



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-804B

VOL. XXXI No. 154B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 5 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 5 January, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. At 5:30 this afternoon I did take under advisement a question regarding the admissibility of an amendment proposed to the Resolution by the Honourable Government House Leader. I have not yet completed reviewing that matter and have not yet prepared a ruling. I would ask the indulgence of the House for a little more time, either by means of a recess or an adjournment, in order to have that ruling ready for the members.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, certainly, as indicated by the Government House Leader, we have no objection to that. However, it had not occurred to me, and I don't think to other members on this side, that as we reached 5:30 this afternoon, indeed a minute or two past, that debate on the issue had been completed. I just wonder if you would rule on that, whether it is your understanding that there is nothing further to be said. If that is your ruling, fine, if you were of the opinion that debate on the question of order had been completed. If not, I would like to make a very brief submission.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I did take the matter under advisement this afternoon at 5:30. However, given the importance of the matter and the willingness on my part to receive advice from members, I will allow further advice that members might have, strictly pertaining to the point of order.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and only to the point of order. Mr. Speaker, you, in a very real sense of the term, sit not only as the presiding officer of this House - and you do so, Sir, with great dignity and in my view efficiency - but you sit in a sense in a role analogous to that of a judge. You must from time to time make findings of fact whether a member said this or that and you do what a judge would do, you look at the record, but to a very considerable extent you apply the rules in the same way that a judge would apply the law.

In a given jurisdiction one looks, in doing that, at what the precedents are and indeed you, yourself, have made a considerable point, and I think an accurate point, that the rules are more than those which are found in the rule book, but also include the precedents. Beauchesne, as we know, is advisory and persuasive but does not have necessarily the force of rules in the same way that the rules and precedents do.

So I simply make that point with respect to the force of the precedents, and indeed the precedents that have been brought to your attention deal with the question of amendments to a resolution. That's point No. 1.

Point No. 2, Sir, is that the resolution and the amendments to the resolution are still part, when they're to be dealt with, of the resolution as a whole and one

looks at the question of severability. Are there parts of it that in effect stand alone? And indeed there are not.

I would just like to take the example that was given by the Leader of the Opposition and I think it's rather a good example. He said, well, we may wish to support the section dealing with municipality, or some of us may wish to support the section dealing with municipalities, but that section which deals with municipalities has no meaning or significance other than in relationship to 23.1 - the indication was that they may not want to support 23.1 - so that there is not the severability that was suggested.

What can take place - and this was pointed out during the course of submissions to you - however is this, and I'm making this argument to point out that in no way is the opposition prejudiced by a ruling that would follow precedents and say that the government may bring in this kind of an amendment; that is, it is open to the opposition to bring in subamendments section by section.

It may if there is something about 23.1 that they don't like even after they've looked at the legal opinions, they can move an amendment to that. They're not precluded by this procedure at all in doing that and that subamendment would be debated and dealt with.

They may, if they want, attack the sections which validate our statutes; which are part of the package. They may bring in those amendments and they may be debated; there is nothing in the proposed procedure which precludes that pack. So that looking, not then narrowly at the force of law, if I may use that term, although that is I think where Mr. Speaker would start from, but looking at whether or not the opposition, and in a reverse case the government, is prejudiced in debate, there is clearly no prejudice because every single qualification that the opposition would want to bring in, if indeed they genuinely think that they have a way of strengthening the bill, may be brought in by way of subamendment, and it's clear that they could do that; clear that there's no prejudice; clear what the precedents are, and I would hope that you take these matters into consideration in making your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina to the same point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I almost hesitate to enter this debate after the learned contribution of the professor from Fort Rouge.

Mr. Speaker, we have here not a resolution which is a whole, as the former Government House Leader has indicated to us, we, Sir, indeed have two separate and distinct issues which we are dealing with in this resolution.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I submit we have Section 23.1 which declares for the first time in the history of the Province of Manitoba that English and French are official languages in the Province of Manitoba.

