legislature. He referred the matter to us. They want to use the word "parliament" in their title, "Youth Parliament of Manitoba and North-Western Ontario." That's all.

Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: Under The Corporations Act, there is a prohibition against using the words "royal", "crown", or something of that nature without the permission of the proper body, so people don't get the idea that corporations are part of the government or part of the Royal Family and that sort of thing. I think he just assumed that this was a name of a similar type and thought it should be approved by the proper institution.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I would move then or I would suggest, rather than move, that we place in our report to the House our agreement in the use of the name "Youth Parliament," under their request for incorporation. I have no objection to them using the term "Youth Parliament" or "The Youth Parliament of Manitoba and North-Western Ontario" or however they want to style themselves, so long as the word "Youth" is attached to the word "Parliament" so there's no confusion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it is the proper use of the Rules Committee to do that. We are dealing purely with the Rules of the House. Anything of that nature, I think, should be dealt with by the entire House, not by this Committee.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, since the report of this Committee will have to be concurred in by the House on motion of the House, I think that would be the appropriate vehicle. If the House felt that this matter in any way infringed upon its privileges as a parliament, then the House could then debate that when the time comes for concurrence in the Rules and the House could, at that time, strike our approval of this Youth Parliament.

Certainly it will go to the House. I agree with Mr. Graham; it should go before the House, but I think placing it in our report, as Mr. Speaker suggests, is the appropriate way to bring it to the House. The idea of having a Private Member's Resolution go into debate, whether or not there is any infringement of the House's privilege or territory by using this name, seems like a bit of overkill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Is that agreed?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I object.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Could I ask Mr. Graham if he has a suggestion as how we should proceed then to accommodate this request?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I would suggest that the Committee not deal with the matter at all. It's outside our jurisdiction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: I was going to ask Mr. Graham the same thing. He's probably correct that it is outside our jurisdiction, but then what has to happen is somebody has to volunteer to bring a resolution to the House so that this thing can be discussed and a decision made.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I would be quite willing to do that.

MR. P. FOX: All right, that solves that problem. Mr. Graham is going to be our volunteer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I need the approval of the Committee for me to speak to the Youth Parliament and tell them to contact Mr. Graham who has volunteered to look after their interests. (Agreed)

Moving right along, Number 8. Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, would you, when you contact them, also advise them that Mr. Graham wanted it done this way because he didn't want the Committee to do it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think so.

Number 8, Mr. Mackintosh, the Rules Book which we discussed last time.

RULES BOOK FORMAT

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: At the last meeting, as you may recall, it was decided that the format of the new Rules Book was too small. The print was too small and it wasn't easy to read. We had it redone in a larger type and, as well, we've got a prototype cover. I hope

it's a fairly nonpolitical colour and accepted by all sides of the House, but I pass it around simply for your judgment as to whether it would be acceptable for distribution to all the members of the House.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I don't care for the type at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I recall, doing it in this size, it could be recorded on the word processing machine and also produced without photo reduction.

Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: There are significant cost savings, of course, by putting it on the word processor in that, every time there's a change to the Rules, we simply have to put it downstairs to the Word Processing Centre and the pages are then xeroxed, rather than sending it out to the printer where it's typeset and reproduced by their means.

As well, we have a permanent record of the changes. It would be stored on one tape. We had some problems, going back, with changes to the Rules Book going through the means of the Queen's Printer and to typesetters. We seemed to lose control over the changes that were being made from time to time.

Lastly, it seems that the changes to the Rules are made fairly frequently now as compared to a number of years ago. That was the reason for it. I think this process was really begun before I came on the scene.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the new style of Rule Book?

Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I expressed some reservations last fall; I have the same reservations. I am not particularly pleased with the quality of the type and the readability of the typeface. I don't know if it's possible to make it darker or bolder so that it's more readable but, for me, the slight enlargement of the type does not compensate for the loss of contrast or sharpness that is available with our present Rule Book. Although I appreciate the work that has gone into developing this and I appreciate the cost savings that are available, I am somewhat reluctant to approve it on that basis. It may be possible to sharpen up and thereby improve the readability of the type and, if that's possible, my reservations would be reduced.

As well, Mr. Chairman, I like the current cover. I like the colour of it and I don't see any reason why we should change the colour. We are all fairly traditional around here. We're used to reaching on our bookshelves for a blue book.

