

Fourth Session - Fortieth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Rules of the House

Chairperson
The Honourable Daryl Reid
Constituency of Transcona

Vol. LXVII No. 1 - 9 a.m., Friday, June 26, 2015

ISSN 0715-2914

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Fortieth Legislature

| Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| ALLAN, Nancy | St. Vital | NDP |
| ALLUM, James, Hon. | Fort Garry-Riverview | NDP |
| ALTEMEYER, Rob | Wolseley | NDP |
| ASHTON, Steve, Hon. | Thompson | NDP |
| BJORNSON, Peter | Gimli | NDP |
| BLADY, Sharon, Hon. | Kirkfield Park | NDP |
| BRAUN, Erna, Hon. | Rossmere | NDP |
| BRIESE, Stuart | Agassiz | PC |
| CALDWELL, Drew, Hon. | Brandon East | NDP |
| CHIEF, Kevin, Hon. | Point Douglas | NDP |
| CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon. | Kildonan | NDP |
| CROTHERS, Deanne, Hon. | St. James | NDP |
| CULLEN, Cliff | Spruce Woods | PC |
| DEWAR, Greg, Hon. | Selkirk | NDP |
| DRIEDGER, Myrna | Charleswood | PC |
| EICHLER, Ralph | Lakeside | PC |
| EWASKO, Wayne | Lac du Bonnet | PC |
| FRIESEN, Cameron | Morden-Winkler | PC |
| GAUDREAU, Dave | St. Norbert | NDP |
| GERRARD, Jon, Hon. | River Heights | Liberal |
| GOERTZEN, Kelvin | Steinbach | PC |
| GRAYDON, Cliff | Emerson | PC |
| HELWER, Reg | Brandon West | PC |
| HOWARD, Jennifer | Fort Rouge | NDP |
| IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon. | Fort Richmond | NDP |
| JHA, Bidhu | Radisson | NDP |
| KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon. | Swan River | NDP |
| LATHLIN, Amanda | The Pas | NDP |
| LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon. | Dawson Trail | NDP |
| MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon. | St. Johns | NDP |
| MALOWAY, Jim | Elmwood | NDP |
| MARCELINO, Flor, Hon. | Logan | NDP |
| MARCELINO, Ted | Tyndall Park | NDP |
| MARTIN, Shannon | Morris | PC |
| MELNICK, Christine | Riel | NDP |
| MITCHELSON, Bonnie | River East | PC |
| NEVAKSHONOFF, Thomas, Hon. | Interlake | NDP |
| OSWALD, Theresa | Seine River | NDP |
| PALLISTER, Brian | Fort Whyte | PC |
| PEDERSEN, Blaine | Midland | PC |
| PETTERSEN, Clarence | Flin Flon | NDP |
| PIWNIUK, Doyle | Arthur-Virden | PC |
| REID, Daryl, Hon. | Transcona | NDP |
| ROBINSON, Eric, Hon. | Kewatinook | NDP |
| RONDEAU, Jim | Assiniboia | NDP |
| ROWAT, Leanne | Riding Mountain | PC |
| SARAN, Mohinder, Hon. | The Maples | NDP |
| SCHULER, Ron | St. Paul | PC |
| SELBY, Erin | Southdale | NDP |
| SELINGER, Greg, Hon. | St. Boniface | NDP |
| SMOOK, Dennis | La Verendrye | PC |
| STEFANSON, Heather | Tuxedo | PC |
| STRUTHERS, Stan | Dauphin | NDP |
| SWAN, Andrew | Minto | NDP |
| WIEBE, Matt | Concordia | NDP |
| WIGHT, Melanie, Hon. | Burrows | NDP |
| WISHART, Ian | Portage la Prairie | PC |

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

Friday, June 26, 2015

TIME – 9 a.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park)

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

*Hon. Messrs. Ashton, Chomiak, Gerrard,
 Hon. Ms. Marcelino, Hon. Mr. Reid,
 Hon. Ms. Wight*

*Messrs. Cullen, Goertzen, Marcelino, Schuler,
 Wiebe*

APPEARING:

*Ms. Patricia Chaychuk, Clerk of the Legislative
 Assembly of Manitoba*

*Mr. Rick Yarish, Deputy Clerk of the Legislative
 Assembly of Manitoba*

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

*Proposed Amendments to the Rules, Orders and
 Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative
 Assembly of Manitoba*

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. We'll call the Standing Committee on Rules of the House to order.

Good morning. Will the Standing Committee please come to order.

This meeting has been called to consider the proposed amendments to the Rules, Orders, and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

Our first item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I nominate Mr. Marcelino.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Marcelino has been nominated. Are there any further nominations?

Hearing no further nominations, Mr. Marcelino has been elected as Vice-Chairperson of this committee.

You will find before you on the table copies of the document entitled Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals, June 2015, which we will be considering today.

For the information of the committee, while the English version of this package is available for your consideration, the French document is still in the process of being translated.

Does the committee agree to proceed with the consideration of the English text with the understanding that the French version of the text will be made available when the package is reported to the House? *[Agreed]*

I need to ask the consideration of this committee how long they wish to sit this morning.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): Until this package has been considered.

Mr. Chairperson: Until this entire package has been considered. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Does the committee agree to consider the amendments in numerical order, with the understanding that we can stop at any time if members have any questions or comments? *[Agreed]*

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I spoke with the—we were trying to arrange this meeting to be most expeditious for everybody here, and, unfortunately, the leader of the—former leader—the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) was not able to attend, and I undertook to indicate that at the beginning of this meeting, that he agrees with these rules and he particularly wants to thank both parties, the leader of the—House leader for the PC Party and the House leader for the NDP for considering the roles and functions of the independent members.

And, within the context of these rules, we have diligently tried to reflect those interests, so I have—it's a rare, but I think honoured position for me as Government House Leader, to have the—and I think leader of—the Opposition House Leader would agree

with me that we've tried very hard to reflect the interests of the independent party, and we will—the interests of the independent parties are—party is reflected in these rules, and to the extent that—I don't think there will be anything unusual as we go through these rules—but to the extent that which the rules reflect the role of an independent party, we have tried our best to, in the parliamentary tradition, to reflect those issues. Thank you.

Mr. Goertzen: I just concur. I spoke with Mr. Gerrard last night at committee, and he is pleased with the rules package and wanted this committee to go ahead in his absence. He just had a scheduling conflict, but he certainly supports it.

Mr. Chairperson: Does the committee wish the Clerk and Deputy Clerk to provide an explanation for each amendment as we go through the document?
[Agreed]

Does the Government House Leader have any opening comments?

* (09:10)

Mr. Chomiak: Other than to thank everyone for their tremendous work and—I've never been a rules-based person, but I've learned as I've sat in this Legislature—pardon? [interjection] I've never been a rules-based, because I've been a kind of a—in 25 years, I—when I became a lawyer, I learned all the rules of the court and—but I'm very, very impressed with the—very impressed with the commitment from all people in the Legislature to try to make these rules both functional and reflective of what we need to do in a parliamentary democracy.

And I often have youth groups in my office, and I often raise the issue of the fact that we shout and yell at each other, but I always say that we fight with words and we have this amazing ability to discuss issues and function despite very strong objections to some of the rules and some of the issues, but we get through it and we don't—and then we walk out of the Chamber and we're friends. And that's pretty significant and that's the genius of the parliamentary system.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank the honourable minister for the opening statement.

Does the Official Opposition House Leader (Mr. Goertzen) have an opening statement?

Mr. Goertzen: I'll try to be brief. I think the last time this committee met, Brad Pitt and Jennifer

Aniston were still married. That was 10 years ago, so I won't delay this any longer than it needs to be.

But it is important to note that, as we went through this rules process together with the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), the Government House Leader (Mr. Chomiak), the independent member, the member for Spruce Woods (Mr. Cullen), we—I think this is version No. 8 and probably the third sort of conceptual version that we went through, and I think it strikes the right balance between ensuring that two mandates are met: the mandate of government that's given by the electorate to govern but also the mandate of opposition, which is also given by the electorate, to be able to oppose vigorously things that the opposition feels it needs to oppose on behalf of the public. And it also meets the needs of independent members, who have a special place here in the Legislature and need to have their rights protected as well.

So we believe that this overall package has struck the appropriate balance. As we said yesterday in the House, this is—not to be overly dramatic, but it's a little bit like the Charter. It's described as a living tree, and this should also be the same sort of thing that continues to evolve and change.

This should not be the end of a process; it should be the beginning. I think we've been, as all of us as legislatures—legislators, been derelict to—in not meeting regularly as a rules committee. We've addressed that in this package. There should be regular meetings of the rules committee. They won't all be this overwhelming in terms of changes, of course, but there'll always be tweakings and changes to ensure that that appropriate balance is made between the mandate of government and the mandate of opposition and, again, to remind ourselves that we play rough sometimes in terms of what politics is and is always going to be. It's always going to be an adversarial type of environment, but the rules that govern that environment should be impartial and should work for everyone who is involved in the system.

And I think we've done our best to strike a balance. We are not perfect in this, and so, again, there need to be changes. They should continue to be tweaked as we go along. Over the years, there'll be other players who are involved in that, but they should all look at it through the mandate—or through the lens of it being a balance between government and opposition meeting their mandates.

I suspect sometime in the future there'll be large changes again, maybe 10 or 15 years from now, and I think that's almost guaranteed. And I think it's guaranteed that I won't be involved in those negotiations, so I'm happy for that as well.

We're willing to move forward.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank the honourable member for the opening statement.

We will now begin consideration of the document itself, and for your information, I will be referring to the item numbers listed in the far left 'colume'—column of the document.

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Marcelino, on a point of order.

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): Can I ask leave from the committee that—if I could take pictures of today's event for posterity?

Mr. Chairperson: Unless there's a will of the committee to do that, we normally don't have that practice of taking pictures in the committee room.

Mr. Goertzen: Perhaps I'd allow leave for a picture at the conclusion of this committee. We could perhaps do a picture together. It is, I think, a significant day, and we could do it at the conclusion of committee. I understand the intention of the member.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, so we'll give an opportunity, then, at the conclusion of this meeting.

Mr. Chomiak: I think the picture ought to include all members of the committee and members of the Clerk's Office that have done what I believe is exceptional work to achieve this.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Then it seems like there's a will of the committee to permit a photograph of the entire group of folks at the conclusion of this meeting. That's agreed? *[Agreed]* Thank you.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: We will begin consideration of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals, June 2015, starting with item 1, Consequential rule change, which takes effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Rick Yarish (Deputy Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba): So the first change on the

list here is just a consequential rule change. We noticed as we were going through that the definition of recognized opposition party as it currently is in our rules actually excludes the official opposition because there's a separate definition for that party. So this corrects that because we were making several references to recognized opposition parties and it needed to include the official opposition. So there's a few changes of this nature along, and that's what this first one's about.

Mr. Chairperson: Any comments or questions? No comments or questions?

Item 1—pass.

Item 2, Sessional calendar. We'll start because there are several there. I'll start with sessional calendar, effective April 20th, 2016.

Ms. Patricia Chaychuk (Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba): All of rule 2 goes from page 3 to 11 as one package. So, if you want, I can give you an explanation of the whole thing but kind of page by page to help understand it better.

On page 3, it defines three periods of the year that the House could be sitting, in November, spring and fall, with the exception that the House must start sitting on the first Wednesday in March. It clarifies what we have in our current rules, which is like a very wide-range period of time when the House could sit to now much more structured and defined times. The House would still be waiting for a letter from the government to call the House back into order sent to the Speaker and the Speaker would be advising the member of that.

On the bottom of page 3 and carrying over to the top of page 4, a provision has been added so that if government-specified bills, in spite of all the previous provisions that are—that will be coming, don't pass by the time of the rising in June, the House can sit for an additional four days, and at the end of four days the bills will be deemed completed.

Hopefully, it's rare that this provision would be used because there are a number of provisions in there for the various stages—for second reading, committee stage, report stage and concurrence and third reading—to be concluded. But, in the event that doesn't happen, this is a fail-safe which would help to guarantee that government bills will be completed in a timely manner that will allow ample opportunity at every stage for consideration and deliberation.

There is a similar provision for at the end of the fall sittings when designated bills are being completed that there are opportunities along the way to deal with every stage in a reasoned and considered manner. But, by the time of the end of the fall sittings, if those bills aren't completed they are still wrapped up and completed on the deeming date.

So I'll stop there in case anybody has any questions. That's sort of like the overall structure of a sitting.

Mr. Wiebe: That's passed with a vote?

Ms. Chaychuk: No. They're deemed passed. They're deemed passed on deeming day. But, prior to that point, there are ample opportunities for votes to be taking place. This is only if for some reason you don't see that happening. But I'm really finding it hard to try to think of a reason why it wouldn't happen. But, as a fail-safe, there's no vote in that case. But for 99.9 per cent of the time there would be votes along the way for second and third readings and committee stage and report stage.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Chomiak. No. Mr. Goertzen.

* (09:20)

Mr. Goertzen: Just on intention, I think it was those who were putting these together to ensure that there would be general structure to the Assembly in terms of when it sat, and we would encourage, obviously, those who are—come after us to ensure that that structure is generally followed and to fall into that pattern. When there is an election year, that's difficult, obviously, but beyond the election years, we think it's important that there be a general structure so that members can organize their affairs and the Assembly can organize their affairs as well.

It's also important to remember that while there are—there is movement of bills through this system, there will never be more time—there has never been more time to debate bills than in this calendar. And I don't think there's ever been a time that I have been an MLA where there'll have been this much time to debate bills.

And so the final sort of deeming proposition, I agree with the Clerk; I can't imagine many scenarios where it would ever be used. And I think what members will find going forward under this calendar is they'll never have more opportunity to debate bills than through this process. Often now we find ourselves very constrained with time for debating bills; I think this will be changed significantly.

Mr. Chomiak: Yes, I want to concur with the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen). In fact, the intention is to have more time to deal with bills and vote, and even though it may appear that there's a constricted debate, in fact, the way the rules are rolled out, there will be more time to do this.

And I concur with the member for Steinbach that the intention is to have the ability of everyone to debate and vote.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further questions or comments?

Mr. Marcelino: Have we provided anything for times of emergencies and natural disasters?
[interjection]

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Chaychuk.

Ms. Chaychuk: Pardon me. Sorry. I never speak, so I'm not used to having to wait. Even I have to learn.

As we work through all nine pages here, there are other provisions that are coming into place. And that's on the—two pages later, but, yes, we do still have provisions for emergency recalls.

Mr. Marcelino: I am more concerned about if there should be any terrorist attack in the Legislative Assembly itself. Is there any provision as to where the Legislative Assembly can sit?

Ms. Chaychuk: That's not something that's ever identified in the rule book of any assembly, but most assemblies would have a separate plan for needing to meet in a time of urgent necessity other than the Legislative Building. But that's not something you would put in the rule book.

Mr. Chomiak: I think there's some sense that the intention of the committee is that if there is occasion where the Legislature could meet in other locations, we would be amenable to that.

Mr. Goertzen: In going through this, it is important to remember that it's impossible for us to plan for every possible event or extreme situation that might happen. Some of that has to be left to the sort of common sense of legislators at that time. So, I mean, we're sort of doing the—well, I know, I mean, sometimes that seems like a stretch, but I think in most scenarios the common sense of elected officials governs.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments on that? No.

It has been mentioned a few moments ago that section 2 covers quite a number of pages, up to page 11, and it includes the topics under item 2 of Sessional calendar, Recalling the House, Specified government bills and Designated government bills. And I want members to be aware that when we are voting on this item, it will include all of those topic headings and explanations.