The second issue, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with in this amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . is the validation, Sir, of laws of the province which have been passed in one language only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are led to believe the major part of the rationale for this debate as given to us by the Attorney-General some eight months ago, it was to prevent a court challenge to the validity of the laws of the Province of Manitoba which were written in English only. That is part and parcel of the amendments as tabled by the new Government House Leader and, Mr. Speaker, I submit they are two separate and distinct issues which deserve the right and the ability of the government to provide us with separate amendments that can be debated separately, that can be voted on separately, and not as a package as has been suggested by the Government House Leader and supported obviously by the First Minister and the Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker, there are indeed two separate issues to be dealt with in the amendments proposed by the new Government House Leader. One of them carries on with the validation of English only laws passed since the late 1800's in the Province of Manitoba; and the other one deals with the official language status of two languages in the Province of Manitoba.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is indeed adequate grounds to separate this issue, to provide separate amendments which can be debated and voted on a separate basis. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the importance of the issue and the feelings of Manitobans that are present on this issue require us as 57 elected members - 56 elected members, yourself excluded, Mr. Speaker, because you will not likely have a vote on this issue - require us to give this the most thorough debate possible.

That, Mr. Speaker, leads me to the conclusion, and I hope yourself, that this should be separated into free-standing motions, clause-by-clause, to allow members of this House - even though the Whips are on in the government's side - but to allow members of this House to examine, to take a look at the arguments presented in favour of these amendments individually by the government and the supporters in the government backbench, if there are any, and allow us, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to examine this issue and vote on this issue clause-by-clause.

I would hope that you give that the consideration that it deserves on an important issue like this that has aroused the interest and the attention of every citizen of this province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you are hearing some suggestion that resolutions dealt with in this House should be considered from the point of view that debate can attach or can be focussed on separate sections of a resolution and that, therefore, resolutions should be severed and there should be individual debate on the various components. Mr. Speaker, that just does not make sense with the precedent that has been followed in this House.

If, for example, the resolution before us was not being amended - or proposed to be amended by the

government - it would be considered in its totality and we had already entered into extensive debate in respect to that resolution, no one on the other side before, Mr. Speaker, raised the question that, oh well, we want this resolution, we want the principles segregated so we can vote on different ones. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose for their own purposes they want to segregate.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, resolutions in this House are considered, and we have considered very involved resolutions, whether it be resolutions on the Crow or other matters, where there are specific points made, a great variety of points - constitutional resolutions, as my leader has indicated - in respect to the resolution on aboriginal rights, various components of that resolution, and resolutions traditionally in this House are dealt with as matters of principle; they are dealt with as a whole.

It's completely different in respect to the treatment, as the House Leader has indicated, when we deal with bills that are before the House, it is a separate process. Those bills are subject normally to a committee review, either Committee of the Whole House or a committee of the House, a standing committee, and there is a first, second and third reading process.

To say that resolutions, and the rules in respect to resolutions apply whether they be government resolutions or private member's resolutions - and you know, Mr. Speaker, that in this House we have accepted amendments that would seek to change everything in a resolution except the first "whereas" - resolutions are dealt with in a separate way. To suggest that this resolution, because it has different component principles, has to be split up is flying in the face of, not only the precedents that the Honourable House Leader has indicated, but common sense, Mr. Speaker, because, as the Attorney-General has pointed out, this resolution is a series of principles that flow from one commitment. That commitment is clear that the government has given to deal with the matter, to deal with the question of French language rights in a comprehensive way, to deal with all of the issues that confront the government in respect to first the court challenge and then the basic need to address the rights question, and that is covered by the resolution. It is one whole; it should be dealt with as one resolution. No attempt should be made to try and force a splitting up of sections of this resolution. I think the precedents are clear, and to suggest that we must split it flies in the face of common sense and the precedents.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suggest to the Government House Leader, and I would hope that he would give very serious consideration to this, that in my view the question of precedents or lack of precedents is not the definitive question here. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources has made reference to what he describes as common sense and, in fact, I am glad he did because that was going to be a reference point for me, Sir, in my comments on this point of order.

