

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session – Thirteenth Legislature**  
**37th Day**

**Tuesday, April 7, 1959**

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

**TRADE UNION ACT INQUIRY**

Moved by Mr. Weber (Meadow Lake), seconded by Mr. Elias (Rosthern):

“That this Assembly recommends to the Government the appointment of a Select Committee of the Assembly, under the provisions of Section 56A of The Legislative Assembly Act, as enacted by Chapter 85 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1958, to inquire into the operation and administration of The Trade Union Act in all its aspects;

the said Committee to be empowered to sit after prorogation, during the interval between Sessions; to have the powers and authority, and provided by Section 24 of The Legislative Assembly Act, to call for such persons, papers and things as the Committee may deem necessary in any of its proceedings or deliberations; to examine witnesses under oath or affirmation, and to report the results of its inquiry to the Assembly within the first ten sitting days of the next ensuing Session;

the said Select Committee to be composed of such Members of the Assembly as may be named later.”

**Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, due to the nature of this motion, and so there will be no misunderstanding by the members of this Legislature, also for the records, I beg your indulgence for referring to my notes.

It is apparent that Saskatchewan is on the verge of substantial industrial development. This foretells increasing labour-management problems. Subsequent to such development and the problems likely to materialize as a

April 7, 1959

result, it is imperative that we, as a democratic government, do whatever we can to anticipate and forestall unnecessary conflict which may arise between individual group interests, to whatever degree necessary, and by using a minimum of compulsion to achieve such ends, the public interest must be protected.

Preservation and maintenance of industrial peace is of primary public interest. At the same time, rights of the individual worker must be adequately safeguarded and supported by mutually beneficial labour-management relations.

Free competition between labour and management is as vital to public interest as it is in all phases of our economic society. The fact that individual values between various elements of our society often conflict, sometimes making striking a proper balance a difficult and delicate problem.

Competitive factors may lead to individual injustices working against either or both workers or management. Therefore, a process of collective bargaining must be established which will consider co-operative as well as competitive elements.

Free competition implies the right of unions and management to negotiate wages; that hours and working conditions must be mutually agreed upon according to their own best judgment; that they must be free to set up their own system for adjusting disputes; that they must be free to choose their own lawful means of enforcement; but there must be mutual respect and responsibility in honouring contracts and agreements. There is an urgent need for a greater sense of self-reliance by both labour and management in collective bargaining, and less reliance placed on government intervention.

A sound co-operative policy established between labour and management would create a relationship which would work to maintain a quality and cost of production most beneficial to the public interest. While differences will arise, there is no reason why they cannot be peaceably and satisfactorily adjusted through sincere negotiation and mutual understanding.

During the transition from a predominately agricultural to industrial economy, considerable economic changes must of necessity occur. To keep pace with such changes our present Labour Relations Act should be constructively reviewed. The process of collective bargaining, for instance, would undoubtedly be greatly improved if less reliance was placed on government intervention, and more responsibility relegated to the bargaining parties.

In other parts of Canada, events have taken place which were detrimental to the best interests of workers, employers and the general public. There has been bloodshed and even death. Actions of this kind are harmful to the entire economy of our country.

This Legislature must accept responsibility for enactment of law as designed to protect, but at the same time make responsible for their actions, both labour and management, toward the end that the interests of the general public are also protected.

Therefore, faced as we are with an economy changing from that of agriculture to industry, and to protect the mutual interests of labour, management and the general public, I move the resolution, which appears under my name on the Order Paper, seconded by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias).

**Mr. W.C. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest, in opposing this motion, that we have not heard one concrete reason why this Assembly should give its support to the motion.

At the outset of my remarks, I would like to apologize for my low tone of voice which comes from a cold, which of course is very awkward for any 'maverick' politician such as myself. But I do want to deal with the substance of what is in the motion, and to suggest that it is completely unnecessary. I repeat there have been no concrete instances given by the mover of the motion as to why we should support it.

Just to comment briefly on some of the general reasons which have been advanced, I think, one the hon. member mentioned was 'bloodshed and death' in other sections of the country. I think, if we turned to some of the scenes of violence and bloodshed which have taken place in recent weeks, we will see that these have been not because of the presence of fair and impartial labour legislation, but because of state interference on behalf of employer organizations with no design to settle labour disputes. I suggest that peaceful labour relations is the very purpose and intent and accomplishment of the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act that we have in this province.

It has been suggested that we need more self-reliance between labour and management and less reliance on government. Well, I think we all accept that both labour and management should do their utmost and should accept basic responsibility in the settlement of disputes that take place between them. Nonetheless, I think that Trade Union Acts anywhere in this country, and certainly The Trade Union Act of this province, are designed to provide a means of settlement when a dispute has reached the stage that will cause strikes, or this will cause a dispute of any kind that is important to the public interest.