Any further comments or questions?

Ms. Chaychuk: I'll continue on, then, because we were leaving off on page 4.

The calendar will now also be incorporating constituency break weeks periodically throughout the calendar in order to allow all MLAs to have more time to spend with their constituencies and with constituency issues, and the purpose would be to have that week and then the Legislature would resume sitting after that break week is over.

And we've identified four of them in the constituency week time frame that takes place on pages 4 to 5: there is one that takes place around Remembrance Day; there's one that would take place around the time of the public schools' break; one that takes place around May 1st; and one that takes place in October in the third week.

Continuing on, then, under recall of the House, there are still provisions for the government to be able to call the House back into session on an emergency basis. The government will now be required to indicate the nature of the emergency in the letter of recall to the Speaker, and the Speaker will have to advise members what the nature of the recall is. The House can be recalled for a period of three weeks, and after three weeks it would have to rise. However, by observing a break week of one week, the government can then call another emergency recall, and so a pattern would be there such that you could be sitting for three weeks on an emergency recall session, take a break, and then another emergency recall session could be held, another break and another emergency recall session.

Mr. Ron Schuler (St. Paul): If need be, could the Legislature decide to extend that three weeks, let's say, for another two weeks, by unanimous leave, or is that a must?

Ms. Chaychuk: It would be by unanimous leave, but through unanimous leave, anything is possible, and subrule 2(7) indicates that if the House leaders agree, the House may meet at any other time referred to in

these rules to still allow the flexibility for situations that may arise.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions on that point? No.

Ms. Chaychuk: Going on to page 6, then, we are introducing a new concept into the rules, one that may be familiar to members who would have seen sessional orders for the past five years or so, and that is creating a category of government bills called specified government bills.

In order for a bill to be considered a specified government bill, it has to meet three tests. The first test is first reading of that bill must be moved no later than the 20th day after the presentation of the Speech from the Throne—20th sitting day. The second reading must be moved no later than the 14th sitting day after that time trigger for the first readings to have been moved. And the third condition is the bill is not included on the list of designated bills that the opposition can hold over to the fall.

So, basically, a government could have a number of bills be specified, but it has to meet these tests. If a bill is introduced and does not meet these tests, it is not a specified bill, and it is not captured by the time triggers in the rules. So, again, the first hurdle is first reading is moved no later than the 20th sitting day after the Throne Speech and the second reading must be moved no later than the 14th sitting day after that deadline for the first readings.

You're all with me so far? Okay.

Then, moving on, we have some actions that would then take place to deal with these second readings of specified bills. On the same day that the bills need to be moved as the outside last time limit for second readings, the opposition party gets to designate five of those bills in a category to be known as designated bills, and the purpose of a designated bill is to hold it over to the fall to allow more time for consideration at second reading, more time for consideration at committee stage and for concurrence and third reading. Designated bills cannot be completed in the spring sittings ending in June.

So there's a balance here. There's an ability for a government to bring in legislation in a timely manner in the goal of trying to get those bills completed in the spring, but there's also a counterbalance for the opposition to look at the legislative package and say,

there are some bills we would like to spend some more time on, and hold them over until the fall.

* (09:30)

Mr. Goertzen: Just to concur with that, I mean, this was sort of the balance and the trade-off to ensure that opposition could spend several months making their points on bills that were particularly contentious; that might often be the budget. I hope that doesn't become sort of the norm in Manitoba where the budget is sort of by default held over to the fall. That would be the opposition's choice, but it would also be a negotiating point for opposition to negotiate with government, I suppose, to try not to have that budget held over. So there will be quite a bit of power for the opposition in a negotiation in this scenario to try to move their budget in the spring. There will also be many times, of course, when the government doesn't get their bills in on the specified dates and opposition can negotiate that as well, to have those moved sooner if they choose to.

So there's plenty of points in here for opposition has a good deal of authority in terms of negotiation. My hope is that the budget doesn't become the default over to the fall, but that's a concession I wasn't able to wrestle out of Mr. Chomiak. But, obviously, this leaves a lot of authority for opposition, and I guess government will have to both be organized and willing to work with opposition on that, which is not a bad thing. It's a good thing.

Mr. Chomiak: I concur entirely with the comments of the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen).

Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation): Yes, I think one of the key elements that also needs to be added in the mix—not only does it enhance the ability of an opposition to delay without the current scenario, which we, you know, do periodically get into where we—because of the open-ended nature of the session, we end up with significant delays on occasion, but what it does do, really—if you were to actually, like you probably mathematically calculate the amount of scrutiny that bills will go through now, and the number of sitting days and the calendar time period in terms of months will be much greater. I think we tend to forget how much we compress bills, so I think this section is important. I notice we passed this. A lot of the provisions in here actually strengthen the reality of an opposition that wants to delay, organizing the public, I mean, all the other various dimensions that go into our system in terms of bills. So, even though

it has a defined end, it really, on average, will result in much greater scrutiny of bills.

Mr. Goertzen: Just a quick point. This section is modelled after the sessional agreement that Ms. Howard and I negotiated two years ago.

Ms. Chaychuk: One other point I would add is it is possible for bills to be moved for second reading before the deadline dates mentioned here. It doesn't mean it has to wait until that time. This is just the ending day by which the second reading needs to move. There's still a lot of ability for bills to come in early, be discussed early and even sent off to committee early. This doesn't prohibit that from happening.

So, after bills have had—government bills have had the second reading moved and the opposition has designated which bills are being hold—held over, the next sitting day is the day when second reading has to be completed in order to make sure that bills can be sent off to committee to allow sufficient time for public presentations to be heard and for clause by clause to be considered.

Time is allowed in committee, but then no later than the 13th sitting day—and that's not calendar day, that's sitting day, so that could mean it's almost—could be up to a period of three weeks—the standing committees must complete consideration of the bills in committee and then report them back to the House, and there are provisions that follow a little later on that talk about what would happen if a committee happened to be sitting that night and how matters would be concluded. But, again, a committee could be meeting earlier and could be finishing its business and reporting back to the House well before this deadline. This fail-safe is only here if you happen to have a committee that's sitting on the final night of that deadline.

There are deadlines also for when report stage and—have to be completed on bills that have been reported back to the House, which is no later than three sitting days after the final committee report day, and also a deadline for concurrence and third reading, which is two days following the completion of report stage. And, again, that's to guarantee that there is time at those steps, but nothing prevents these bills from being dealt with even sooner and earlier in the sitting calendar portions than these deadlines.

If the second reading, report stage, and concurrence and third readings stages are not completed

on the designated trigger days, there are actions outlined in 2(15) that would follow. On that day, the House is not adjourned until those actions are completed. If at 3:30 we're still in routine proceedings, the Speaker interrupts and proceeds to orders of the day. At 4 p.m., the Speaker interrupts and puts the questions on the remaining bills without further debate or amendment, though you can have votes. Matters of privilege and points of order are held until the votes are completed, and these divisions on these bills can't be deferred to a later date.

Things can be waived; sometimes you might need to, a little bit of leave in the House. But this is the intention for trying to make sure the process is finished in an orderly manner.

There are also provisions in 2(16) for what would happen if a committee is sitting up last night to draw it to a close, and a time of 9 p.m. would be allowed for public presentations. But, by a UC of the committee, that could be extended 'til 10 o'clock. At 11 p.m., amendments must be distributed in committee, and at midnight the Chair starts putting the question to complete the amendments and the bills.

And the idea of having a time trigger in was to make sure that public presenters are not here 'til midnight or 2 in the morning waiting to make a presentation. And I'll pause there in case there are questions.

Mr. Goertzen: A couple of things. We specifically put in a designated time at second and third readings to ensure that opposition is able to speak to all the bills that are going to second and third reading to just ensure that happens. There needs to be opportunity. There should be more opportunity than ever with this calendar, but we want to ensure that opposition has the opportunity at both second and third readings to speak to the bills.

Also, and this is really a point that Mr. Gerrard made strong within our negotiations to a bill, then, is much time, more time than we've had before for committees. Committees is an important part of our process. We are one of two, I think, provinces that have public presentations. This should allow for more time than ever for committees to be held. We extended the time for written presentations to be made for 24 hours after the committees, which is a concession to allow for more time for written presentations.

And, you know, I think that this—the recent history—at least my time here and any time I can remember before, any government that didn't go out of their way to ensure that committees were held to ensure as many people who wanted to speak as were interested to speak, there's a political price for that. And I don't think that that's something that any government should ever try to do. If they ever tried to do, it would go poorly for them.

And I would say that my experience here is that—both as an opposition member and otherwise—has been that governments go out of their way to ensure those committee hearings happen—and because it goes very poorly for governments if they don't. And so we've had committee hearings on Saturdays and on Sundays and throughout the week. So we've sat 13 days sometimes on committees, and I think that that's appropriate, and that's what should happen. We need to ensure those committees happen.

The only thing that I think was poor was when we made committee members or members of the public be here at 3 or 4 in the morning and present. I think that was disrespectful to them and didn't—wasn't—didn't shine light on us either—a positive light.

So I think that takes care of that, but we'll have more time for committees than ever, and that's good. We want to preserve and strengthen the committee system because it's something that we're all proud of as legislators. Even when those committees are difficult, and we've all—all of us—I looked around this table—sat on some difficult committees. But they're valuable, and so I think we made a system that'll make it even stronger.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, and I want to echo the degree to which this, I think, deals with the paradox of our committees, and that is that we have that unique ability for Manitobans to present. It's—is something that is used quite frequently when it comes to more controversial bills, but there's been a bit of a paradox that there's often a lot of frustration that goes with the committee process, and not the least of which is when we have late-night sittings.

And a lot of it really is not even the deliberate intent of the government of the day. It's often just a matter of the calendar, the scheduling and the fact that without a fixed calendar we often end up with a lot of bills brought through in a short period of time at the end of a session by agreement.

* (09:40)

And one of the first things that gets compressed is the 'committee'-committee stage. You still have the committee stage, but what this does is it shifts—this shifts the paradigm significantly. It—to my mind, other than when you have, you know, leave, and there may be a circumstance where there—that may change it, it really takes out the major causes of the frustration: late sittings past midnight. And I've been there, done that, both in opposition and government. I think we all agree that that's not the intent, and, you know, there may be exceptional circumstances where you even use some of the provisions to sit later.

Giving some greater ability for people to schedule when they appear, that's another frustration. I've seen committee hearings where people have sat here at three, four, five committee hearings and do not get a chance to speak. So the—you know, it really, I think, actually significantly reforms our committee process because we should be proud as Manitobans of this. Again, that paradox is that it's not necessarily the view coming out of committees.

I also think that what's important here is we're shifting the dynamic with the consideration of potential amendments as well, because one of the weaknesses of the way we normally do business, and it's not intentional; usually, it's just a matter, again, of scheduling, is I know certainly as opposition critic or as minister, I've been in committees where good points were raised by presenters, and I'll say this as a minister, good points were raised by the opposition. But, again, given the dynamic of getting a bill through, we often will defer the consideration of amendments to report stage, which, you know, is an important element as well, but I've watched, you know, dozens of presenters who actually make fairly decent points, and then, of course, we push through the bill. So there's another level of frustration. And that's not to say that government is always going to listen but, sometimes, with a bit of a time to think about it, I'll predict that with a more organized committee structure, what will happen is you will see more ability for governments or, potentially, I suppose, for opposition, you know, on opposition bills, for the mover of the bill to actually consider the points raised by the presenter, go to legal counsel and get amendments drafted up.

It's important to note, again, that we essentially—usually, we have a whole series of presenters, but the government has its amendments lined up, and the opposition has its amendments lined up, and they're rarely influenced by the presenters other than the broader, you know, perspective that the presenters

may have. And I have seen cases on bills, particularly on some of the less controversial bills, where there are some really good points made in committee. So I actually think this is a significant reform of how we do business, and I look forward to the day where people walk out of the committee hearings and actually feel good about it because I think Manitobans should. We are unique. I think we are one of two that does have hearings. And I would say we're No. 1 in terms of using it.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments on this item?

Mr. Goertzen: Briefly. We have committed as a rules group, for lack of a better word, to have at least one and I think maybe two rules committees in the fall where we're going to look also at standing committees generally and how to strengthen those. So I want to put that on the record.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Any further comments?

Ms. Chaychuk: All right. So you will now have seen that yes, we do have identified dates when the second readings, committees, report stage and concurrence and third readings of specified government bills must be completed. And then, again, if for any reason we're not there by the time of rising in June, we do have that provision for those four additional sitting days where the House can come back, deal with the matters, and at the end of those four days, items are considered to be passed.

I should also mention for bills that are not specified, i.e., they come in too late, they're not governed by any of these provisions, and that would still require negotiation and, ideally, a consensus agreement between government and opposition for those bills to be completed.

When we come back in the fall, the focus is, then, on designated bills, and the rules now say that within two sitting days of a session resuming, second reading of the designated bills must be completed. Once that period is—and on that day, if the motion hasn't been moved yet but they should have been, there is time and provisions for the minister's critics and independent members to speak and for a question-and-answer period on those bills.

The bills are then sent to committee, or, if they're completed sooner, sent to committee sooner and the committees must report back no later than the ninth sitting day after the second reading completion date in the House to allow time in committee. Then, no

later than three sitting days after the committee report day, report stages are completed, and no later than two sitting days after report stages are completed, concurrence and third readings are completed.

If actions are required to complete the stages of designated bills, they are outlined in subrules 2(21) to (22) and 2(23). And we had to add a provision for Committee of the Whole in 2(3) in the event that one of the designated bills held over is a bill like BITSA, which receives its 'consittee'-committee consideration in Committee of the Whole.

And we've retained the rule, but, if there's no Speaker, the Clerk acts in the Speaker's place for the purpose of these rules.

So all of this together is the new proposed rule 2. Lots of different pieces of it, but it works together to try to find an integrated balance between the start of a session, the end of a session, the introduction of bills and the measured and complete consideration of the bills.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions? We're ready?

Item 2—pass.

We'll move on to item 3, Friday Supply sittings, effective April 20th, 2016.

Ms. Chaychuk: Yes, we have had provisions in the past for Friday sittings of Supply, but this now clarifies that we will only have Friday sittings of Supply if there is agreement between opposition House leaders and the Government House Leader and written notification or some sort of designation given to the House by Wednesday of that sitting week, and the rules group was considered enough to accept the idea of that notification coming by Wednesday, because, for practical staffing purposes, we need those two days to allow time for Assembly staff to be scheduled for Fridays, because they may sit Fridays or they may not.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments, questions?

Item 3—pass.

Now move on to item 4, Intersessional Committees, effective April 20th, 2016.

Ms. Chaychuk: This rule is now providing a protection for not only MLAs but for members of the public to indicate that there are certain periods of the year when intersessional committee meetings will not be held for the purpose of accepting public

presentations. And those months are January; February; June, when the House is not sitting; July and August.

We have often had the Legislature sitting into the summer months, and that has often potentially been a hardship for people who are coming to make presentations to be here and to wait to have to give a presentation. Now they know they will not be sitting in the committee room in these months unless there is an agreement between opposition House leaders and the Government House Leader. They do have the ability, particularly in exceptional circumstances, to allow for intersessional committee meetings for public presentations, but the goal is to try to avoid that, if possible.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I think it's important to note that what this really does is also reflect the fact that the committee hearings are tied into this new legislative calendar. So, again, there are times when the Legislature does its business, and the intent here is to have the committee process, which is, of course, the integral part of that, parallel that. And, again, I think it addresses one of the frustrations with the committee hearings we've had, committee hearings that are held at a time which, really, are not the prime time for Manitobans, and I think it's reflected here. So this is really matching the committee hearing process with our sessional calendar.