MR. R. DOERN: How about red, white and black?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, that interjection came from the Member for Elmwood and he suggested we use red, white and black. Mr. Chairman, I've got to put up with one red, white and black thing in my life this month. I don't need any others. I would like to suggest we stay with the blue colour; I have no objection to it; it's something we are used to. But I would like to hear

from staff as to whether or not we can sharpen the text that we're going to have under the new format.

I realize that, despite my objections, we're going to have to go ahead with it just because of the cost saving and everything else that's involved in maintaining a good up-to-date Rule Book. I recognize that, but I would like it to be a little sharper and a little clearer if possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: I would concur with most of the remarks of Mr. Anstett. I believe if the quality of paper was possibly improved that we would probably get a sharper print than we do. That often makes the difference between a good print and a poor print. I am reminded of the telephone book which has got some very cheap paper in it and I have one devil of a time trying to decipher some of those numbers because the 3's run a little bit when the ink is wet; they look like 8's and vice versa. But I am sure staff can check into this and find out for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: I suggest that I come back with another copy because I don't want to get into the production of this and then not have members satisfied with it. So perhaps we'll do another run on a different quality of paper and a different print, if we can. I am not an expert on the processes.

I don't know, is there a consensus on the colour at all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: First, I guess as you just mentioned colour, we have got the one beige or buff-coloured one there now. Have you brought a whole bunch of those? That's the only one there is and you've got it.

MR. P. FOX: Are there options? Bring this back the next time in a variety of colours and then have to state that either one of the two . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Regarding the printing and the clarity of the print, can we not leave it up to the Clerk's Office to see if they can't improve the quality of it? We are not going back to the old format; that's quite clear. I don't want to delay getting the revised Rules and the changes that we have made today in the Rules before they can go to the members. We may not have another Rules Committee meeting until well into the Session; I don't know. But I don't want to hold up the progress of the printing and distribution of the new Rule Book until this Committee meets again. I have confidence to leave it in the Clerk's Office and to have them come up with a format, and do what they can to make it clear. I am certainly not willing to hold it up because it's not quite as clear as people may like it to be, as it is right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo Mr. Scott's suggestions. Although I have raised my

reservations, I certainly have every confidence that the Clerk's Office, since we are committed to going with this format, will do what they can in terms of paper quality, type style, type size to make it as legible and sharp and clear as possible. So, therefore, if the rest of the Committee is agreed on that, that we allow them to go ahead and produce this making whatever changes they can with those purposes in mind, then it's just a question of choosing the colour of the cover. In view of the objections that some people have to blue, I'll go along with this colour.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That was pretty fast backtracking. Most people stand up for their principles longer than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom. Order please.

MR. A. RANSOM: I would just like to ask if the index in the new book is the full index that will appear or whether that's a partial index.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackintosh.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: I believe that's the full index. We've added a table of contents.

MR. A. RANSOM: That's what I was looking at then. You've got the index at the back.

MR. G. MACKINTOSH: The index is at the back. There isn't a table of contents in our present Rules and we've added one.

MR. A. RANSOM: I was confused on those and, on the colour, Mr. Chairman, actually I think the blue is a good colour because it contrasts with everything else pretty well that the government turns out. It is readily identifiable as your Rule Book, rather than something that might be an annual report from any one of a number of —(Interjection)— No, but the government puts a lot of things out in orange and this contrasts with it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: It matches the government-issued pens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the discussion on the proposed Rule Book. Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Since there is only one issue at conflict maybe we can decide to colour question now and let the Clerk's Office get on with providing us with our new book. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, this is one issue we could decide by vote in the Committee. The Clerk suggested the change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the will of the Committee regarding the colour of the Rules Book cover?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Blue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a consensus of the members prefer a royal blue? (Agreed) That being the case, so be it.

Item No. 9, subject matter of Bill 30 referred to this Committee by the House and not yet dealt with. What is your will and pleasure?

Mr. Anstett.

SUBJECT MATTER OF BILL 30

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I have met with Mr. Ransom to discuss some of the concerns that were raised in the House last Spring with regard to Bill 30. I have not had a chance; I don't know if he has had a chance at this point to discuss some of the matters we discussed with our respective caucuses to report back to the Committee. I would hope that at a subsequent meeting of the Committee, if that's possible, we would be able to report on some progress as to resolving those areas in which both sides had some differences.