I believe that if the Minister of Government Services, the Minister responsible for piloting this legislation

through the House at this juncture, is sincere in what he has said from time to time about the door being open, about being willing to reach an accommodation and a compromise that provides the kind of safety net or minority cultural and linguistic interests and aspirations that he has addressed frequent debates and frequent discussions on this point, and if he's sincere about wanting to work to a conclusion that is achieved by positive co-operation, by co-operation - there is no other kind of co-operation than positive co-operation - but that is achieved by co-operation in a positive spirit to do right by our province and its history and its future, then he would have to concede, Sir, he would have to concede, that reason - and I would use the term sweet reason - insists that he should give very serious consideration to accepting the proposal put forward by this side of the House that this resolution be dealt with in a form that permits us to address it virtually clause-by-clause, issue-by-issue, point-by-point.

I don't see how the Minister of Government Services, who has attempted, and I think certainly taking him at face value, attempted to deal with this issue in a way which he sincerely believes is one that goes to the very heart of the spirit of Manitoba and which requires the co-operation and good will of all Manitobans if we're going to reach any conclusion. I don't see how he can repudiate the request and the argument put forward by the opposition in this case, Sir.

We're dealing with a very unique situation that goes to the Manitoba personality, the Manitoba psyche, the Manitoba persona, the depths and the roots of our history whether the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Government House Leader appreciates that or not.

He has spoken frequently of the desirability of co-operation and the desirability and willingness on his part to be malleable and amenable in the hope that his opponents in this debate will similarly be malleable and amenable. It seems to me, Sir, that he can't ask for that and then resist and repudiate what common sense and sweet reason cry out for here in a situation that is so unique, not only to Manitoba but to Canada, that the case put forward by my House Leader, I submit, Sir, is unarguable.

We are dealing here with a gut issue insofar as the history, current times and the future of Manitoba and the Manitoba personality are concerned. We are dealing here with a resolution that is unique, not only in Manitoba history, but unique in Canadian history. We're not dealing with a private members' resolution, that it consists of a number of whereas clauses, and that is dealt with at a level of debate and interest that oftentimes is highly insular, highly singular, highly subjective, certainly highly limited.

We're dealing here with the basic stuff of which Manitoba's past, present, and future are and shall be made. In that context, and in that spirit, I don't see how any well-meaning Minister attempting to pilot this legislation through the House can deny the legitimacy of the opposition argument. He, and his Leader, the Premier and his colleagues, have confronted us with a resolution that is complex, that is broad and far-reaching in its spectrum, that consists of a major number of changes, amendments, revisions from those which were originally proposed to us in this House last

July, Sir, and it is only in the best interests of Manitobans that we be able to deal with those proposals and those clauses virtually on a clause-by-clause, issue-by-issue, point-by-point basis. He will be surprised, I'm sure, if he permits the House to proceed in that way, to find that there are aspects of the proposal with which members on this side are in concurrence.

There are aspects of it with which we agree but, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, like the legislation having to do with seat belts, motorcycle helmets and child restraints, it's extremely difficult to be asked to deal with a composite, polyglot piece of legislation - in this case a resolution - that touches on so many different issues that have so many different perspectives and meanings and ramifications for so many of us, and to ask us to deal with them all in one lump. We can deal with them in their individual context, in their individual import. It's extremely difficult, unfair and, I suggest, Sir, even cynical to propose that this House and this province, and the people of this province through their elected legislators here, deal with it in one chunk, one bunch, one polyglot mass in the way that he's proposed.

So, I call on the Government House Leader, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker, to launch his career as House Leader, and to launch his career as the Minister piloting this legislation through the House in a positive and constructive and sensitive way, and to permit us to proceed on the basis that has been proposed by my Leader and my House Leader, and that would be supported, and that would be requested, I submit, by the majority of fair-minded and well-meaning Manitobans, and that is a fair and honest and reasonable approach to the legislation, not a cynical approach in which he attempts, and his colleagues attempt, to ram it through in a way in which it cannot be addressed on the merits of its individual parts.