* (09:50)

Mr. Goertzen: I want to apologize to the Government House Leader (Mr. Chomiak). I—late last night I was reading this rule, and it occurred to me that we wanted the intersessional committees to be considered a sitting day to be reflective of how often the House is sitting, because we sit more often than sometimes people realize. But we don't want the intersessional committees to count in terms of the sitting dates for timelines because that would throw off the entire calendar.

So, for example, if an emergency session was—or, sorry, if a throne speech was called, that would start the trigger for the counting of the days. But if there were 20 intersessional committees in two days, it would be as though the House had sat for 22 days and that's not the intention.

I'm happy to take a break. We need to discuss this or I apologize; it was a late night.

Mr. Ashton: Well, I wonder if we just can't designate sessional—you know, just come up with a different title for these sittings. They're less like—

An Honourable Member: I happen to have an amendment.

Mr. Ashton: Okay. *[interjection]* Of course, that means we have to look at it for 24 hours. Is that right? Or, no, sorry.

Mr. Goertzen: The amendment would be the rule 4. So I move the amendment

THAT rule 4(6) be amended to add the following words after "Legislature":

"but are not to be included in the count of sitting days for Specified and Designated Bills."

Motion presented.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments? Questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? *[Agreed]*

The amendment will be included.

Mr. Wiebe: Just get some clarification: Is Public Accounts considered a standing committee?

Mr. Chairperson: I believe it is.

Mr. Wiebe: Just to clarify then, Public Accounts can't meet in January, February, June, July or August?

Ms. Chaychuk: This is for the purpose of hearing public presentations and Public Accounts doesn't receive public presentations.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank the honourable member.

Now, any further questions on item 4, Intersessional committees, as amended? No? We're ready for the question?

The pleasure of the committee to adopt item 4, Intersessional committees, effective April 20th, 2016—*[interjection]* As amended.

Shall it pass? *[Agreed]*

I thank all my colleagues here for their advice this morning. Apparently, I'm not up to the—quite to the challenge yet.

We'll now move on to item 5, Challenges to Speaker's rulings, effective October 20th, 2015.

Ms. Chaychuk: So many years in the making, this one, and finally here. This one—

An Honourable Member: It's not passed yet.

Ms. Chaychuk: I said it's here; I didn't say it was passed. I said it was here.

This will remove the appeal of the ruling of the Speaker on points of order. We have to change it in this section and you'll see it later on about 10 pages down the road. But this now means you can only appeal the ruling of a Speaker on a matter of privilege, not a point of order.

Mr. Goertzen: And I'll just say this was not a concession by opposition. This is something opposition, or as an Opposition House Leader, we have talked about for quite a long time. There might be a time in the future where future House leaders want to consider removing the appeal from matters of privilege, but this is, at least, a step in the right direction.

Mr. Ashton: I think you'll recognize that the vast majority of appeal—appeals here are basically tactical, and not necessarily including all of my points of order when I was Opposition House Leader, but, you know, it's kind of one of the Manitoba traditions that really, in a lot of ways, is out of step with virtually every other Legislature, certainly, in the country and, I think, elsewhere. The big difference I want to note is the Speaker's now elected, and when you have an appointed Speaker, you—I mean you had Speakers that obviously were certainly independent.

I'm reminded we just had the 25th anniversary of Meech Lake and certainly the Speaker of the day, who was independent even though he was an appointed Speaker. But now that we actually elect the Speaker, the pattern across the country is that you then have some recognition of the Speaker's role as rulings being final. I think the difference on—in, again, a matter of privilege, is essentially what the Speaker rules a matter of privilege, whether it's a prima facie case and it's had the notice provisions. There then is a motion to, you know, to the House that's either accepted or not, so you, you know—there is potential to appeal the Speaker's ruling on that it's not a prima facie case, but there is a rather different circumstance, and whether we eventually eliminate that or not, in this particular case, the Speaker's role is to enforce the rules of the House.

And I think this will take out some of the tactical elements. I think it'll make it a lot easier for Speakers

as well, because I've often found that the Speaker's in a very difficult circumstance, you know, as the sessions get a little bit more heated. You know, trying to keep order and decorum, you know, with the focus tactically being actually on the Speaker himself or herself. So, yes, I think, it's long overdue and I—you know, again, it's somewhat different from matter of privilege, but we'll see if that evolves over time as well.

Mr. Goertzen: And the tactical element has normally been used to delay bills. That'll now be—opposition will be able to delay the bill through six months, which is all bills have ever really been delayed in the past so that the tactical element isn't as important.

Mr. Ashton: Just further to that, maybe it's *[inaudible]* former opposition House leader and our current Opposition House Leader. We've also built in other tactical elements that allow an opposition to make its point, particularly the strength in Opposition Days. Actually, we have about two Opposition Days, which we didn't have before. So I think, throughout this, there's been an attempt to recognize that by taking out this as a tactic, we're actually putting in other tactics that are available, that are actually more substantive that actually do involve debate rather than, you know, than strictly bell ringing.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 5, Challenges to Speaker's rulings, effective October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 6, Electronics during oral questions, effective October 20th, 2015.

Ms. Chaychuk: I'll explain this rule, but, after this rule, I'm going to then turn the floor over to Rick Yarish—Mr. Yarish, for a while, because he and I worked on these rules together as a team, and I would like him to also have the ability to be explaining some of these to the committee as well. So we'll co-share our time.

Mr. Chairperson: Any comments or questions?

Ms. Chaychuk: This rule will now be changed. We've had a ban where members couldn't use electronic devices during oral questions. You will now be allowed to use them but in the loge—not from your seat, not from the back of the Chamber, but you have to go to the loge to use it. And it's in

recognition of the fact that members may have some very important emails or texts or phone messages coming in, particularly for—in the case of family emergency or some other critical situation related to their constituency. Members can now go to the loge and use their electronic devices there during oral questions. *[interjection]* We didn't say pictures. No, it just says using electronic devices.

Mr. Chairperson: Any—Mr. Ashton.

Mr. Ashton: Some of us like to describe this as the Luddite rule, so we're now saying that we're—no offence to Luddites here—but we're actually going to be less Luddite than we were before. I think it does recognize one thing, increasingly with, you know, text messaging and email communication and cellphone communication. I've had situations where I've had urgent family issues that I have been monitoring, family members were sick, you know, various different things. And it is, you know, it is rather difficult when you don't have that communication. So I think it preserves that and I think it's a compromise allowing it in the loge as well. I think the key thing is we can always step outside to take a message, but, by having it in the loge, it does allow people to—MLAs to still be part of, you know, question period and to return to their seat, for example, if they're a minister taking a call. So this actually took quite a bit of discussion, but I think it's a reasonable compromise.

* (10:00)

Mr. Schuler: Having travelled to a lot of different legislatures, we are certainly behind what is allowed in those. But I do also understand there is something called compromise and incremental change. And, if this is the change we're going to get, I think it's a good step. I believe in 10, 15 years—and it's been said around this Chamber that probably in 10, 15 years, it'll—there'll be a need for another for another set of rule changes. And I don't think this catches us up, but it is an incremental change in getting us caught up. I think these are a reality.

For those of us who have teenagers in the house, I live with this 24-7. I've accepted it. I understand that when you're in the kitchen, you text your children in the living room to come for dinner. It's the way things are now done, but at least we have an incremental change.

Mr. Wiebe: Just very quickly, I want to echo the comments of Mr. Schuler with regards to—I'm not quite a teenager, but I am the youngest on the

committee, so I think I should, you know, lend my voice to this.

I do feel that this is a good first step. I do think that we should revisit this. I actually have put a lot of thought into how we could adopt more usage. You know, as I sit here with two screens in front of me and take all of my notes and do all of my work electronically now, I think we need to look at how we can do this. But it is open to too much abuse at this point, so I would just encourage future committees to look at how we could implement this without abuses happening in the future.

Mr. Goertzen: The committee will meet two times a year going forward, and so, absolutely, those are the kind of things we want to encourage, that culture.

Just as a reminder, as an Opposition House Leader, any member who's ever come to me and said, I have a family issue; I'm going to be on my BlackBerry during question period. We've never called a point of order on that member and we never would.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Mr. Marcelino: Yes, as a recently minted government whip, the only way that I could communicate with the assistant to tell her which members of the government benches are not there is through the texting mode of my iPhone. And, if I were to go to the loge every time, there have been times when I make a list of those who are not in there, and it's the only way that I could communicate or else I have to go out, and I don't like using the loge, but.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, appreciate all the comments and advice on this matter.

Are we ready for the question?

Item 6, effective October 20th, 2015–pass.

Item 7, Routine proceedings, effective October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So this is a fairly simple but substantial change. Members wanted to change the order of items in routine proceedings so that they would appear as follows. The first several are the same—introduction of bills, committee reports, tabling of reports, ministerial statements—and then members' statements will now come before oral questions, and petitions will come after oral questions, and it will conclude with grievances.

Mr. Speaker: Comments? Questions?

Are we ready for the question?

Item 7, Routine proceedings, effective October 20th, 2015–pass.

Item 8, Consequential rule change, effective October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So this is related to something that will come up in a few pages. We're deleting chapter V of the rule book which deals with an archaic practice referred to as orders for return and addresses for papers. So, because of that deletion happening later, consequentially there's a number of other references that need to be removed, so that's part of what's happening in this section.

We're also adding in this section an omission that had been left out for perhaps 140-some years, which is that in the order for daily routine, it does not reference the debate on the Speech from the Throne and the budget motion, so we've inserted that as a correction for past—

An Honourable Member: 140 years?

Mr. Yarish: Something like that, you know, getting around to it now.

And, yes, so there's a few references to that effect in this and that's why the whole rule is being changed.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Item 8, Consequential rule change, effective October 20th, 2015–pass.

We'll now proceed to page 17 of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals—June 2015, item 9, Question time during private members' bill debates, effective October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So this is a new provision, and then you'll see this appear in a couple of spots. And, essentially, what this is allowing is, in addition to debate on private members' bills, which is a long-standing practice, we're now inserting a provision whereby questions can be asked of the sponsor of the bill, and there is a structure which has been created here to allow that. Basically, the sponsor makes their speech, the first speech, and then following that, the Speaker of the House will ask, before we proceed with the debate, are there further questions, at which time any other member can ask a question of the sponsor. The first question will go to a member from a party other than the sponsors, and then there'll be a rotation between parties, and each independent member in the House is guaranteed to ask one

question, and all questions and answers will be 45 seconds or less.

So this, as I say, does happen in a few other cases. It'll be not unlike oral questions, but it'll be sort of a lower profile and more specific to the issue.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Goertzen: I think to engage members who are otherwise not able to be engaged in these matters.

Mr. Chairperson: Any—Mr. Ashton?

Mr. Ashton: Yes, and I think we're actually going back in time in terms of practice in some way because it was common practice on second reading for the mover of the second reading to be asked questions. We—that's gone into disuse, and if you consider the fact that especially at second reading, you're talking about the principle of the bill, what it does is it actually in addition to the debate actually does provide in a lot of cases some greater clarity of the intention of the bill, so the fact that it's also going to apply to private members, I think, is really—is actually a strength in parliamentary procedure that really has gone into disuse. So this is very positive.

Mr. Chairperson: No further comments, questions?

Are we ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 9, Question time during private members' bill debates, effective October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 10, Selected private members' bills, effective October—April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: So this is another new concept. This allows each government and opposition caucus to select three private members' bills to come to a vote at second reading each session. Independent members will also be allowed to select one private members' bill in this fashion, and they will further not—*independent* members will not be required to have a seconder to introduce one private members' bill per session.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments, questions?

Mr. Ashton: I think what this does is it actually puts into the rules what has evolved as practice in recent years. I actually feel that one of the greatest signs of progress that we've seen in the last number of years has been the degree to which private members' bills have been considered and put to votes and, in some cases, passed. That was not always the case

historically, and this really formalizes—it doesn't prevent agreement on a greater number of bills, but by putting this in place, it really—it puts into the rules, essentially, what we have evolved to as a practice.

Mr. Goertzen: It will give more weight to private members' bills and those members who bring them forward knowing that at least a good number of them can come to a vote. Also, we've—this rule only comes into effect April 20th, 2016; however, we have made an assurance to the independent member that he will be able to bring forward a bill in the fall and have it come to a second reading vote, and we'll put that in a sessional agreement assuming that the House rises on Tuesday.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Are you ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Question for the committee is item 10, Selected private members' bills, effective April 20th, 2016.

Shall the item pass? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Chairperson: We'll move on to item 11, Oral questions, effective October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: This is a substantial change but in—at the same time, it's actually formalizing some things that have been practised for quite some time. We're actually, among other things, creating a section in the rule book for oral questions, which has never existed before. And we're introducing—or formalizing some provisions like the time limit for questions and the rotation of questions between parties. Those have been something that's been agreed to historically by House leader agreement outside of the rules, but this is putting them in the rules, and there's some provisions governing each of those.

There's also a prohibition on raising points of order and matters of privilege during question period, which is something that has—we've seen less of in recent years, but this will prohibit it, and like many other jurisdictions, including the House of Commons, the way that would be facilitated is if an issue arises during oral questions, members will raise it as soon as oral questions is completed. They'll stand up and raise a point of order.

We're also deleting outdated point of order appendix that's been in the rule book for perhaps 100 years.

*(10:10)

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I note the phasing out Beauchesne's, which is—I was going to say I have a rather worn copy of—actually two editions of Beauchesne's, so—but I think it's important to note that, essentially this also reflects our current practice. It's rare to get points of order in question period currently or matters of privilege. I can't recall even this session at all—*[interjection]* Yes, maybe one after question period.

I actually—I think it's important to note one of the reasons for that is the degree to which we have changed our rules, the most significant which is requirement preamble for supplementary questions. That was a source of probably 90 per cent of the points of order. Beauchesne's citation 417, and, I think, this really, again, reflects the general practice.

The other thing I would point to, again, you know, we have an elected Speaker that represents all MLAs in terms of that, and this is really very similar to what the House of Commons has evolved to as well. So it's—I think it's our practice to put into the rules.

Mr. Goertzen: I agree. It codifies the practice we've had for the last number of years, and, certainly, we've tried to minimize points of order during question period. And I've, as Opposition House Leader, tried to, more than has been necessary, do them at some point other than question period. So I think it's a good practice.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Are you ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 11, Oral questions, effective October 20th, 2015—pass.

For information of the committee, Flor Marcelino has been added to the committee.

We'll now move on to item 12, Opposition Day motions, effective April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: And just for information of the committee, this is actually on two pages, 19 and 20.

So there's some changes to the way Opposition Day motions are considered. The primary change is

that, as opposed to the current system, which has a somewhat involved 10-day waiting period for when Opposition Day motions are filed and then considered, now Opposition Day motions would be filed—on the day opposition motions are filed, the next day will be the day of debate. They need to be filed by 5 p.m. with the Clerk, and then they'll proceed to debate the following day.

Also, other provisions that were changed. There used to be an automatic vote at 4:30 or half hour before adjournment. Now the debate will be limited to one sitting day, but the House will not adjourn until all members wishing to speak to the motion have done so. So, in certain cases, we might sit past the hour of adjournment to conclude the Opposition Day motion, and that's incorporated in the rule.

Mr. Goertzen: This is a concession to opposition and allow opposition to, in a more timely way, deal with matters that they're concerned about as opposed to waiting two weeks, at times, or longer, so it's a concession for opposition.