So unless someone else wishes to discuss the matter further today, I would suggest we pass on until we have something either to report to the Committee or to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that your will and pleasure? (Agreed) Then defer Item No. 9 until another time.

On No. 10, anything else to come before the Committee?

Mr. Scott.

OTHER MATTERS

MR. D. SCOTT: The point that Mr. Penner had asked to be included on the agenda was to deal with just a general look at the practices and the Rules of the House overall and to have a look at what the Federal Rule changes have been. It is not necessarily saying that we should change and follow along the format of their new adoption of Rules just started in the most recent Session of the Parliament of Canada —(Interjection)— that's right, which read for a one-year trial.

Both Mr. Penner and myself spoke with Bill Blaikie and Bill Blaikie, I understand, has spoken with Charlie Mayer both of whom were on the Federal Rules Committee. They have, I believe, already made arrangements to go and speak to both caucuses or the Rules Committee - I am not sure which - of the Provincial Parliament in Ontario, and suggest that we could possibly set up the same thing here with both caucuses in Manitoba using two representatives of the Federal House, one from each party, for them to give an assessment to us of both the rationale behind some of the changes and also the success those changes are having in the Federal House.

We fully recognize that this isn't something that's going to happen. You don't get major changes like that overnight; it took years in the Federal House. But it was just the point that maybe if we sat down with them and went over, there is something we may be able to learn something from there or they may be able to give us some advice, not advice, but maybe by showing us how their House and what has happened in their House especially over the next year that they may be able to share some of their gained experience with us and with both caucuses.

Mr. Penner wanted to, I guess, just basically get approval from the Committee here to see if it would

be worthwhile proceeding. Perhaps we could contact Messrs. Mayer and Blaikie to come and make a joint presentation to the two caucuses or to the Rules Committee. This would be down the road. It wouldn't be some time probably until later in the spring or maybe even in our Rules Committee meeting next summer, but just to get the idea of whether we want to have them come to show things that may be adaptable to our House and we may wish to start contemplating if we want to move in that sort of direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. A. RANSOM: I would like to know what is the purpose of that? What problem situation do we have provincially that is related to whatever it was the problem that the Federal Parliament had? Just because some other Parliament has changed their Rules, I don't think is necessarily a reason for us to get excited about it and rush to ask them how it worked. If you have a problem with the operation of our own House, then let's address the problem and see if the way to go about it is to talk to somebody from Ottawa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Although I would not want to attempt to start going through the Rule Book and pointing out where I think there is room for improvement at the present time, I think basically our Rules are good Rules. Nevertheless, one of the things that happened in Ottawa, I believe is happening here, and that is that the Executive Branch of government is developed to the point that the Legislative Branch does not have the power, capability, committee structure and Rules which enable it to operate as the restraint, as the check, as the balance on the Executive Branch that it was originally designed for. That was one of the primary focuses of the Federal Rules review. I think that's a concern, I would think particularly Members of the Opposition would have in Manitoba as well.

I would concur in Mr. Scott and Mr. Penner's suggestion that we at least have a look. If we can enhance the processes in the Assembly with just that purpose in mind, without regard to any particular problems we might have, I think that would be advantageous.

I think additionally just on one small point, the idea of a question and answer session at the end of speeches, 20-minute speeches with 10 minutes dedicated to questions and answers of the member who just finished speaking is a very interesting concept and it could lend itself very well to debate and to the enhancement of information exchange in the House and therefore for the public. So I think there are some advantages and that's one small point, I think, worth looking at.