That's the challenge for the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether he'll be big enough for it; I don't know whether he'll be up to it, but I suggest that it's an interesting political challenge for him, it's an interesting career challenge for him, and Manitobans will be keenly awaiting his response to that challenge; will he be big or will he be small?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in concluding the opposition's further arguments to the point of order that's raised, I want you to know, Sir, that we accept and appreciate the fact that you, Sir, recognize the importance of the subject matter by indicating to all of us that you are taking this matter under further advisement.

Despite the intemperate intervention on the part of the Minister of Finance earlier on this afternoon you, Sir, are aware of the fact that you are presiding, and we are all participating in a very unique happening. We are talking about the very first constitutional amendments to the Constitution of Canada and Manitoba - (Interjection) - perhaps the Aboriginal rights, but the ones that are involving a province, perhaps the ones . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, if honourable members want to persist on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . dealing with this subject matter as being just another one of a series of matters that are dealt with routinely in this House, then they really and truly do not perceive of what this issue is about. Sir, I am simply . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . indicating to you that I'm happy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member kindly restrict his remarks to the point of order that is before the House.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just some further brief comments with regard to the suggestion that the government is in any way unwilling or unable to accommodate requests from members opposite that might allow proper examination of this matter.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the reason that I raised some concerns about the point of order raised by the Opposition House Leader was because of the importance of this matter and the importance attached to us following the rules and precedents established both with regard to this House, but with regard to other jurisdictions in dealing with resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no question the government has been willing to take a long time. A suggestion of ramming or of trying to construct an amendment in such a way as to prevent debate, prevent discussion, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely not the case. The amendment was prepared, the way it was prepared specifically for one reason, because it was our belief - and is certainly my conviction on having done the research - that that was absolutely the way it had to be prepared, but in no way, Mr. Speaker, was that presentation designed to restrict the participation of members in debate, for them to make suggestions with respect to individual clauses, just as we do on debates on resolutions, to highlight particular items, to make suggestions for changes, to enter into discussion.

I'm very pleased at the suggestion of the Member for Fort Garry that there is a willingness on the other side. To be quite honest that is the first indication I've had and I am impressed by it.

I am also, Mr. Speaker, nonetheless unchanged in my desire to proceed according to rule and precedent. That is my job as Government House Leader, to observe the rules and practices of this Chamber.

So, Mr. Speaker, the government certainly has a willingness to listen to suggestions, to engage in debate on every single item, both in the resolution and in the amendment, during the debate that will be ensuing on this matter. Certainly we will take that same attitude on the bill on which we will have clause-by-clause consideration. Mr. Speaker, to allow that on the amendment would certainly be a departure. We do it not, Mr. Speaker, to in any way prevent co-operation, to prevent debate focussed on individual items. If the member wishes to divide his speech on this debate into seven or eight items and be very specific, or on

further amendments or subamendments. All of those things are possible under the rules . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for members opposite, particularly the Member for Fort Garry who I know appreciates the point, it is not, I repeat, not our intention, as it would be in committee where we must deal clause-by-clause on a bill, to in any way preclude further amendment. I have said that twice now, the Premier has said it once, the amendment is not moved with that in mind. We will not be making those consequential procedural arguments.

If members wish to move amendments on, for example, Section 23.2 after a question has been put on the amendment I moved with regard to the very final section, I would have no quarrel in agreeing that the amendment would be in order. — (Interjection) —

If the amendment is attractive and commends itself, I said in my remarks, and I'm sure the Member for Fort Garry heard it very clearly although it may have been missed by others, Mr. Speaker, the government is willing to listen to constructive suggestions that will enhance the intent of the government program in this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell on that same point.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a classic example of the opposition having to bail the government out of one of the most serious problems that this province has ever seen in its history and here we are pleading and begging with this government and this new House Leader, showing them ways and means how we can get them off the horns of this terrible dilemma that they've not only got themselves into, Mr. Speaker, they've got the government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to help you in your wisdom . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I said that I would listen to the advice of members but their remarks should be strictly to the point of order. Would the honourable member kindly restrict his remarks to the point or order?