Mr. Ashton: I concur and I think I would go, you know, further than that, that what it also does is tactically allow an opposition to raise its concerns in a substantive manner. Previously, oppositions would often move points of order, challenge the Speaker, you have bell-ringing, so that would be substantive debate.

I think the timeliness of this is a significant enhancement of the opposition's ability to raise issues in—at any time throughout the session.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions? No? Ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 12, Opposition Day motions, effective April 20th, 2016—pass.

We'll now move on to page 20 of our document, item 13, Consequential rule changes—rule change, effective October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: This is a fairly simple change. We're deleting some references to rules which will be deleted on the next page. So there's no sense in having the reference there if the rules aren't going to exist anymore. And the rules relate to private members' resolutions.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments, questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Question.

Item 13, Consequential rule change, effective October 20th, 2015–pass.

We'll now move on to item 14, Private members' resolutions, effective April 20th, 2016.

Ms. Chaychuk: Just by way of explanation, we, currently, in the rules have a process that we never follow and we waive the rule for every year. It is the creation of a committee of House leaders to consider PMRs and to designate some as prioritized, but that would require all PMRs to be submitted within 14 days of the Throne Speech.

We've never really done that because both sides of the House would prefer to have PMRs coming up later that are more timely. So this rule removes the need for that House leader committee meeting to meet to consider resolutions for–prioritized and to also remove the rule requiring all PMRs to be submitted within two weeks of the Throne Speech.

Instead, it maintains what we have been using as our contemporary practice, and that is an announcement a week in advance by the House leader from the government side and from the opposition side which allows a lot more flexibility.

In addition, we are adding the proposal where there is now going to be a 10-minute question period when resolutions have been moved. After the mover speaks, other members will have the opportunity for up to 10 minutes to ask questions and there will be a 45-second rule in place for questions and answers.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Goertzen: Again, this is simply to engage private members more thoroughly in the debate in the Legislature.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay.

Ms. Chaychuk: One other thing I should also note, that it provides for opposition members to also–could have ability to bring in one resolution as well, and it provides on Thursdays, if there are more than one recognized opposition party, a sharing of the Thursday time.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Item 14, Private members' resolutions, Question time during private members' resolution debates, taking effect April 16th, 2016–pass.

Now, move on to page 24 of our document, item 15, Budget debate, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: A few changes here. The members decided to reduce the number of days of debate on the budget motion from eight to six, and concurrent with that they're reducing the speaking times in the debate from 30 minutes to 20 minutes. They're also reducing the number of times the government can interrupt this debate from three to two. The idea of all of this is to allow more days in the session for other business, but to still allow the–approximately the same number of members to speak to the budget motion. So that's–by shortening the speaking time that should be achieved, and that's the intent of this change.

Oh, and pardon me. There is one other important provision in 32(9) which is on page 25, which is the Termination of debate. What that means is it–the budget debate cannot be further delayed by other means, because on the eighth sitting day after the main motion has been moved, 30 minutes before adjournment the Speaker will interrupt the proceedings and put the question. So, even if there's other events that have transpired to perhaps interfere with this debate, the Speaker's still going to enforce that. After eight days this gets a vote.

There's a similar provision for the Throne Speech which will come to you in a moment.

Mr. Goertzen: As a result of Estimates there's probably no–nothing before the Legislature that has more opportunity for debate than the budget. So we thought shortening this and giving more time for debate on bills and committee because we want to preserve the sanctity of our committee process. This was the appropriate place to find more time without limiting members from speaking to the budget debate.

* (10:20)

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I just want to make clear that this doesn't in any way, shape or form reduce the ability of members to speak, and reflects, actually, an evolution in speeches. We've knocked the 40-minute speeches to 20, other than for the designated speakers. And it does not in any way, shape or form prevent MLAs from speaking on a very important document that does restrict in other ways. That's the only difference.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, any further comments or questions?

Ready for the question? The question is item 15, Budget debate, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Shall item 15 pass? *[Agreed]*

We'll now move on to page 26 of our document, item 16, Matters of privilege, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So, similar to the points of order during question period prohibition, matters of privilege will no longer be allowed during oral questions.

So this required a couple of changes. The one rule on matters of privilege states: "When a Matter of Privilege arises it shall be taken into consideration immediately, except during Oral Questions," which is the part that we're changing, so that this is reflected there.

We're also, coincident with this, deleting an appendix on matters of privilege, which is a bit outdated and is also covered in a body of practices—many, many Speakers' rulings over the last several decades. So it's effectively redundant. However, we're keeping one provision from the appendix and moving it into the rules, which says that a submission from a member raising a matter of privilege should conclude with a motion.

All of this, matters of privilege are, of course, covered thoroughly in the procedural authorities and this is consistent with all of that information as well.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I think the removal, again, of specific provisions and previous references which can also reflect that there is Manitoba practice that's, in many cases, somewhat different from the House of Commons and, you know, by having citations that are essentially from House of Commons-based practice, whether it's actually the Canadian House of Commons or British House of Commons, it really doesn't reflect the degree to which we often have very different practice. So it's more than just a technical matter. I think it recognizes that the—we are the masters of our own House in many ways, and by taking this out it really—it clarifies the degree to which Speakers' rulings practice in Manitoba that really are the defining element.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 16, Matters of privilege, taking effect October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 17, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: This relates to matters of urgent public importance, and the reference change here is because we're changing the order of items in routine proceedings. The previous MUPI rule said that you could raise them after members' statements, but now members' statements are before question period, so we've changed that to after petitions, which is the second item after oral questions. So it just sets a different spot in the order of events when it's going to happen. It's effectively the same time, pretty much at the end of routine proceedings, but it's just wording change was required to reflect the other change.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments, questions?

Mr. Goertzen: Along with noting that MUPIs are—haven't been used particularly often lately, but I think that given the ability of Opposition Days be moved more timely, it might be less likely that MUPIs will be used—the opposition will be able to move, essentially, MUPIs within a 24-hour period, just by a different name, so it's a good compromise.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Item 17, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 18, Speeches not to be read, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: This is a rule that the rules group decided to delete effectively to reflect more modern realities of the House.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I'd like to—I'm not going to bring in a minority opinion here, actually, but I think the issue is this has not been enforced and it's still not common practice for people to read speeches. I don't think it's advisable.

Debate is, you know, really not based on exchanging written, you know, pre-written comments back and forth. I actually think that significant elements of the new rules package will actually enhance debate—the question periods that we have within discussion on bills, for example. So, in taking this out, I, you know, I—it's funny; I'm wondering if someday we're actually just going to have virtual sittings of the Legislature because, you know, if you just rely on written text, you might as

well just, you know, email each other back and forth or, you know, post it on a bulletin board.

So I—this does not say we're encouraging people to read. It just says, reality is people are reading anyway; we're not forcing it. So let's take it out.

Mr. Goertzen: For the record, I don't read my speeches. Although I think many members, including my own caucus members, wish that I would many times but, for me, this was more an issue of ambiguity. And it's difficult sometimes to tell whether a member's reading a speech or referring to notes or points that they're making. And, so, we've not raised this as points of order because it's just a difficult thing to determine, whether somebody's reading or just referencing points that they've made. We all write down points sometimes to guide us in our comments, so I just think it's a difficult thing but I don't disagree with the member, that we're not encouraging members to read word-by-word speeches in the Legislature.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments on this item?

Number 18, Speeches not to be read, effective October 20th, 2015—pass.

We'll now move on to item 19 on page 28. Item 19 is Consequential rule change, October 20th—taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So this is to correct ambiguities in references to opposition parties. You might remember the first item changed the definition of opposition parties that used to exclude the official opposition; now it includes the official opposition.

So, in this rule, there was a redundancy because it had said this 30-minute rule does not apply to leader of the government, official opposition and recognized party. Now, recognized opposition party includes official opposition, so we're just making a clarification and eliminating redundancy.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 19, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015—pass.

We'll move on to item 20, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So this is deleting a rule that is now effectively being superseded by the rules we've been discussing for question period during bill debates.

Mr. Ashton was referring to this practice before. It has happened, hasn't been used often, but it's now been replaced by a more comprehensive system. And so this rule now becomes effectively obsolete.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 20, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 21, Debate on the address in reply to the Throne Speech, taking effect October 20th—

Floor Comment: April.

Mr. Chairperson: April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: So this is again similar to the changes in provisions to the budget debate which I referenced a few minutes ago. Similar sort of thing, reducing the number of days of debate from eight to six, reducing speaking times from 30 to 20 minutes, reducing the number of times the government can interrupt debate from three to two and one other provision. Oh, yes, there's an also archaic process in the old rule 45(6) where there was a motion to present an engrossed copy of the Throne Speech, which hasn't—we used to do this, but it hasn't happened in about 10 years. And so it made sense to delete it from here.

Ms. Chaychuk: Yes, that was a ceremony we used to do in the Lieutenant Governor's office, and the aides said to us, please stop doing that. But we need to change the rule to be reflective of that.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I'd also note that the—under the new rules, we've—now have created consistency between budget and Throne Speech, in terms of votes on amendments and the main motion being on the final day—the sixth day. We currently have a difference between Throne Speech and budget.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Item 21, Debate on the address in reply to Throne Speech, taking effect April 20th, 2016—pass.

We'll now move on to item 22, Challenges to Speaker's rulings, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Ms. Chaychuk: So, like I was saying about a half an hour ago. Yes, we are taking away appeals to the challenges of Speaker's rulings on points of order. We had to change it in another section of the rule book, where it makes references to Speaker deciding the point of order, to make it consistent. And it's also adding a provision whereby in Committee of Supply

and Committee of the Whole, the rulings of the chairpersons on points of order are not subject to appeal. However, in standing committees, those rulings by those chairpersons on points of order can still be appealed in a standing committee.

* (10:30)

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Goertzen: Just in terms of the distinction between the two committees, and I think I was involved with suggesting that. Both Speakers, Deputy Speakers, Committee of the Whole, they have—they're not elected, all of them, obviously, but they have some standing in the House in terms of their appointments. Also, in a committee that's not directly in the House, a challenge to the Speaker's ruling doesn't result in a delay, and those committee chairs tend to be a little bit more ad hoc, and so the feeling was to leave that ability within. I don't think it'll be abused, but it didn't seem necessary to remove the ability to have a standing committee Chair be challenged.

Mr. Chairperson: Further comments, questions?

Ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 22, Challenges to Speaker's rulings, taking effect October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 23, Written questions, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: So these changes to the rules governing written questions allow that—so each minister responsible for answering the question must respond in writing within 30 days of the question appearing on the Order Paper.

There is also a provision of putting a number on the written questions that a member can put on the Order Paper per session, which is five, and that hadn't existed before. And it clarifies a little bit of how the process is supposed to work; sort of fleshes out more the process from how it used to be.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Goertzen: Written questions have largely fallen into disuse. I know there are some members—I look at my friend from St. Paul—who have used them, but often they fall into disuse, and I suspect they have fallen into disuse because they often aren't answered. And so this would at least—it doesn't govern the

quality of the answer but at least requires some response.

Mr. Ashton: I'm assuming here, again, it's the practice, again, that the—it is the prerogative of the government to determine which minister responds. Still, the normal rules of—that apply to question period apply as well, that—it's basically a question that will be asked and, of course, the government would have the option of, you know, providing an answer that doesn't necessarily deal with an issue if it's not the prerogative of the government. I just want to get clarification on whether we need to actually identify that or is that understood in practice that normal rules of the House apply.

Mr. Yarish: Yes, my understanding would be effectively, yes, that the government would respond. You can—it can be addressed to a minister but the government can respond.

There's also a provision in 60(1)(b) that allows a question—a written question could seek information from another member who is not necessarily in Cabinet relating to any bill, motion or other public matter in which that member is concerned. But with regards to questions of the government, yes, the same principle as question period would apply—oral questions—would apply.

Mr. Chairperson: Further comments or questions?

Mr. Marcelino: Days—30 days, is that sitting days or calendar days—60(2)—calendar?

Mr. Yarish: Yes, that's calendar days.

An Honourable Member: Why don't we say that?
[interjection]

Mr. Chairperson: For the information of Mr. Marcelino, if you referred to item 60(2).

Mr. Marcelino: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: It says in there: "A Member replying to a written question must do so within 30 days of the written question appearing on the Order Paper."

Ms. Chaychuk: According to The Interpretation Act, unless you specify sitting days, it's always interpreted as calendar days. So, if where it says—

Mr. Chairperson: It defaults.

Ms. Chaychuk: Yes. If it says a sitting day, that's considered a sitting day, but if it doesn't say sitting day, it's always considered to be a calendar day.

Mr. Chairperson: By default.

Ms. Chaychuk: Yes. *[interjection]* By The Interpretation Act.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Any further comments or questions?

Are we ready for the question on this item?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 23, Written questions, taking effect April 20th, 2016–pass.

Item 24, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: The next rule change we'll be considering after this is deleting a chapter of the book, chapter V which relates to Address for papers/orders for return. Because that chapter is being deleted, these two subrules, 60(4) and 60(5), relate specifically to those two items and are exclusive to that, so these two rules no longer have any purpose. Therefore, they're being deleted.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 24, Consequential rule change, taking effect October 20th, 2015–pass.

Item 25, Address for papers/orders for return, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: So as I mentioned before, this chapter is being deleted. Addresses for papers and orders for returns are fairly archaic practice that haven't been used in many decades and the rules group decided there was no point in keeping it in the rule book. Therefore, it's being deleted.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Mr. Goertzen: I consider myself relatively adept at understanding rules and I struggled with this one for about two days and I still don't understand it. So I'm willing to see it deleted.

Mr. Ashton: I have very much the same reaction. When it doubt, take it out.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, any further comments or questions? Ready for the question?

Question is item 25, Address for papers/orders for return, taking effect October 20th, 2015.

Shall the item pass? *[Agreed]*

Now, we'll move on to page 34 of our document, item 26, Condolence motions, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: So similar to some other things that the rules group decided to do here, this is actually formalizing a practice that we've been following for many, many years, whereby condolence motions are moved in the House to honour the passage of former members and it's all been done by practice over the years. And this formalizes that. So it also states that condolence motions will be considered during the fall sittings, though with unanimous consent you could do it at another time of year. And it's also states that condolence motions do not need to go on notice, you can just move them. They're not subject to amendments, speaking time limits do not apply and in a unique and, I think, appropriate measure, the way of marking the passage of the motion is to actually have members stand for a moment of silence. So this is, again, formalized in the rules.

Mr. Goertzen: The feeling was to have this in the fall because we generally have more time in the fall. Obviously, that—there can be exceptions to that, depending on the availability of the family and the nature of the condolence motion. It is an important thing that we do as legislators here, and it might be unique, relatively unique. I do think we should, at some point in a future rules committee, have discussions about how we can make this more meaningful perhaps and we'd had some of those discussions within the committee and I would probably refer that to a future rules of the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments or questions?

Ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Question is item 26, Condolence motions, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Shall item 26 pass? *[Agreed]*

We'll move on to item 27, Speaking time in Committees of the Whole House and the Committee of Supply, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: So the move here is to reduce speaking times from 10 minutes to five minutes, and this does apply for Committee of Supply, which would be during Estimates, and also concurrence debates and a few other moments, also in Committees of the Whole House, where it would also be reduced to five minutes. The exception to this is that opening statements for ministers and critics from recognized

opposition parties will be 10 minutes, which is what they are now. So you're giving a little bit more time for the opening statements in Supply, but every other exchange in Supply would be five minutes.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, I think this, again, could be something we categorized as something that strengthens the ability of an opposition to hold the government accountable. What it really does is it allows more effective use of the time in Supply, and I think if you look at most of the exchanges, they range from detailed questions, you know, detailed answers being provided to more debate and I think this shifts, it gives the opposition much greater ability to focus in on the questions, if they so choose.