The changes in the way committees operate in Ottawa are very interesting and might well lend themselves to our operations, since not all members are able to participate in all subjects at all times. Mr. Graham suggests we don't live up to our commitments now. He might well be right but I, for one, don't think that we should avoid an opportunity to become more informed about Rules and Rule changes that might be possible - just to look at ideas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. A. RANSOM: Well, there's nothing wrong with becoming informed, Mr. Chairman, but unless we have an identifiable problem that both sides of the House see as a problem, we are not likely to make any change. Look at the difficulty we've had in deciding what the policy should be on interjections in the Hansard record. To think that for some abstract reason we're going to change the structure of how we do business in the Legislature I think is just wholly unrealistic. If it's simply an exercise in finding out what is going on, fine, but until the committee comes here to talk about some problem that they have, whether it's decorum or whether it's the amount of time that's taken up, or whether it's the executive of government not disclosing enough of their spending plans or whatever, then simply addressing, say in an abstract way, what's going on somewhere else I see largely as an exercise in education alone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the three substantive changes in Rules that I have seen in the time that I have been here have been decisions with respect to the elimination of the Friday afternoon sitting; the decision with respect to the admission of television cameras; and the decision with respect to changing the start of the sitting day from 2:30 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. All of those were significant substantive changes which bear upon and bore upon the workday of the legislator and the manner in which he or she organized his schedule.

I think there well may be some substantive changes that are necessary in the 1980s that should be contemplated but I have some sympathy for the position taken by my colleague, Mr. Ransom, and I think that perhaps a necessary exercise at this point is for both caucuses to address that question themselves over the course of the next Session whenever each or either caucus has time and discuss with our colleagues and poll our colleagues as to whether there are some substantive changes that these two groups should perhaps bring forward to this committee over the course of the next year.

Insofar as the suggestion of Mr. Scott is concerned, I would like to hear from Mr. Mayer and Mr. Blaikie, purely out of interest, because I'm interested in what Ottawa is doing and what the substance of all those proposed experiments really amounts to, and it is a one-year experiment and has some interesting features to it. I'm not quite as optimistic about the 10-minute question session that Mr. Anstett is. That's fine if you get 10 questions and 10 answers, but if you get one one-minute question and the person who was speaking then uses the next nine minutes to simply elaborate on the speech that he or she made, which would not be a practice followed by any around this table, but we all know some members of the House who would do that, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure what would be gained necessarily, but in theory it's an interesting theory and I'd like to hear what Mr. Mayer and Mr. Blaikie have to say about it.

So I'd look at it from the point of view of an interesting instructive session as Mr. Ransom has suggested and

really not much more than that at this point in time. But I think that the Legislature could be well served by having both caucuses look informally over the next year, among themselves, at what substantive changes they think perhaps should be put on the table for consideration by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was there a proposal, Mr. Scott, in your opening remarks, I'm not sure?

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, I had the proposal, Mr. Chairman, of just looking for a consensus here first off, and I don't know that there is a consensus, to invite these people to come and speak to the two caucuses jointly, rather than just talking to the Rules Committee because that's more of a formal thing than having both caucuses meet just to be able to relate to us some of the progress that they have had in the changes and the impacts that those changes have had in Ottawa. Not that we restrict ourselves only to what they have done, but I think that it's imperative and essential for ourselves to be looking, as legislators, of a way to enhance the system and I don't like the idea, you know, just change for the sake of change. But I don't know necessarily that one has to come up to some great horrendous problem before you consider change, and it's not so much change as it is alteration and evolution. We must recognize that the problem that you process is an exception and it has a history of evolution within it. It's just to try and keep our ears open and eyes open as to things that may come up over time that we would like to address.

I take Mr. Sherman's point very soundly that we should be looking at our own caucuses and maybe coming back for something as well. You know, if there are changes or problems that we have or directions that we wish to see the Rules and the procedures of the House move toward, and perhaps we don't need the Federal people at all. I'm not looking upon them coming in and telling us what to do at all but just come in to share some experiences that they have had.

In the past I think this has happened through the meetings that the Clerks have across the country and that the Speakers have and that the Canadian Parliamentary Association sometimes discusses, and that's a very worthwhile thing but it's only a very few members of the caucus that get to share in those. If we had a bit wider broader format that came to us that we could possibly gain, both caucuses, from it and just stimulates some ideas for discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. A. RANSOM: I assume, Mr. Chairman, that since the changes in the Federal Parliament are for a year only that they intend to evaluate them at the end of that time and decide whether they'll proceed. Since they will be operating that way it would seem reasonable then that we at least await the evaluation of their rule changes. At the moment, I think they are still caught up in the euphoria of something novel and it will take presumably the period of a year before they know whether they're really effective in what they had intended to achieve by them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything further on this topic?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Not on this topic, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't seem to have a consensus, Mr. Scott, but that won't prevent you or your group from making whatever arrangements you wish to make for yourselves.