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my remarks basically to the Chair in this matter because you have a most difficult decision to make on this resolution that's before this House tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you don't make the wrong decision because, if you listen to what members opposite are saying, because you are setting a precedent. The first precedent in this province, the first time we've amended the Constitution by this method that this government has tried, we are setting a precedent doing what we are here in this Session.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the decision that you make will be as wide and as open for future generations yet unborn, because no doubt the day will come, Mr. Speaker, when certain other amendments will be brought before this House at that time, and I would

hope that generations yet unborn will have more latitude in amending the Constitution, of not only our country but this province, than we're getting from this government and this House Leader that we are dealing with here right tonight. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you'll take a very close look at that when you bring your decision back to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank all honourable members for their advice. The House will now recess for awhile and the members will be summoned to return by the ringing of the bell.

RECESS SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On January 5th the Honourable Government House Leader moved an amendment consisting of five parts to the Constitutional Resolution regarding Official Languages.

After listening to the views of several members I took the matter under advisement in order to further consider it. Three questions arise.

First, whether or not the motion is in order; secondly, whether an omnibus amendment such as the one proposed would pre-empt further amendments to the resolution; and thirdly, whether or not the amendment should be divided to permit members to express an opinion on each part.

With regard to the first concern, whether or not the motion is in order, although our Rules are silent upon the matter, longstanding Manitoba practice has been to accept omnibus amendments to resolutions. Accordingly, the amendment is in order.

Secondly, the possibility that the omnibus amendment would pre-empt further amendments was of considerable concern to me. However, it is now clear that amendments referring to clauses not addressed by the proposed amendment could be introduced subsequent to the disposition of the omnibus resolution.

Thirdly, with regard to whether the amendment should be divided to permit expression of opinion on each part of the amendment, I refer to *Beauchesne Citation 415* which is based on a ruling of Speaker McNaughton in Ottawa in 1964. That reference deals with dividing a main resolution. I can find no references to any amendment being divided. Although I sympathize with the concerns of the opposition regarding their ability to debate the component parts of the amendment separately there is a method whereby this can be achieved.

Any member may propose an amendment, a subamendment to change or delete a specific part of the amendment and so the debate would be specific to that part.

In view of the above reasons I am satisfied that members will be able to satisfactorily debate all elements of the matter fully without resorting to the division of the amendment.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just for some further clarification on your fourth paragraph that rules out: "However it is now clear that amendments referring

to clauses not addressed by the proposed amendment could be introduced subsequent to this position of the omnibus resolution." Does that preclude any amendments until the entire omnibus resolution is disposed of?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether or not it is appropriate for questions to be addressed to you directly in interpretation of rulings.

However, if I can be of some assistance, I think your ruling is clear and that is, that amendments can be made subsequent to the disposition of the omnibus resolution to any clauses not affected by the amendment.

Any members desiring to make amendments to sections covered by what's being referred to as an omnibus amendment may do so by means of subamendment. So there would appear to be an appropriate vehicle, in terms of the way the Speaker has ruled here, to amend both clauses which are covered by the amendment that was moved this afternoon and also to clauses that are not covered.

The only distinction between the ability to amend would relate to whether it was by subamendment or by main amendment, and also whether it was before or after the disposition of the amendment that was moved this afternoon.

That's certainly how I read it, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure if it's your disposition to answer questions from members.

MR. SPEAKER: There is apparently a typographical error in the paragraph mentioned by the Honourable Opposition House Leader. The word "resolution" there should be "amendment", and it is to refer to when that omnibus amendment is dealt with, then further amendments would be in order.

The question before the House then is the amendment moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, as read. Do you require it read again? Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader and seconded by the Honourable Member for — (Interjection) —

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, subject to the acquiescence of the Minister of Natural Resources I

would move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire of the government's business intentions tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, it would be our intention tomorrow to proceed with the business before the House, which is the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act and, if possible, to proceed with the Bill 115 which is on notice.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).