So it'll take the existing time period and provide much greater ability for opposition to function.

Mr. Goertzen: Also agree this is a concession for opposition, and to paraphrase my dearly departed friend, Albert Driedger, if you can't ask a question in five minutes, you don't have a question, and if you can't answer it in five minutes, you don't have an answer.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): One point of clarification on this because very often the minister will take a number of minutes to consult with a deputy minister and just that time could eat up much of the five minutes on some occasions. But it doesn't—will it count or will it not count?

* (10:40)

Ms. Chaychuk: Consultation time is not considered their speaking time because they're actually not speaking on the record. It's when they are back on the record and speaking is the five minute—but it—but that consultation time does count against the 100 hours, though.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: The question is item 27, Speaking time in Committees of the Whole House and the Committee of Supply, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Shall item 27 pass? *[Agreed]*

Item 28, Questions taken under advisement during Estimates and Concurrence, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: This is a new provision. It's modelled in part on a process that has evolved in the Public Accounts Committee over the last five or six years. Essentially, it's this: It's a common practice during Estimates and concurrence for ministers to take questions under advisement, something they need to seek more information on or get research done on a question. And that's happened, as a practice, for years, but there's never been any process governing when they need to respond on that.

So this institutes a fairly specific process, saying that within 45 days of that question being asked, the minister is obligated to provide some sort of response. There's—the rule specifies how that response could occur. To summarize that, they could answer verbally in the departmental Estimates, so perhaps the next day or the further—day after that. They could also table the answer in the departmental Estimates. Or, if it's in concurrence, they could answer verbally or table the answer; or, if it—if they get the answer after concurrence and the Estimates have concluded, they can table the answer in the House, or, if the House isn't in session, they can table the answer intersessionally, following our established intersessional tabling provisions.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, this is a, I think, a very important shift. And it does parallel PAC; it does certainly parallel some of the practice that has evolved, certainly, with some ministers and critics. It's certainly something I've tried to do as a minister, perhaps going back to my experience in opposition.

Often questions are asked that are fairly detailed; they do require some time to assemble the answer. So what this does is it recognizes the, you know, the complexity of some of the answers and also applies a mechanism that can deal with it both during the committee process and then applies what happens when you're in Estimates for a period of time and the answer can't be obtained for them. It is a bit of a paradox that a lot of times the key people to provide the answer are actually the people sitting around the table providing advice to the minister.

So this, actually, I believe, down the line, will greatly strengthen an opposition's ability and a government's ability to provide detailed responses to questions raised in Estimates and will provide a much more efficient use of Estimates time.

Mr. Goertzen: I agree this is a concession for opposition. By way of an example, I'm still waiting for the answers to the questions I asked

Minister Struthers in Conservation in 2004. So if we could make this retroactive, I'd be happy about that.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments? Questions?

Item 28, Questions taken under advisement during Estimates and Concurrence, effective April 20th, 2016–pass.

Item 29, Concurrence debate, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: So this changes the provisions for calling the Premier in concurrence to state that it can happen no more than three days. Currently, it's no more than three times, but a time could be more than one day, because calling them could carry over from one day to the next. So this clarifies that rule.

Mr. Goertzen: I don't know if there's ever been a time where the Premier's been called more than three days, so we might be creating a rule to protect ourselves from something that hasn't happened and may never happen. But I think it's reasonable in the fact that the Premier obviously has responsibilities that are beyond most ministers or members of government, and so I think it's a reasonable rule to adopt.

Mr. Ashton: I concur. I also think it recognizes the Premier has overall responsibility, you know, for issues, so it's certainly something that's really—opposition may be tempted to do on occasion, recognizing the ability to ask the Premier questions of virtually anything or everything, but I think the Opposition House Leader's identified the—he's identified the degree to which the—there's a balance here and it reflects the other duties of the Premier, so important rule.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments or questions?

Item 29, Concurrence debate, taking effect April 20th, 2016–pass.

Item 30, Rules Committee meetings, taking effect April 20th, two thousand–pardon me, October 20th, 2015.

Mr. Yarish: This is a new provision which is stating that this committee will meet at least twice a year, and the call for the committee meeting will be made after the House leaders of recognized parties and each independent member consult with the Government House Leader who will then call, as we

say, a minimum of two meetings per year, and it's calendar year.

Mr. Ashton: This is very significant. It's significant for a number of reasons. First of all, the rules committee does not meet on a regular basis, hasn't met on a regular basis and has traditionally been seen as important only for this type of a process where you have a general agreement on rules and you proceed.

And I think the—there's a couple of recognitions here: one is that the rules are constantly evolving; the second, I think, and it'll be further recognition and that is that there's some significant changes in these rules and there probably is some value to having an ongoing ability to review them. In practice, this is a lot of very good intent in here, but there's a very significant shift that could result in some unintended consequences. So I think it recognizes that.

And it, I think, more broadly recognizes that when you're going to make a major change in the rules, which this does—it brings us much more in line with the practice of virtually every other legislature in Canada—that a key way to make sure it will work in the future is to have a forum on a regular basis to deal with it. That's why we have a rules committee, so this will actually mean that the rules committee not only will meet but I think will have a more significant role on an ongoing basis in further evolution of the rules and dealing with some of the significant changes we're bringing in today.

Mr. Goertzen: I certainly think this is as much a cultural change as a rule change. And I very much want—because none of us know how long we'll be in the positions we're in, I'm sure that in the not-too-distant future, I won't be the House leader for our party and the current House leader won't be the House leader for his party, and I want to leave on the record that future House leaders should look to have a culture where they work together to modify the rules as necessary, to tweak them as necessary, to understand that the rules are here to provide a forum where we can act in a way that the public expects us to, in terms of being passionate about debate, and sometimes being adversarial about issues. But that the rules are there for everyone to work and within the context of those rules we can be spirited and we can be strong-willed where government and opposition needs to be but the rules have to work for everybody.

And so there's a time for partisanship and there's a time for—to not be partisanship. And I think when it

comes to rules, the rule that should govern, the culture that should govern, is non-partisanship. And so I hope that this is as much a cultural change as a rule change.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further comments?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall item 30—

Sorry, did you have your hand up?

Mr. Gerrard: I just wanted to echo the importance of making this shift toward a Rules Committee meeting regularly and being able to often make small changes but occasionally make larger changes for—to adjust to the times and to adjust to the changing circumstances which we may find ourselves in.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 30, Rules Committee meetings, effective October 20th, 2015—pass.

Item 31, Public presentations to standing committees, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: This rule changes the provisions which govern presentations in committee, specifically happening after midnight. A few—10 years ago there were provisions adopted which made it only under very specific circumstances that this could happen, but it did also leave some discretion to the chairperson of a committee hearing presentations. This removes those conditions and basically says the committee must not hear public presentations past midnight and—but does allow that, through unanimous consent, that decision can be made. It removes the ability of the chairperson to make that determination.

Mr. Ashton: I will sum this up in the sense that there's one tradition that is an unfortunate one in Manitoba and I made more detailed comments earlier. There's an element of legislation by exhaustion, and I think this is something that it—there's a clear consensus all the way through the preliminary discussions on the rules and leading up to today, which is that, from now on, and especially with the ability to have a more organized calendar, that this is something we do not want to see occur in the future.

There's plenty ability to have committee meetings at a reasonable time that will accommodate the public and hear from the public. So this is a very, very significant cultural shift in the way we do business.

* (10:50)

Mr. Goertzen: And, certainly, I—to add on to those comments, while the dates that we have within this agreement, within these news rules are the mandatory dates, they are the latest dates. And I would encourage any government in the future, and the current government, to ensure that they're organized in such a way as to allow for the maximum time for presenters to come to—and, I think, that midnight is even sometimes too late for many people. And it should be governed by the spirit of trying to ensure that the public is accommodated as best as possible.

We sometimes, as MLAs, take great pride in the fact that we sit through the night and do things that way, and we tell war stories about that. But I doubt, highly, that the public goes home and talks too grandly about how they were here to three in the morning, making a presentation. So if we're going to do it, let's leave it to MLAs and not to the public.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes, there were some fairly extensive discussions about this and a number of other—or changes to the rules. First of all, I think that the intent here is to have a more organized committee session at times when it's more convenient for the public to be there. But I also want to emphasize that, in making the changes that we've made, in terms of the times when committee hearings can be—must be completed, that in the discussions we've had, that this is in no way to suggest that the number of people who are presenting—who want to present at committee should be limited. That it is—will be up to the government and opposition parties to work together to make sure that there is sufficient time to hear everybody who wants to be heard at committees. And I think that that was a strong feeling in the discussions that we had.

Mr. Chairperson: Ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Item 31, Public presentations to standing committees, taking effect April 20th, 2016—pass.

On page 38 of your document, item 32, Public Accounts Committee, taking effect April 20th, 2016.

Mr. Yarish: This changes the provision, which states how often the Public Accounts Committee should meet. Previously, it was six to eight meetings of the committee per year. That's now been changed to a minimum of nine meetings per year.

Mr. Goertzen: I think there's been some positive changes to the Public Accounts Committee over the last number of years. I think there are more things that can be done to strengthen it, but, I think, it's—the fact that it's operating much better than it did in years past gives strength to having it meet, actually, more often, because there's more value in its meeting. And that's also a model, I think, for the fall, when this, our rules committee, meets again to look at standing committees more generally.

I think we should look at the positive reforms we've made to PAC and look at how some of those can be extended to other standing committees of the Legislature.

Mr. Ashton: That's been so paradoxical over the years that we are probably the strongest in terms of hearing public presentations through our committee process, but we've had some of the weakest committee practices and structures.

I concur with the Opposition House Leader on PAC; there's been a significant shift there. So this reflects the positive element. And what's particularly unique about PAC, of course, is the degree to which it actually does involve both government members and opposition members. In fact, opposition members having a very significant role. That's not unlike the situation you see with the House of Commons, with their committee structure.

And I concur with the Opposition House Leader, that this is something that we can consider further in upcoming discussions on the committee structure, taking our committee structures and strengthening them, and, particularly, strengthening the role of private members in that process. So this is reflective of that.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes, I think it is important and significant that we're moving to having a minimum of nine Public Accounts Committee meetings in a year. This is a very important committee in terms of improving government for everybody and being on top of issues. And we should be meeting—well, and discussing reports soon after they're initially presented.

The—I want to make a comment. Even though we are talking about meetings should be held at regular intervals, I think that as we move forward, that House leaders should also recognize that we're, in general, moving away from July and August committee meetings and to—there may be an option here to have several PAC meetings in September

when we're going to be doing more general meetings. I think that that will be up to future House leaders to discuss and to decide, but I think the important thing here is having nine PAC committee meetings a minimum each year.

Mr. Schuler: As one committee member who served here more than many others, I think special thanks should go to the Government House Leader, the member for Kildonan, Dave Chomiak; the Opposition House Leader, the member for Steinbach, Kelvin Goertzen; and the independent member, the member for River Heights, Dr. Gerrard, for starting this process and for bringing it this far. I know it's not complete yet, but for one member who has suffered for a long time under some very archaic and wild, wild rules, this is a long time in coming, and for members who are going to be coming after the next election, they will not know the kind of effort and work that's gone into this.

So, to those individuals and the clerks and the translators and the legal department, everybody who participated, thank you very much from a member who came in here with three very small children, babies, and missed a lot of opportunities because there weren't these kind of rules in place.

Thank you on behalf of the Manitoba Legislature.

Mr. Marcelino: I also want to, as a corollary to the statement from Mr. Schuler, I want to make it of record that a lot of work also was done behind the scenes by Mr. Chad Samain and the whip's assistant, Marina Goodwin, and it's amazing how their talents have jelled together with the House leader and everybody else in order to make the House be more operational. And I am very thankful for being a part of this historic day.

Mr. Goertzen: I put some thanks on the record already, and I'll save more of that for when this passes in the House, but I'll note Mr. Robert Pankhurst, who is on our side as an assistant, who works with Chad on issues, and when I was tied up in the rules issues, he kept the House going. So that's important that we have people who support us behind the scenes, but I'll save some of those for when and if this moves to the final stage.

Mr. Ashton: I think we have one provision left, right? *[interjection]* And I do have some final comments, but you have to leave, I think. What I was going to do, perhaps, if I'll make some final comments, we'll treat that as a footnote because

I know the Opposition House Leader does have to leave.

I think what's important to put on the record here is there was a lot of efforts gone into this, and, quite frankly, I believe it reflects the basic principles of any legislature, far more effective than our current rules. It reflects the ability of the government to govern, the ability of an opposition to oppose, the ability of the public of Manitoba, the unique aspects for our committee processes, to actually have a significant input. It will be a much more civilized process in terms of having some greater predictability. I think that's really important for families, and there are many people I know of that do not go into politics for one reason. It's not that they're not political; it's because of what they've seen over the years and the potential impact on their families, so I think it's tremendous.

I do want to really credit, certainly, our House leader. He's got another meeting right now, so he—I'll make sure he gets a copy of the transcript here, and also Mr. Goertzen. This was a historic opportunity. This is traditionally when things are done, you know, this time in the cycle of the Legislature. We've tried numerous times, and I think every single House leader we've had in the last period of time has had some element of this. We've had sessional rules for one session on a couple of occasions, but the key thing here is what we're doing is we're making a clear commitment in the future to a much better system, and I really want to credit everyone that's been a key part, particularly our House leader and particularly Mr. Goertzen as well.

* (11:00)

Ms. Chaychuk: I don't get to speak on the record very often, so I'm taking this opportunity to issue a thank-you to the working party: to Honourable Mr. Chomiak, Mr. Goertzen, Honourable Dr. Gerrard, Honourable Mr. Ashton and Mr. Cullen. You were very open, inclusive, and very welcoming of all the ideas that the clerks brought forward. You achieved a consensus and a good balance—and it's a measured balance. And for—speaking for the people who will happen to be working with presiding officers and chairpersons and Speakers in the future, we thank you for the work and the ideas that you have put forward and for the changes you will be bringing forward to the rules.

You guys were fantastic; you were great to work with; and you were all very welcoming of the

suggestions and ideas that we had, and I thank you for that.

Mr. Gerrard: I will say more when we—this comes to the House, but I do want to add, as well as a thanks to government and opposition House leaders and supports, a particular thank-you to our Clerk, Patricia Chaychuk, and to Rick Yarish. You have put in an enormous number of hours, and I don't think this would have happened with the quality and the speed that it did without you and, of course, without the people who are involved in backup, including translations, so thank you.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): It certainly was interesting to be involved in this process. and, obviously, you learn from the process. When I first got elected, I thought this—there would be structure to this place, but, as you get in here, you learn quite quickly that there's not that much structure. So I think this will put together a framework, and I think it'll be—I'm hoping it'll be functional but—and I think it'll lead to the accountability and transparency that the public is looking for as well.

And to the point about, you know, we've made some moves to be a more family-friendly Legislature. I think this will certainly take it one step further and be—it will certainly benefit everybody. And I think it will not only benefit members that are here, but certainly members that potentially are looking at this occupation. And I think certainly from the changes we've made in the committee that will certainly help the public as well. And I think, you know, those are going to be positive changes.

I certainly want to thank the—acknowledge the House leaders for the great work they've done and certainly all those on the committee that were open and brought many years of experience to the table, so it certainly was appreciated and certainly to the—Patricia and Rick, we thank you for your assistance as well.