Are there any other topics under Other Matters?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, there's a Rule of ours that has always concerned me and I don't know whether we want to repeal it or live up to the spirit of it. I'm referring to Rule 71 in our Rule Book that has been there for quite some time and, in my recollection, I think there have only been a couple of meetings of that particular committee to deal with the regular review of the regulations that have been passed, and under Rule 71 that Standing Committee should be doing an ongoing review of all regulations and we seem to have fallen behind in that. I just wonder whether we as a Rules Committee should be making some recommendation that the Rule be adhered to or be repealed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I understand, Mr. Chairman, this matter was raised before the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders in November of 1980, and at that time there was some discussion between Legislative Counsel and the then Attorney-General, the Member for St. Norbert, regarding some staffing difficulties associated with the kind of comprehensive review involved and other problems associated with that. I understand that the last time any such review was done by a committee, or reported through a committee, was sometime in the late sixties, 1968, I believe. Perhaps Mr. Tallin might be able to shed some light on exactly what the status of this Regulation Review is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: We had made a start on some of the Regulations that we were asked to review. We have reviewed the Regulations of the years, 1978-79, 1979-80. We have not gone back to do a review of the revised regulations which were approved by the Committee back in 1970 or any of the intervening regulations since then and we haven't had time to do any since the end of 1980 Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask advice. Is it not the responsibility of a committee, especially a Standing Committee, do they not have power to hire their own staff to do that work if they so require it?

MR. R. TALLIN: You're asking me?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes. A Standing Committee has that authority, do they not?

MR. R. TALLIN: I don't know if they have any power to hire anybody. Any costs involved would be through the Board of Internal Commissioners, but you can call witnesses if you want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the motion establishing the committees at the beginning of each Legislature provides for staff in addition to the summoning of witnesses and the power to call for papers. You can check that in last year's Journal, but I believe that's the wording of the motion. So I believe the committee has the authority under the resolution of the House to hire staff, but I believe that there is no vehicle by which it can hire staff except, as Mr. Tallin suggests, the Board of Internal Economy. But I think the committee would have to meet and request the authorization of that staffing from the Board, but it certainly has the power to ask for that under the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: I just want to ask a question of Mr. Tallin. Didn't we, at one time, have a Mr. Rutherford who went through all the Statutes and all the Regulations as well and reviewed them and brought them all up-to-date? Have we not, outside of what you suggested that there has been some revision and some review, no one else has done it since?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: Mr. Rutherford was hired as a Revising Officer by the Attorney-General to do a revision of the Statutes and a revision of the Regulations and he worked on that for about ten years, on those two projects. The 1971 Revised Regulations were the ones that he put before the Rules and Regulations Committee of that day for their approval. What he attempted to do was indicate where he had made changes in the regulations and some of those changes related to places where he thought the regulations had been ultra vires or were in violation of the Rules of the House. But he had not specifically reviewed every one of those regulations in the Revised Regulations in 1971 with that in mind.

He did report it, but his review was not directed to that purpose. His review was directed to getting them so that people could understand them. Unfortunately, although they went up to 1970, they were not approved by the House until 1971 and were not published until 1972 which meant by the time they were published they were two years out of date and you well know how quickly governments make regulations these days. So it was not a very successful purpose, but we have not had anybody since he finished doing that job doing any revisions. When I say review, it's a question of going through and saying, well, we think this section of this regulation is in breach of one of these Rules in 71(2).

MR. P. FOX: I have a question. Can you give us a quantum figure of the immensity of this job? Would it

be necessary to hire one or two staff and how long would it take them to go through to bring things up-to-date? That's the first question.

The second question is then what would it take to keep it up-to-date so that we don't get that far behind again?

MR. R. TALLIN: If the committee were to meet something like quarterly to do it, I think our staff could probably keep it up-to-date because then the pressure is on us to meet a quarterly deadline. What the difficulty is, is that we used to meet an annual deadline up until 1971 and, after 1971, no deadline because nobody ever fixed a date by which we were to have these ready.