Just—and I hope this is going to be a continuing dialogue, and, hopefully, the members that maybe weren't paying attention to the rules, as many don't—they rely on the guidance of the House leader—but, hopefully, now that we have lots of changes in place, members will be putting their input forward as well, and we can make some positive changes in the future, so thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank all honourable members for their comments here, but we have a couple of items yet left to conclude.

Any further comments or questions on item 32? No.

Item 32, Public Accounts Committee, taking effect April 20th, 2016—pass.

Now to item 33, Question time during second reading debates on government bills, taking effect October 20th, 2015. Any comments?

Mr. Yarish: Thank you to members for all the kind words and thank you also to Patricia for her leadership in this project.

On this rule, Question time during second reading debates on government bills, this is the third instance of this new question period concept that we're introducing. This one's a little bit different because it's on government bills, and the question period itself is a little bit more structured. It still happens after the sponsor's—the minister's opening speech, but it's 15 minutes, in this case, and there's a little bit more of a complicated process for the rotation of questions. There's still 45 seconds, but the first question will go to the official opposition critic or their designate. Subsequent questions go by—go to—are asked by critics from other recognized parties or their designates, and subsequent questions are asked by each independent member, and then remaining questions can be asked by any opposition members. Same concept as the other ones.

Mr. Gerrard: I think this is an example of the sort of balance that we have tried to achieve that will reflect the priority that the official opposition critic has in terms of asking questions, and then the recognized opposition parties and then the independent members and then anyone in the opposition, and I think that that's a good balance. And I think we're going to see that this whole process of asking questions is going to be a fruitful one. There are many times in the past years that I've been here where I felt it would be very useful to have a question asked of the minister, and I think that this is a good step forward.

Mr. Chairperson: Any comments? No?

Item 33, Question time during second reading debates on government bills, taking effect October 20th, 2015—pass.

I believe that concludes all the items in the document that you have before you.

Does the committee agree that the Clerk be authorized to update Appendix E of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative

Assembly of Manitoba to accurately reflect the speaking time provisions contained within? *[Agreed]*

Does the committee agree that the Clerk be authorized to renumber the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and make other minor corrections that in no way alter the intended meaning of these amendments? *[Agreed]*

Does the committee agree that the Clerk be authorized to prepare revised rule books incorporating all amendments, additions and deletions? *[Agreed]*

Does the committee agree that these amendments to the rules are permanent? *[Agreed]*

Does the committee agree that, for future reference, the document entitled Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals—June 2015 be included in the Hansard transcript of these proceedings of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

Does the committee agree that the amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, as amended and as agreed to by this committee, be reported to the House? *[Agreed]*

Ms. Chaychuk: I couldn't let this meeting pass without giving a few additional thank-yous, and the first is to my partner in crime, Mr. Yarish, because he shared the late nights and the weekends and this would not have happened without him.

Thanks are also extended to the other table officers who also contributed ideas: Mr. Signorelli, Ms. Grenier, Mr. Michaud and Mr. Recksiedler. And thanks also go to the fantastic people at Legislative Counsel: Mr. Wright, Ms. Perry, Ms. Bailey, the translators led by Mr. Coutu. I'm not sure if there's anybody else, but you would not have this document in front of you without them and I owe a debt of thanks to them all.

Mr. Chairperson: I'd like to thank all the honourable members that were involved in this process and to all of our table officers, and as we've heard here, many of the members were getting emails into late evenings, working weekends and—*[interjection]* Yes, and there were lots of times where these ideas were going back and forth, and I know that there was a tremendous amount of work that went into this process and a lot of personal time that was given up by our table officers and Ms. Chaychuk and Mr. Yarish and, of course, many

other members themselves, members of this committee, and so I'd like to thank each and every one of you for your work. It showed a tremendous amount of goodwill and co-operation which is very much appreciated and, I think, holds us in good stead for the future. It's a credit to the Assembly and the way where all the parties can come together and work to come to a consensus agreement. And I'd like to thank each and every one of you for that process.

So, if there's no other business that this committee needs to consider, then the hour being 11:09 a.m., what is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Rise.

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 11:09 a.m.

* * *

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (changes) | Takes effect |
|------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | <i>THAT these Amendments will come into force, on October 20, 2015, unless otherwise indicated.</i> | |
| 1. | Consequential Rule Change To correct ambiguities in references to opposition parties. | <i>THAT the definition "a Recognized Opposition Party" in clause 1(3)(h) be replaced with the following:</i> <i>(h) "a Recognized Opposition Party" means <u>an opposition party represented in the Legislative Assembly by four or more Members;</u></i> | October 20, 2015 |
| 2. | Sessional Calendar New rules governing when the House can sit, and actions that must take place during the sessional year. Recalling the House New rules specifying that emergency sessions may last up to three weeks adjourned. Specified Government Bills New rules for a process whereby certain Bills are identified for passage in the spring session. Designated Government Bills New rules allowing the opposition to designate up to five government bills for the purpose of further consideration at a later sittings period. | <i>THAT Rule 2 be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i> <u>Sitting Periods</u> <u>2(1) The House may meet at any time during the following sitting periods, except during the Spring Sittings when the House must begin to meet on the first Wednesday in March:</u> <u>November Sittings</u> <u>From Tuesday following the Remembrance Day week as described in sub-rule 2(2)(a) to the first Thursday in December.</u> <u>Spring Sittings</u> <u>From the first Wednesday in March to the first sitting day in June.</u> <u>Fall Sittings</u> <u>From the first Wednesday in October to Thursday of the week prior to the Remembrance Day Week.</u> <u>Within these periods, the House is to meet on a day fixed by the Speaker at the government's request and, unless adjourned earlier by order of the House, is to be adjourned by the Speaker, without a motion for adjournment on the applicable day. The House then stands adjourned to the call of the Speaker.</u> <u>The government may call the House into session for four additional sitting days in June after the first sitting day in June to complete consideration of specified bills. On the last day of these four additional sitting days the remaining stages of specified bills not dealt with by the usual hour of adjournment will have all remaining questions put to a vote following the provisions outlined in 2(15)*. The House will not rise until royal assent has been granted.</u> <u>If the day of the week on which Remembrance Day falls prevents the House from sitting for seventeen days in the Fall Sittings, the House may extend daily sittings until 10:00 p.m. Each of these extended sitting days shall count as two sitting days for the purpose of achieving seventeen sitting days.</u> <u>These extended sitting days may be held at any point in the Fall Sittings for the business of supply and passage of the Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Act and to achieve the following Completion Days for Designated Bills:</u> <u>Second Reading per sub-rule 2(17)</u> | April 20, 2016 |

* As amended in the House on June 29, 2015.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (changes) | Takes effect |
|------|------------------------|--|--------------|
| | | <p><u>Committee Stage per sub-rule 2(18).</u> <u>Report Stage per sub-rule 2(19).</u> <u>Concurrence and Third Reading per sub-rule 2(20).</u></p> <p><u>On the last Thursday sitting prior to the Remembrance Day Week, the remaining steps for designated bills and the business of supply and passage of The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act must be concluded. Any remaining steps not dealt with by the usual hour of adjournment will have all remaining questions put to a vote following the provisions outlined in 2(21) and 2(23)†. The House will not adjourn until royal assent has been granted.</u></p> <p>Constituency Weeks</p> <p><u>2(2) The House shall not meet during the following Constituency Weeks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>the week in which Remembrance Day falls if it falls on a weekday, or the week following Remembrance Day if it falls on a Saturday or Sunday (“Remembrance Day week”);</u> (b) <u>the week designated under The Public Schools Act as a spring break or vacation (“Spring constituency week”);</u> (c) <u>the week in which May 1 falls if it falls on a weekday, or the week following May 1 if it falls on a Saturday or Sunday (“May constituency week”);</u> (d) <u>the week commencing on the third Monday of October (“October constituency week”).</u> <p>Recall of the House</p> <p><u>2(3) If the government advises the Speaker that the public interest requires the House to meet at any time because of an emergency or extraordinary circumstances, a reason for the recall must be provided. The Speaker must advise the Members that the House is to meet at the time specified by the government and of the reason for the recall.</u></p> <p>Recalled House may meet for up to three weeks</p> <p><u>2(4) When recalled under sub-rule 2(3), the House is to begin to meet at the specified time, and unless adjourned earlier by order of the House, is to be adjourned by the Speaker, without a motion for adjournment at the usual adjournment time on the twenty-first calendar day after it was recalled. The House then stands adjourned to the call of the Speaker.</u></p> <p>Further recall of the House</p> <p><u>2(5) If the House is adjourned in accordance with sub-rule 2(4), the House must not be recalled again under sub-rule 2(3) until after the House has been in recess for a period of one week.</u></p> <p>Recall not prevented</p> <p><u>2(6) For certainty, nothing in this rule prevents the government from recalling the House under sub-rule (3) at any time except sub-rule 2(5).</u></p> | |