When the complaint was made in 1978 or 1979, I think - I forget which date it was that you referred to, or was it Mr. Graham that referred to it? - we were asked to do a certain amount of work in a block. Well, we never got that block of work finished. All we got was these two years of regulations that we have reviewed. My own feeling is that the best way to get a handle on it again is to start with the ones that are going to be filed with the House this coming Session and say we want a report on that, and we can start from that fresh and carry on. Then, in a few years, it will pretty well accumulate almost all the regulations because they have a tendency to be re-enacted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I raised the issue because I have some concern about it. I think it is a very important aspect of our legislative work that we have let slip and I would like to see some mention made in our report that we recommend to the House that the Standing Committee gets on with this work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I would not only concur in that recommendation, but further suggest to the House that, if necessary, the committee be mandated to meet quarterly and that, if necessary, the committee be authorized to engage staff to do that work. I think Mr. Graham's point about the necessity of this work being done is very well taken and Mr. Tallin's suggestion that they might well be able to do it in-house with existing staff with deadlines set is certainly welcome, but we still have quite a number of years left undone. In effect, we are looking at the best part of ten years and I think those years have to be caught up as well. I think it would be negligence on the part of the committee to start today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin.

MR. R. TALLIN: One of the difficulties is that, even in the work we did in those two years that I mentioned, a great many of those regulations have now been repealed and it seems kind of senseless to be studying regulations which are no longer in force.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I would only do regulations that are enforced, Mr. Chairman, and that might make the task easier going back to 1971, but I certainly concur that

a note in our report recommending not only that the committee meet but that all regulations that have not been reviewed by the committee and are still in effect since the date of the last review, whenever that was, perhaps Mr. Tallin can advise the Clerk in preparation of the report that we urge the House to meet its responsibility in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection to that then perhaps a note will occur in our report noting that the committee had not met since whatever the date was and that . . .

MR. R. TALLIN: Oh, the committee has met many times; they just haven't directed their attention to this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . hasn't met to discuss the regulation. The Committee recommends that they do so, is that agreed? (Agreed)

Any other matters to come before the Committee? Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, back on Tuesday, the 21st of September when we last met, it was agreed that we would begin a review of Speakers' Rulings starting with the last Session and have staff prepare notes on the rulings, the text of the rulings, the Hansard associated with each of them and distribute that material prior to our next meeting so we could discuss them. As I understand, members wanted to assess them in terms of the presidential nature of Rules, in terms of our Rules changes and how rulings that were affected by Rules changes over the years might be rulings that we no longer wanted to consider relevant.

We have a massive compendium prepared by the former Clerk going back the best part of 30 years, I believe, on Speakers' Rulings and I'm concerned that we haven't begun that. I guess, basically, I raise the question first of all, to urge that we begin that task in this Committee because I think that's one of our primary obligations and I think we've been neglecting it, and also to ask why we don't have that material here today and why it isn't on the Agenda since it was agreed to on the 21st of September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't believe it was actually agreed to; I know there was some discussion of it. In considering it afterwards, I came to the conclusion it would require a change in the Rules, even The Legislative Assembly Act, in order for a committee to do something that the House is not presently able to do. We have two procedures that the House can adopt with regard to Speakers' Rulings: one is the appeal, that's the reason that it came before the Committee last time; and the other is a substantive motion having to do with a Speaker's Ruling. That is all that the House can do. It is specifically forbidden for the House to reflect, or for any member to reflect on a Speaker's Ruling, unless it is by means of one of those two things. Beauchesne makes it quite clear that a committee cannot do any more than the House can do, and a committee can only do those things that are referred to it by the House. So from that point of view, if the Committee is to do this thing, then it will require a motion of the House that enables it to review Speakers' Rulings separate from those two things that it presently has.

MR. A. ANSTETT: With respect, Mr. Chairman, if that was your position, then I think you should have reported that to the Committee rather than leaving it off the Agenda. I would refer you to Page 47 of the Minutes of that meeting of the transcript in which you, as Chairman, ask, "Is that the agreement of the committee? Okay, we'll see what we can do." You've chosen not to do it. I, with respect, disagree with your rationale. It's expressly to allow the House to move by substantive motion that it does not wish to accept certain rulings as precedents that it was suggested this Committee should review them so that it can then report to the House and ask for the House to move a substantive motion that a precedent in 1961 or 1978 or 1975, 1982 - cover all the Speakers who were here - is not a precedent that this House wishes to observe for purposes of its Rules and for purposes of its procedures. That was the concern that was raised and it's exactly with that in mind that it was suggested.