† As amended in the House on June 29, 2015.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|------------------------|--|--------------|
| | | <p><u>Meeting outside sitting periods on agreement</u></p> <p><u>2(7) If the House Leaders agree, the House may meet at a time other than during a sitting period referred to in sub-rule (1).</u></p> <p><u>Specified Government Bills</u></p> <p><u>2(8) In order for a government bill to be specified, the following actions must take place:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(a) First Reading must be moved no later than the twentieth sitting day after presentation of the Throne Speech; and</u> <u>(b) Second Reading must be moved no later than the fourteenth sitting day after the First Reading Completion Day for Specified Bills; and</u> <u>(c) The bill has not been included on the list of designated bills tabled by the Official Opposition in accordance with sub-rule 2(9).</u> <p><u>Opposition bills cannot be specified or designated.</u></p> <p><u>Designation by Opposition parties</u></p> <p><u>2(9) No later than the fourteenth sitting day after the First Reading Completion Day for Specified Bills, the Official Opposition may designate up to five government bills for the purpose of further consideration at a later sittings period. If The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act is identified as a designated bill, it counts as two of the five bills that can be designated. If there is a second Opposition party, the division of designated bills is four for the Official Opposition and one for the Second Opposition Party. The Interim Appropriation Act may not be designated under this rule.</u></p> <p><u>Second Reading moved for Specified Bills</u></p> <p><u>2(10) On the same sitting day identified in sub-rule 2(9), and after bills have been designated by the Opposition parties, the House is to not see the clock until the Second Reading motions have been moved for bills the government identifies as specified, excepting designated bills. On this day, the Minister, Critics and each Independent Member may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes each per government bill moved for second reading, followed by an up to 15-minute question and answer period for each bill conducted according to the provisions of sub-rule 136(5).</u></p> <p><u>Second Reading Completion Day for Specified Bills</u></p> <p><u>2(11) On the following sitting day after the actions under sub-rule 2(10), the questions for Second Reading of bills the government identifies as specified must be put.</u></p> <p><u>Committee Completion Day for Specified Bills</u></p> <p><u>2(12) No later than the thirteenth sitting day after the Second Reading Completion Day for Specified Bills, Standing Committees must complete consideration of any Specified Bills that have been referred to those committees and report those Bills to the House on the following sitting day.</u></p> | |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|------------------------|--|--------------|
| | | <p><u>Report Stage Completion Day for Specified Bills</u> <u>2(13) No later than the third sitting day after the Final Committee Report Day for Specified Bills, report stage on each specified government bills must be completed.</u></p> <p><u>Concurrence and Third Reading Day for Specified Bills</u> <u>2(14) No later than the second sitting day after Report Stage Completion Day for Specified Bills – or in the event no report stage amendments have been filed, no later than the fifth sitting day after Final Committee Report Day for Specified Bills – Concurrence and Third Readings of specified bills must be completed. On this day, the Minister, Critics and each Independent Member may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes each per government bill moved for concurrence and third reading. The House cannot adjourn until royal assent has been granted.</u></p> <p><u>Actions to complete Second Reading, Report Stage and Concurrence and Third Reading of Specified Bills</u> <u>2(15) If the actions referred to in sub-rules 2(11), 2(13) and 2(14) have not been completed by the noted date, the following provisions are to apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(a) The House will not adjourn on that day until the Speaker has put all the applicable questions on all specified bills.</u> <u>(b) If by 3:30 p.m. Routine Proceedings has not concluded, the Speaker must terminate Routine Proceedings and proceed to Orders of the Day.</u> <u>(c) At 4:00 p.m. the Speaker will interrupt debate and put all questions on the remaining bills with no further debate or amendment.</u> <u>(d) Matters of privilege and points of order will be held until all votes are completed.</u> <u>(e) Despite sub-rule 14(4), divisions on these specified bills cannot be deferred.</u> <p><u>Actions to complete Committee Stage of Specified Bills</u> <u>2(16) If the actions referred to in sub-rule 2(12) have not been completed in committee by the noted date, the following provisions are to apply if a committee is sitting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(a) If a Committee considering Bills has not completed public presentations, it must close public presentations at 9:00 p.m. By unanimous consent the deadline can be extended to 10:00 p.m. The public has the ability to provide written submissions for an additional 24 hours.</u> <u>(b) At 11:00 p.m. any member of the Committee who wishes to move an amendment to a Bill must file 20 copies of the amendment with the Clerk of the Committee, and the Clerk must distribute the amendment to members of the Committee. After that time, an amendment may be moved only if copies of it were filed with the Clerk and distributed as required by this rule</u> <u>(c) At midnight the Chair of the Committee must interrupt the proceedings and, without further debate or amendment (other than an amendment distributed as required by rule (b)), put every question necessary to</u> | |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (changes) | Takes effect |
|------|------------------------|--|--------------|
| | | <p><u>complete clause-by-clause consideration of the Bills under consideration.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>The committee must report the Bills to the House at its next sitting. In the event that the Committee fails to report the Bills at that sitting, the Bills are deemed to be reported to the House, as amended by the Committee (if applicable) and the report is deemed to be received by the House at that sitting.</u></p> <p>Designated Bills</p> <p>Second Reading Completion Day for Designated Bills</p> <p><u>2(17) Within two sitting days of the session resuming, the question for Second Reading of designated bills must be put. Emergency recall sittings are exempt from this provision. On this day, the Minister, Critics and each Independent Member may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes each per government bill moved for second reading, followed by an up to 15-minute question and answer period for each bill conducted according to the provisions of sub-rule 136(5).</u></p> <p>Committee Completion Day for Designated Bills</p> <p><u>2(18) No later than the ninth sitting day after the Second Reading Completion Day for Designated Bills, Standing Committees or Committee of the Whole must complete consideration of any Designated Bills that have been referred to those committees. Standing Committees must report those Bills to the House on the following sitting day while Committee of the Whole can report bills on the same sitting day once consideration of the bills is completed.</u></p> <p>Report Stage Completion Day for Designated Bills</p> <p><u>2(19) No later than the third sitting day after Final Committee Report Day for Designated Bills, Report Stages of designated government bills must be completed.</u></p> <p>Concurrence and Third Reading Completion Day for Designated Bills</p> <p><u>2(20) No later than the second sitting day after Report Stage Completion Day for Designated Bills – or in the event no report stage amendments have been filed, no later than the fifth sitting day after Final Committee Report Day for Designated Bills – Concurrence and Third Readings of Designated bills must be completed. On this day, the Minister, Critics and each Independent Member may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes each per government bill moved for concurrence and third reading. The House cannot adjourn until royal assent has been granted.</u></p> <p>Actions to complete Second Reading, Report Stage and Concurrence and Third Reading of Designated Bills</p> <p><u>2(21) If the actions referred to in sub-rules 2(17), 2(19) and 2(20) have not been completed by the noted date, the following provisions are to apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>The House will not adjourn on that day until the Speaker has put all the applicable questions on all designated bills.</u> (b) <u>If by 3:30 p.m. Routine Proceedings has not concluded, the Speaker must terminate Routine Proceedings and proceed to Orders of the Day.</u> (c) <u>At 4:00 p.m. the Speaker will interrupt debate and put all questions on</u> | |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|------------------------|---|--------------|
| | | <p><u>the remaining bills with no further debate or amendment.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>Matters of privilege and points of order will be held until all votes are completed.</u></p> <p>(e) <u>Despite sub-rule 14(4), divisions on these designated bills cannot be deferred.</u></p> <p><u>Actions to Complete Committee Stage of Designated Bills</u></p> <p><u>2(22) If the actions referred to in sub-rule 2(18) have not been completed in a standing committee by the noted date, the following provisions are to apply if a standing committee is sitting:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>If a Committee considering Bills has not completed public presentations, it must close public presentations by 9:00 p.m. By unanimous consent the deadline can be extended to 10:00 p.m. The public has the ability to provide written submissions for an additional 24 hours.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>At 11:00 p.m. any member of the Committee who wishes to move an amendment to a Bill must file 20 copies of the amendment with the Clerk of the Committee, and the Clerk must distribute the amendment to members of the Committee. After that time, an amendment may be moved only if copies of it were filed with the Clerk and distributed as required by this rule</u></p> <p>(c) <u>At midnight, the Chair of the Committee must interrupt the proceedings and, without further debate or amendment (other than an amendment distributed as required by rule (b)), put every question necessary to complete clause-by-clause consideration of the Bills under consideration.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>The committee must report the Bills to the House at its next sitting. In the event that the Committee fails to report the Bills at that sitting, the Bills are deemed to be reported to the House, as amended by the Committee (if applicable) and the report is deemed to be received by the House at that sitting.</u></p> <p><u>Actions to Complete Committee of the Whole Stage of Designated Bills</u></p> <p><u>2(23) If the actions referred to in sub-rule 2(18) have not already been completed in Committee of the Whole, the following provisions are to apply:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>If not already in Committee of the Whole by 4:00 p.m. the House must resolve into Committee of the Whole.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>At 4:00 p.m. the Chairperson must put the remaining questions without further debate or amendment to conclude consideration of the legislation before the Committee.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Matters of privilege and points of order will be held until all votes are completed.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>Despite sub-rule 14(4), divisions on these designated bills cannot be deferred.</u></p> <p><u>If no Speaker</u></p> <p><u>2(24) If there is no Speaker, the Clerk is to act in the Speaker's place under this rule.</u></p> | |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|---|------------------|
| 3. | Friday Supply Sitings Estimates Committees will sit Friday mornings only if written consent of the House Leaders is provided by 5:00 p.m. on the Wednesday before the Friday morning sitting. | <i>THAT sub-rule 4(5) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i> <u>Committee of Supply Friday Sitings</u> <u>4(5) Once consideration of departmental estimates has begun, the Committee of Supply may sit on Friday mornings from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. if the House Leaders from all recognized parties provide written notice to the Speaker by 5:00 on the previous Wednesday.</u> <u>4(5.1) When the Committee of Supply sits on Friday mornings from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. the Speaker must adjourn the Thursday sitting on Friday at 12:30 p.m.</u> <u>4(5.2) Any Friday on which meetings of the Committee of Supply are held shall be considered to be a sitting day of the Legislature.</u> | April 20, 2016 |
| 4. | Intersessional Committees This rule prohibits intersessional committees to hear public presenters in the following months: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January • February • June • July • August | <i>THAT sub-rule 4(6) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i> <u>Intersessional committee meetings</u> <u>4(6) During intersessional periods, any day on which meetings of Standing or Special Committees are held shall be considered to be a sitting day of the Legislature, and the Speaker shall record the number of sitting days which are Committee days. Despite sub-rule 92(8), ten calendar days notice is required for intersessional committee meetings.</u> <i>THAT the following be added after sub-rule 4(6), effective April 20, 2016:</i> <u>Intersessional committee meetings to hear public presentations</u> <u>4(7) Despite sub-rule 4(6), Standing Committees cannot meet intersessionally during the months of January, February, June, July and August to hear public presentations unless:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>All recognized opposition parties have granted leave on the record; or</u> (b) <u>House Leaders of all recognized opposition parties have countersigned the letter from the Government House Leader calling for an intersessional committee meeting.</u> | April 20, 2016 |
| 5. | Challenges to Speaker's Rulings The ability to challenge the ruling of the Speaker on a point of order has been removed. | <i>THAT sub-rule 9(1) be repealed and replaced with the following:</i> <u>The Speaker's duties</u> <u>9(1) The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and enforce the Rules, and shall decide all questions of order without appeal.</u> | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (changes) | Takes effect |
|------|--|--|------------------|
| 6. | Electronics during Oral Questions Revised rule will allow Members to use electronic devices during Oral Questions, but not when they are in their seats. | <i>THAT sub-rule 19(4) be repealed and replaced with the following:</i> Use of electronic devices <u>19(4) Members may use electronic devices in the House and in Committee in silent mode. During Oral Questions, such devices may only be used in the Loges.</u> | October 20, 2015 |
| 7. | Routine Proceedings Re-ordering the sequence of events in Routine Proceedings | <i>THAT Rule 23 be repealed and replaced with the following:</i> Routine Proceedings 23(1) Routine Proceedings in the House at 1:30 p.m., and at 10:00 a.m. when it sits on a Friday, is as follows, unless the House orders otherwise: Introduction of Bills Committee Reports Tabling of Reports Ministerial Statements <u>Members' Statements</u> <u>Oral Questions</u> <u>Petitions</u> Grievances | October 20, 2015 |
| 8. | Consequential Rule Change Related to deleting Chapter Five from the Rule Book. | Order after daily routine 23(2) After the daily routine of business, the Orders of the Day shall be considered as follows, subject to rules <u>29, 32(4) and 45(1)</u> : <u>Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne</u> <u>Budget Motion</u> Committee of the Whole House, for considering Bills Committee of Supply Report Stage, Bills reported from Committees Government Bills – Concurrence and Third Readings, Second Readings Government Motions Opposition Day Motions Resolving into Committee of the Whole or of Supply <u>23(3)</u> Whenever the Order of the Day is called for “Committee of the Whole House, for considering Bills” or for “Committee of Supply”, the Speaker is to leave the Chair and the House is to resolve itself into the Committee. Private Members' Business 23(4) Subject to sub-rule 4(3), Private Members' Business shall be considered as follows when the House sits on Tuesdays and Thursdays: Tuesday: 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. (Private Members' Hour) Private Bills | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|---|------------------|
| | | <p>Public Bills Private Members' Resolutions Motions</p> <p>11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon (Private Members' Hour) Private Members' Resolutions Motions Public Bills Private Bills</p> <p>Thursday: 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. (Private Members' Hour) Public Bills Private Bills Private Members' Resolutions Motions</p> <p>11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon (Private Members' Hour) Private Members' Resolutions Motions Private Bills Public Bills Deferred votes from previous Tuesday Private Members' Business at 11:55 a.m.</p> <p>Divisions during Private Members' Business 23(5) A division requested during a Private Members' Hour on Tuesday must be deferred to the Private Members' Hour the following Thursday. The deferred vote shall take place at 11:55 a.m. on Thursday, and despite rule 14(4) shall not be further deferred.</p> <p>23(6) A division requested during a Private Members' Hour on Thursday takes place immediately.</p> <p>23(7) In the case of a division occurring pursuant to <u>sub-rule 23(6)</u>, after the division is requested or after the vote is recorded on a division, the House shall consider the next item of business only with leave or if at least 30 minutes remain in that Private Members' Hour.</p> | |
| 9, | <p>Question Time During Private Members' Bill Debates A new rule will designate a 10 minute question period during debate on Private Member's Bills to allow questions from Members.</p> | <p><u>Private Members' Bills Question Period</u> <u>23(8) Following the Sponsor's opening speech on the Second Reading of a Private Members' Bill, a ten minute question period on the Bill may occur.</u> <u>During this question period:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>questions may be addressed to the Sponsor by any Member, with the first question being asked by a Member from another party, followed by a rotation between parties;</u> (b) <u>each Independent Member may ask one question; and</u> (c) <u>no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.</u></p> | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|---|------------------|
| 10. | <p>Selected Private Members' Bills</p> <p>New rule allowing each government and opposition caucus to select three private members' bills to come to a vote at second reading each session.</p> <p>Independent members can select one private members' bill and will not be required to have a seconder to introduce one private members' bill per session</p> | <p><i>THAT the following be added after Rule 23, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p><u>Selected Private Members' Bills</u></p> <p><u>23.1(1) Each recognized party may select up to three Private Members' Bills per session to proceed to a Second Reading vote.</u></p> <p><u>Bills to proceed to a Second Reading vote</u></p> <p><u>23.1(2) Each Independent Member may select one Private Members' Bill per session to proceed to a Second Reading vote, and despite Rule 68(1), an Independent Member will not require a seconder to move each Reading motion for their selected Private Members' Bill.</u></p> <p><u>Written notice</u></p> <p><u>23.1(3) Written notice of each Bill, indicating the sitting day and time when the vote will occur, must be provided to the Speaker by the House Leader or the Independent Member no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled end of the Fall Sittings.</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 11. | <p>Oral Questions</p> <p>A new section for Oral Questions has been created to house the new rules governing O.Q., including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time limits for questions • Prohibition on points of order and matters of privilege • House Leaders to establish rotation for questioning between parties <p>The Point of Order appendix has been deleted as the references are dated and the content is more accurately represented in Manitoba Speaker's Rulings.</p> | <p><i>THAT the following be added after Rule 26:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u></p> <p><u>Oral Questions</u></p> <p><u>26.1(1) The time allowed for Oral Questions shall not exceed 40 minutes.</u></p> <p><u>Rules of debate apply</u></p> <p><u>26.1(2) The rules of debate shall apply to Oral Questions.</u></p> <p><u>Time limits on questions and answers</u></p> <p><u>26.1(3) Questions and answers in Oral Questions shall not exceed:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) <u>60 seconds for Leaders of Recognized Parties.</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) <u>45 seconds for other Members and Ministers.</u></p> <p><u>Order of questions</u></p> <p><u>26.1(4) Following a general election and before the first House sitting period, the House Leaders must jointly advise the Speaker of the order, by party, in which questions will be asked during Oral Questions. The order will be followed for the duration of each Legislature, unless the composition of the parties in the House changes, in which case the House Leaders must, before the next House sitting, advise the Speaker of any change to the order in which questions are to be asked.</u></p> <p><u>Prohibition on Points of Order and Matters of Privilege during Oral Questions</u></p> <p><u>26.1(5) The Speaker shall not consider Points of Order or Matters of Privilege during Oral Questions.</u></p> <p><i>THAT the item "POINT OF ORDER" in the APPENDICES be repealed.</i></p> | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|---|------------------|
| 12. | <p>Opposition Day Motions Changes to these rules to allow motions filed by 5:00 p.m. with the Clerk to proceed to debate in the House the following day.</p> | <p><i>THLAT sub-rules 28(3) to 28(6) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p><u>Filing of Motion</u> <i>28(3) An Opposition Day Motion shall be filed with the Clerk on a sitting day before the House adjourns, or before the usual adjournment hour, whichever is later.</i></p> <p><u>Placing on the Order Paper</u> <i>28(4) An Opposition Day Motion shall be placed on the Order Paper on the sitting day after filing, notwithstanding sub-rules 63(1) and 67(2).</i></p> <p><u>Consideration of Motion</u> <i>28(5) An Opposition Day Motion shall be considered on the same day it appears on the Order Paper.</i></p> <p><u>Notifying House Leaders</u> <i>28(6) The Clerk shall notify House Leaders and Independent Members on the day an Opposition Day Motion is filed.</i></p> <p><i>THLAT sub-rule 28(8) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Not for Second <u>Reading</u> or Concurrence and Third Reading <i>28(8) No motion under this Rule shall be for Second <u>Reading</u> or Concurrence and Third Reading of a Bill.</i></p> <p><i>THLAT sub-rule 28(14) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Debate limited to one sitting day <i>28(14) Debate on an Opposition Day Motion is to be limited to one sitting day. <u>The House shall not adjourn until all Members wishing to speak to the motion have done so.</u></i></p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 13. | <p>Consequential Rule Change Removing a reference in rule 30(1) to PMR rules which have been deleted.</p> | <p><i>THLAT sub-rule 30(1) be repealed and replaced with the following:</i></p> <p>Orders not taken up <i>30(1) Subject to sub-rule 23(3), <u>Written Questions</u>, notices of motions by Members, and orders not taken up or proceeded with when called, may be allowed to stand and retain their precedence; otherwise they shall be removed from the Order Paper.</i></p> | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|--|---|----------------|
| 14. | <p>Private Members' Resolutions The process of designating prioritized Private Members' Resolutions has been deleted and the practice of weekly House Leader announcements will become the exclusive rule for PMRs.</p> <p>Question Time During Private Members' Resolution Debates A new rule will designate a 10 minute question period during debate on Private Member's Resolutions to allow questions from Members.</p> | <p><i>THAT Rule 31 be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS</p> <p>Definition of "resolution" 31(1) In this Rule, "resolution" means a vote, motion, resolution or address, but does not include a motion for the first, second or concurrence and third reading of the Bill, or a motion to refer a Bill to a Committee.</p> <p>Submitting a resolution 31(2) Each Private Member may submit one resolution <u>per legislative session</u> to the Clerk, who <u>shall</u> determine if it is procedurally correct.</p> <p>Resolutions cannot be amended 31(3) <u>Resolutions cannot be amended, unless by unanimous consent of the House.</u></p> <p>Time limit of debate 31(4) Each resolution is to be considered for no more than three hours. At the end of the three hours of debate, or if there are no more Members wishing to speak, the Speaker must put the question.</p> <p><u>Private Members' Resolution Question Period</u> 31(5) <u>Ten minutes prior to the end of the second hour of Private Members' Business, the Speaker shall interrupt debate to allow a ten-minute question period on the resolution under consideration. If a deferred vote under sub-rule 23(4) has been scheduled for this time the Speaker shall interrupt debate five minutes prior to the end of the second hour.</u> <u>During this question period:</u> (a) <u>questions may be addressed to the Sponsor by any Member, with the first question going to being asked by a Member from another party, followed by a rotation between parties;</u> (b) <u>each Independent Member may ask one question; and</u> (c) <u>no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.</u></p> <p><u>This ten minute question period shall count as part of the three hours of debate on the Resolution.</u></p> <p>Tuesdays – <u>Government Resolutions</u> 31(6) <u>Each Tuesday the Government House Leader or designate shall announce in the House which resolution will be debated during Private Members' Business on the following Tuesday morning.</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|------------------------|---|--------------|
| | | <p>Thursdays – Opposition Resolutions <u>31(7) If there is one Recognized Opposition Party, each Thursday the Opposition House Leader or designate shall announce in the House which resolution will be debated during Private Members’ Business on the following Thursday morning.</u></p> <p>Opposition Resolutions – more than one Recognized Opposition Party <u>31(8) If there is more than one Recognized Opposition Party, the Opposition House Leaders must submit to the Speaker an agreement that specifies which party’s private member resolutions will be debated during Private Members’ Business on each Thursday morning during the session. The House Leader of the party whose members’ resolutions are to be debated the following Thursday morning shall make the announcement required under sub-rule 31(6).</u></p> <p>Independent Member resolutions <u>31(9) One resolution submitted by each independent member will be scheduled for debate on a Tuesday morning and announced by the Government House Leader.</u></p> <p>Secunder not required <u>31(10) Despite sub-rule 68(1), an Independent Member will not require a seconder to move their resolution.</u></p> <p>Resolutions not disposed of <u>31(11) When a resolution is called for the first time by a House Leader of a recognized party during a Private Members’ Hour, and</u> (a) the resolution is not disposed of within that hour, or (b) the Member is not present or does not proceed with the resolution at that time; <u>the resolution is to be placed on the Order Paper at the bottom of the list of resolutions.</u></p> <p>Request to “stand” or “adjourn” matters <u>31(12) Despite sub-rule 35(1), during Private Members’ Business, no Member may ask that a matter be allowed to “stand” and no motion to “adjourn” can be made respecting a resolution.</u></p> | |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|---|----------------|
| 15. | <p>Budget Debate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the number of days of debate on the budget motion from eight to six. • Reducing the speaking times in the debate from 30 minutes to 20 minutes. • Reducing the number of time the government can interrupt the debate from three to two. | <p><i>THAT sub-rules 32(3) to 32(6) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Limitation on debate 32(3) The debate on the motion for approval by the House in general of the budgetary policy of the government, and any amendments thereto, shall not exceed <u>six</u> sitting days, including the day of the presentation of the Budget.</p> <p>Precedence on Order Paper 32(4) The Order of the Day for resuming debate on the motion for approval by the House in general of the budgetary policy of the government, and any amendments thereto, shall take precedence over all other motions for the same day.</p> <p>Interrupting debate 32(5) Despite sub-rule (4), the Government House Leader may interrupt the debate on as many as <u>two</u> sitting days to call government business.</p> <p>Disposal of questions 32(6) On the <u>sixth</u> of the <u>six</u> days, at 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless debate has previously been concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion, and any amendments thereto.</p> <p>Speaking times in debate <u>32(7) No Member may speak for more than 20 minutes in this debate.</u></p> <p>Exceptions <u>32(8) The 20-minute limit does not apply to the Leader of the Government, of the Official Opposition, or of a Recognized Opposition Party.</u></p> <p><u>A Leader who has not spoken for 20 minutes in this debate may, by giving written notice to the Speaker, designate one Member who may speak in the debate for as long as the Member wishes. If the Member then speaks in the debate, the 20-minute limit applies to the Leader.</u></p> <p>Termination of debate <u>32(9) On the eighth sitting day after the main motion has been moved, at 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless debate has previously been concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion, and any amendments thereto. The Speaker shall not hear Points of Order or Matters of Privilege until all questions relating to this debate have been disposed of.</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|--|--|------------------|
| 16. | <p>Matters of Privilege The rule relating to Matters of Privilege has been updated to reflect the prohibition on matters of privilege during oral questions.</p> <p>The Matter of Privilege appendix has been deleted – with the exception of the reference to the need for a motion which has been included in the new rule 34(2) – as the references are dated.</p> | <p><i>THAT Rule 34 be repealed and replaced with the following:</i></p> <p><u>Matters of Privilege</u> <u>34(1) When a Matter of Privilege arises it shall be taken into consideration immediately, except during Oral Questions.</u></p> <p><u>34(2) A submission from a Member raising a Matter of Privilege should conclude with a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.</u></p> <p><i>THAT the item "MATTER OF PRIVILEGE" in the APPENDICES be repealed.</i></p> | October 20, 2015 |
| 17. | <p>Consequential Rule Change The MUPI rule needs to be changed to reflect re-ordering the sequence of events in Routine Proceedings.</p> | <p><i>THAT sub-rule 36(1) be repealed and replaced with the following:</i></p> <p>Setting aside regularly scheduled business of the House 36(1) After <u>Petitions</u>, any Member may move to set aside the regularly scheduled business of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, of which the Member has given prior notice to the Speaker not less than 90 minutes prior to the start of Routine Proceedings.</p> | October 20, 2015 |
| 18. | <p>Speeches not to be read To reflect the modern realities of the House.</p> | <p><i>THAT Rule 38 be repealed.</i></p> | October 20, 2015 |
| 19. | <p>Consequential Rule Change To correct ambiguities in references to opposition parties.</p> | <p><i>THAT sub-rule 43(2) be repealed and replaced with the following:</i></p> <p>Exceptions 43(2) The 30-minute limit does not apply to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) the Leader of the <u>Government</u> or of a Recognized Opposition Party;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) a Minister moving a Government Order; or</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(c) a Member making a motion of “no confidence in the Government”, or the Minister replying to the motion.</p> <p>A Leader who has not spoken for more than 30 minutes in a debate may, by giving written notice to the Speaker, designate one Member who may speak in the debate for as long as the Member wishes. If the Member then speaks in the debate, the 30-minute limit applies to the Leader.</p> | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (changes) | Takes effect |
|------|--|---|------------------|
| 20. | Consequential Rule Change Rule 43(4) will be deleted as the new process for question time during debates supersedes it. | <i>THLAT sub-rule 43(4) be repealed.</i> | October 20, 2015 |
| 21. | Debate on the Address in Reply to Throne Speech <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the number of days of debate on the budget motion from eight to six. Reducing the speaking times in the debate from 30 minutes to 20 minutes. Reducing the number of time the government can interrupt the debate from three to two. Rule 45(6) will be deleted as this practice has been discontinued. | <p><i>THLAT Rule 44 be replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Limitation of debate on Address in Reply to Throne Speech 44 The proceedings on the Order of the Day for presenting and debating the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and on any amendments proposed thereto, shall not exceed <u>six</u> sitting days.</p> <p><i>THLAT Rule 45 be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Precedence on Order Paper 45(1) The Order of the Day for resuming debate on the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne shall take precedence over all other motions for the same day.</p> <p>Interrupting debate for government business 45(2) Despite sub-rule (1), the Government House Leader may interrupt the debate on as many as <u>two</u> sitting days to call government business.</p> <p>Disposal of questions 45(3) On the <u>sixth</u> of the <u>six</u> days, at 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless debate has previously been concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion, and any amendments thereto.</p> <p>Speaking times in debate 45(4) <u>No Member may speak for more than 20 minutes in this debate.</u></p> <p>Exceptions 45(5) <u>The 20-minute limit does not apply to the Leader of the Government, of the Official Opposition, or of a Recognized Opposition Party.</u></p> <p><u>A Leader who has not spoken for more than 20 minutes in this debate may, by giving written notice to the Speaker, designate one Member who may speak in the debate for as long as the Member wishes. If the Member then speaks in the debate, the 20-minute limit applies to the Leader.</u></p> <p>Termination of debate 45(6) <u>On the eighth sitting day after the main motion has been moved, at 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless debate has previously been concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion, and any amendments thereto. The Speaker shall not hear Points of Order or Matters of Privilege until all questions relating to this debate have been disposed of.</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|--|------------------|
| 22. | <p>Challenges to Speaker's Rulings</p> <p>The ability to challenge the ruling of the Speaker on a point of order has been removed. This change will also apply to Chairpersons in Committee of Supply and in Committee of the Whole House, but it will not apply to Standing Committee Chairpersons.</p> | <p><i>THAT sub-rules 50(3) and 50(4) be repealed and replaced with the following:</i></p> <p>Decision</p> <p>50(3) The Speaker shall decide the point of order and the Speaker's decision <u>is not subject to appeal to the House</u> and cannot be debated.</p> <p>Points of order ruled on by Chairperson</p> <p>50(4) <u>Rulings on points of order by a Chairperson in Committee of Supply and in Committee of the Whole House are not subject to appeal, while rulings of a Chairperson on points of order in a Standing Committee can be appealed.</u></p> | October 20, 2015 |
| 23. | <p>Written Questions</p> <p>Changes to rules governing this process so that each Minister responsible for answering the question must respond in writing within 30 days of the question appearing on the Order Paper.</p> | <p><i>THAT Rule 60 be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Written Questions</p> <p>60(1) <u>Each Member may place up to five Written Questions on the Order Paper per session. A Written Question may seek</u> information from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>a Minister</u> of the Crown relating to public affairs; <u>or</u> b) <u>another Member</u> relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which <u>the Member</u> may be concerned. <p><u>In putting any such Written Question, or replying to it, no argument or opinion shall be offered or any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain it.</u></p> <p>Responses by Members</p> <p>60(2) <u>A Member replying to a Written Question must do so within 30 days of the Written Question appearing on the Order Paper.</u></p> <p>Written Questions listed</p> <p>60(3) <u>A Written Question that remains unanswered will be listed on the Order Paper once every two weeks.</u></p> <p>Replying to Written Questions</p> <p>60(4) <u>A Member replying to a Written Question shall table the answer in the House or, if the House is not in session, follow established intersessional tabling provisions in accordance with sub-rule 24(2).</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 24. | <p>Consequential Rule Change</p> <p>Old sub-rules 60(4) and 60(5) will be redundant when Chapter V of the Rule Book is deleted.</p> | <p><i>THAT sub-rules 60(4) and 60(5) be repealed.</i></p> | October 20, 2015 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|--|---|------------------|
| 25. | Address for Papers Order for Return Deleting Chapter Five from the Rule Book. | <i>THAT Chapter V (Rules 61 and 62) be repealed.</i> | October 20, 2015 |
| 26. | Condolence Motions A new rule to reflect the current way the House considers Condolence Motions. | <p><i>THAT the following be added as Chapter V (Rules 61 and 62), effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>CHAPTER V</u> <u>CONDOLENCE MOTIONS</u></p> <p><u>Condolence Motions</u></p> <p><u>61(1) A condolence motion is to be considered during the Fall Sittings. A condolence motion may be considered during the Spring Sittings only by unanimous consent.</u></p> <p><u>Notice not required</u></p> <p><u>61(2) Despite Rules 43 and 63, a condolence motion is moved without notice during Orders of the Day.</u></p> <p><u>No amendments</u></p> <p><u>61(3) A condolence motion is not subject to amendments and speaking time limits do not apply.</u></p> <p><u>Moment of silence</u></p> <p><u>62 At the conclusion of the speeches the Speaker puts the question and asks Members to signify their approval of the motion by rising in their places for a moment of silence.</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 27. | Speaking Time in Committees of the Whole House and the Committee of Supply Question and answer time during debates in Committees of the Whole House and the Committee of Supply will be reduced to five minutes each. Opening statements in Supply for ministers and critics will be ten minutes. | <p><i>THAT sub-rule 75(1) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Rules observed in Committee of the Whole</p> <p><u>75(1) The Rules shall be observed in a Committee of the Whole House, insofar as they are applicable, except the Rules requiring seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking, and, in the case of the Committee of Supply, requiring Members to rise to speak. The speaking time limit in Committee of the Whole is <u>five</u> minutes.</u></p> <p><i>THAT sub-rules 77(1) and 77(2) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p><u>Speaking Times in the Committee of Supply</u></p> <p><u>77(1) With the exception of opening statements, Members shall speak for no more than five minutes in Committee of Supply debates.</u></p> <p><u>Opening Statements</u></p> <p><u>77(2) Opening statements from Ministers and critics from Recognized Opposition Parties shall be restricted to 10 minutes.</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (changes) | Takes effect |
|------|--|---|------------------|
| 28. | <p>Questions taken under advisement during Estimates and Concurrence</p> <p>Questions taken under advisement during Estimates and the concurrence debate must be answered in writing within 45 days of the question being taken under advisement. The Clerks will develop protocols for Supply Chairs to address this, and the Research Branch of the Clerk's Office will develop a system to track the questions and answers. This system will be modelled on the system used the Manitoba Public Accounts Committee since 2010.</p> | <p><i>THLAT the following be added after sub-rule 77(16), effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p><u>Matters under advisement</u></p> <p><u>77(16.1) During the consideration of departmental estimates and the debate on the concurrence motion in the Committee of Supply, when a Minister takes a question under advisement he or she must, within 45 days of the question being asked, respond to the question in one of the following ways:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>in the Committee of Supply before the conclusion of that department's estimates:</u></p> <p>i. <u>by providing the answer verbally, or</u></p> <p>ii. <u>by tabling the answer;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>in the Committee of Supply during the debate on the concurrence motion:</u></p> <p>i. <u>by providing the answer verbally, or</u></p> <p>ii. <u>by tabling the answer;</u></p> <p>(c) <u>in writing:</u></p> <p>i. <u>by tabling an answer in the House, or,</u></p> <p>ii. <u>if the House is not in session, by following established intersessional tabling provisions in accordance with sub-rule 24(2).</u></p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 29. | <p>Concurrence Debate</p> <p>This revised rule will state that the Premier may be called to appear in the Concurrence debate no more than three days.</p> | <p><i>THLAT sub-rule 78(4.3) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Limits on number of times Ministers can be called</p> <p>78(4.3) The First Minister is only eligible to be called once on the concurrence list <u>for a maximum of three days</u>, while the other Ministers of the Crown can be called a maximum of three times.</p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 30. | <p>Rules Committee Meetings</p> <p>A new rule which specifies that the Rules committee should meet twice a year.</p> | <p><i>THLAT the following be added after sub-rule 84(4):</i></p> <p><u>Rules Committee to meet twice per year</u></p> <p><u>84(5) After consulting with House Leaders of recognized parties and each Independent Member, the Government House Leader shall call a minimum of two meetings per year of the Standing Committee of the Rules of the House.</u></p> | October 20, 2015 |
| 31. | <p>Public Presentations to Standing Committees</p> <p>Deleting provisions relating to committees hearing presenters past midnight.</p> | <p><i>THLAT sub-rule 92(5) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p>Sitting past midnight</p> <p>92(5) Except with the unanimous consent of the Committee, a Standing or Special Committee <u>must not hear public presentations past midnight. After concluding public presentations, by unanimous consent the Committee may sit past midnight to consider a Bill clause by clause.</u></p> <p><i>THLAT sub-rule 92(6) be repealed, effective April 20, 2016.</i></p> | April 20, 2016 |