It's not suggested for a minute that this Committee would make a determination, but rather that this Committee would recommend in a report to the House that certain Speakers' Rulings are precedents with which the Rules Committee does not feel the House should continue to live. It was with that in mind that I made that suggestion and I believe all members of the Committee understood it from that perspective and therefore agreed to it. I'm wondering when we're going to get on with the task.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other members?

If you want me to go into any further detail, the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding stand permanently referred to the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House. What you're considering here is not the Rules; you're talking about Speakers' Rulings which belong to the House. The House has two methods of dealing with Speakers' Rulings which are laid out in the Orders. That's clear enough. If the House cannot do something, it cannot order one of its committees to do that thing.

Beauchesne says, "A committee can only consider those matters which have been committed to it by the House. Citation 621." Now, it's clear that there was no instruction for the Committee to consider Speakers' Rulings, and Speakers' Rulings are not the Rules of the House, which are permanently referred. Now, if you have a specific item that you want dealt with, then it can be brought up because it's one of the Rules, but a Speaker's Ruling is not.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, with respect, Beauchesne also provides that Speakers' Rulings are precedents of the House and are part of the Rules of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where does it say that?

MR. A. ANSTETT: I don't have that Beauchesne in front of me. You'll find that Speakers' Rulings are precedents for the House and the House shall be guided by them. They are part of the Rules, customs and usage of the House. In addition, it has been our practice in this House to observe Speakers' Rulings as precedents, and that is where we have run into some difficulty in

the past because of conflicting rulings and any consultation of the compendium will tell you that.

We're not suggesting - I'm not suggesting - that the Committee should be doing something that the House cannot do. The House can decide as it did in, I believe 1960 or 1961, with regard to a ruling by Speaker Abe Harrison - and if you need a precedent that would be the one - that a particular ruling by the Speaker would not be a precedent under which the House would operate. I am suggesting that this Committee should do for the House what the House did in 1961, do its homework for it, present to it a list of those Speakers' Rulings about which the Committee has some concern in terms of how they affect our Rules and our customs and ask the House then to decide whether it wishes those rulings to be precedents or not. I think that's well within the Committee's mandate since the precedents of Speakers' Rulings are very relevant to the Rules of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Now, Mr. Speaker, if Speakers' Rulings become precedents and become forms of proceedings of the House, because that's what the ruling does, and it is under Section 71(3) indicated "The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly stand permanently referred to the Standing Committee . . ." and I see no harm in having a look at whether our forms of proceedings, however they were arrived at, by consensus and then given to the Assembly or by rulings of Speakers or Chairmen or whatever, shouldn't be reviewed to see if we can't get at whatever problems we may have that give us ambiguity when we are proceeding in the House. And, as an aside, I know all my rulings weren't 1000 percent. I am prepared to have a look at them and see how often I had a beeper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham, did you indicate . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I see nothing wrong with a review of Speakers' Rulings if, for no other reason than to have members acquainted with them. I think it would serve a very useful purpose for the committee to take a look at them because they do affect the Rules of the House and the operation of the House. I don't have any particular hangup about it, but I think it would be to everyone's advantage so they could know better the rulings of the House that have been handed down in the past and do become part of our customs and proceedings in this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if Mr. Graham would agree that the House does not have the authority to reflect upon a Speaker's Ruling unless it be by immediate appeal - that's one thing - or, secondly, by a substantive motion.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I have always operated under the philosophy that the House can do anything it wants to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: With regard to that point, although I subscribe generally with Mr. Graham's statement that

the House can do anything it wants to, I would suggest that the committee doing a review and then reporting to the House is in anticipation of the House passing, exactly as you suggest, a substantive motion with regard to any of those rulings, if it wishes to comment on them. But, at the present time, the House has no vehicle with which to review rulings unless it comes to this committee and that's the only place to do it, and I think it's the proper vehicle for it. The substantive motion route would have to be followed, I agree completely, and it would have to be followed if the House decided, on report of this committee, to set aside certain rulings as precedents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Just a further comment, I'd like to say that we wouldn't be reflecting on any Speaker or any Chairman. What we would be suggesting to ourselves is to improve our own procedures as they relate to the present time and if something has become out of use, for whatever reason, a ruling at that time may have been very valid but may no longer be cogent today. So having a look at those procedures won't hurt us and it shouldn't reflect on who made the ruling or when it was made. It may have been very valid at that time, but we have changed our rules all along the way. The House is master of its own destiny to that extent and we should be able to say once in a while some of the things we are doing now are just no longer in tune with what we really want to accomplish and where we want to go.