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – June 2015

| Item | Purpose of Rule Change | New Rules (<u>changes</u>) | Takes effect |
|------|---|--|------------------|
| 32. | <p>Public Accounts Committee</p> <p>Increasing the minimum number of Public Accounts Committee meetings held per calendar year to nine from “six to eight”.</p> | <p><i>THAT sub-rule 111(1) be repealed and replaced with the following, effective April 20, 2016:</i></p> <p><u>Meetings</u></p> <p>111(1) After consulting with the PAC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, the Government House Leader shall call a <u>minimum of nine meetings</u> of the PAC per year. To the extent practicable, the meetings shall be held at regular intervals.</p> | April 20, 2016 |
| 33. | <p>Question Time During Second Reading Debates on Government Bills</p> <p>A new rule will designate a 15 minute question period during debate on Government Bills to allow questions from Members.</p> | <p><i>THAT the following be added after sub-rule 136(4):</i></p> <p><u>Government Bills Question Period</u></p> <p>136(5) <u>Following the Minister’s opening speech on the Second Reading of a Government Bill, a question period of up to 15 minutes on the Bill may occur.</u></p> <p><u>During this question period:</u></p> <p>a) <u>One question at a time may be addressed to the Minister by any Member in the following sequence:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>first question asked by the Official Opposition critic or designate;</u> ii. <u>subsequent questions asked by critic(s) or designate(s) from other Recognized Opposition Parties;</u> iii. <u>subsequent questions asked by each independent Member;</u> iv. <u>remaining questions asked by any opposition Members.</u> <p>b) <u>No question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.</u></p> | October 20, 2015 |

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>