A MEMBER: That's what we've been doing all day.

MR. P. FOX: Well sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: If I may, I would like to suggest that we continue or that we proceed to do what we agreed to do back in September, that is, have the staff prepare a review of the rulings for the immediate past Session and that we begin to consider those at our next meeting along the guidelines we suggested.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Not a review, just a compendium.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, notes on the rulings, texts of the rulings, Hansard associated with each of those, and distribute them prior to the meeting so that we can discuss them.

If there is time we can go back through three or four Sessions. I made it only one so that we didn't have too heavy a load for any one meeting. Some people suggested last time that we could start back, I think, in the middle-fifties where Mr. Reeves had started doing his Compendium of Rulings, but there probably are a fair number of rulings back then that are irrelevant because of the substantive number of changes in the Rules. So we might as well start in a most recent period and work back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're still suggesting the committee do something that it is not empowered to do by the

House. You are suggesting it do more than the House can do. I am telling you it is not possible; it's against the Rules.

MR. A. ANSTETT: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's possible; I believe the committee has the authority and I do not believe it's against the Rules and I suggest we do it. Perhaps you might want to take the consensus of the committee. If it's the will of the committee to do it, I think we have that authority to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe you have not the authority to do those things that the House has not commanded the committee to do. It's quite clear that a Committee of the House may do only those things which it is instructed to do. I'll give you the actual wording. "A committee can only consider those matters which have been committed to it by the House". All it requires is a simple resolution of the House that that's what the House wants to do; a substantive motion that previous rulings be whatever it is and that the committee do it or something, but it requires the House to make that decision and only the House can do it.

Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: Our Rules are precise and clear and they indicate one exception to that, and that is, that "The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly stand permanently referred to the Standing Committee". That's all we are discussing, the Proceedings and the Order Forms and the Rules. That's what we want to look at, past rules, present rules, it doesn't matter. So, therefore, I think this takes precedence. We're permanently referred to these things as a Rules Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Rules are, but the rulings are not. There is a difference.

MR. P. FOX: Again, it's a matter of interpretation. If rulings are not rules, then we shouldn't follow them; we should forget them. Rules are within which we operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to get bogged down in semantics, but it says on the front of your book - that's the Rule Book and our Rules are in there and we have this committee to decide what the Rules are and for the House to agree or disagree.

Mr. Anstett.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I knew I'd find it. You asked me for the citation earlier. I think I have found the citation that is very specific to the problem at hand, Citation 119 on Page 39 in the Fifth Edition. "Speaker's Rulings, once given, belong to the House which, under SO12, must accept them without appeal or debate, Ottawa procedure. They become precedents and form part of the Rules of Procedure". I rest my case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "They are given under misrepresentation" - same Citation - "the House itself, not the Speaker, should take the initial steps to avoid the consequences or implications." When the House takes those steps and refers it to this Committee or to some other than it can be dealt with.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, only if the Rule has been given under misrepresentation. I am not suggesting that any rulings have been given under misrepresentation. By statement of fact, rulings form part of our Rules of Procedure. The additional material in that citation relates to consideration of rulings which have been given as you suggest.

From point of fact under our Rule 71(3), Rulings of Speakers fall under the ambit of this Committee in accordance with that Citation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Allow me to take the matter under advisement and report back at the next meeting.

Was there anything further under Other Matters?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, on that matter that you are taking under advisement. Could I suggest that you take a measure of the will of the Committee and then if you determine when you take it under advisement that this is properly within the ambit of this Committee's

discussion, that we could at the next meeting begin that review? In other words, if you decide that Citation 119 is applicable that we then begin at the next meeting to begin our review. Otherwise we discuss this for no purpose at all. It will be delayed again and we could well be into the fall since we generally meet very seldom when the House is in Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am open to hearing the will of the Committee. (Agreed)

MR. A. ANSTETT: Bud, your the only one who hasn't said "agreed."

MR. L. SHERMAN: I said "agreed" some time ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything further to come before the Committee?

Committee rise.