As a matter of fact, in this province I think we could say that most parties that have to do with collective bargaining, both labour unions and most employers, do in the main settle their disputes without course to The Trade Union Act. I have some figures before me that, I think, will be of interest to the House and I shall give them before I sit down. The period of 1945 to 1958 – figures that I have secured from the Department of Labour for the period 1945 to 1958 – show the number of Board conciliations and the number of references that have been made to what is known as voluntary,

April 7, 1959

informal conciliation. In the years that I have mentioned, there is an average of roughly 79 per cent of the disputes settled in voluntary, informal conciliations without recourse to any Board, either the Labour Relations Board or Conciliation Boards set up under The Trade Union Act.

I would like to point out (and it is an interesting thing) that in Saskatchewan we do not have the same compulsory conciliation technique that applies in The Labour Relations Acts or some other provinces; in fact, most other provinces. This process is one where, before any strike can be taken, the employees are compelled to go through a very lengthy procedure of informal conciliation and conciliation Board methods. In Ontario it has been reckoned that the period I am speaking of, runs into something better than six months. Rather than this being a cooling-off period, it creates a frustration which leads employees to the boiling point. Actually we find in other provinces, that there are more strikes proportionate to the number of employees than there are in this province. Considering the wage and salary earners in this province and those of other provinces in Canada, we have less time lost in strikes.

I am just going to refer to a few recent years in substantiation of this point. First of all, I would like to point out that, taking the period of the last four years in Saskatchewan, there have only been an average of five strikes per year in this province. Taking the strike time lost in Canada and in Saskatchewan, the yearly average 1951 to 1953 for Canada in strike time losses resulted in 206 minutes per wage and salary earner; in Saskatchewan, for the same period, only 43 minutes per wage and salary earner per year were lost. That is 206 minutes per year for Canada, and 43 minutes for Saskatchewan. That, incidentally, would be, for the years 1951 to 1953, about 1/10 of one per cent of the total estimated working time in the province.

Again, taking the year 1957, the Canadian average of strike time resulted in an average of 202 minutes per wage and salary earner being lost as against 19 minutes lost in Saskatchewan. In 1958, in Canada again, the average was 346 minutes per wage and salary earner against 14 minutes in Saskatchewan.

I give you these figures, Mr. Speaker, because they point up, first of all, that The Trade Union Act in practice has been successful in forestalling, not creating, labour strife; in making for labour peace, if you like. Secondly, because of the first point there is certainly no real reason in fact why there should be an examination of Saskatchewan's Trade Union Act in the terms that are mentioned in the motion.

I think, too, that we might look for one minute, because of the emphasis that is given from time to time on figures of lost time in strikes, to the time lost in other respects. It is interesting to note that, in Saskatchewan, we have, of course, proportionately a somewhat less severe

unemployment situation; but there was in the years 1955, 1956, 1957 and 1958, an average for every day of these years of 11,880 persons who were unemployed. What was the lost time due to strikes in the corresponding four years, Mr. Speaker? They were a total average time loss of 4,187 days for each of those years. There we have a comparison of almost 12,000 days lost by unemployment for every day of the year in this province as against 4,187 days for a whole year, because of strikes. Again, if we compare accidents to strike time lost we find, if we take only accidents reported to the Compensation Board, that in the same year there was 43 times more time lost because of accidents in the province than was lost due to strikes; and if we take sickness, there was 370 times more time lost than was lost due to strikes.

I suggest, that the time loss due to strikes in this province has not created any condition where there needs to be an examination of the basic legislation governing labour relations. It is a fact that The Trade Union Act has been a success for the reasons that I have mentioned. It is true that The Trade Union Act goes somewhat further than the Acts in other provinces, and I think it is a very good thing that it does. I think that, if the labour legislation of the other provinces that I have made reference to, was as good as The Trade Union Act in this province, they would have less labour trouble than they have had over the years with their own labour legislation.

I would like to sum up these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that no concrete reasons have been given us as to why the examination is demanded as posed by this resolution, and that every good reason exists for no examination.

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

### **DOMINION-PROVINCIAL TAX AGREEMENTS**

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 31, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson:

“That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to again urge the Government of Canada to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference at which special attention will be given to establishing a policy whereby the Provinces receive a larger share and a more equitable distribution of funds from the Government of Canada within the framework of the Tax-Rental Agreements.”

April 7, 1959

and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McCarthy, as amended:

“and we commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements to the payment of unconditional grants to the municipalities.”

**Premier Douglas:** Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable debate on this motion and the amendments which have followed it, and I don't propose to trespass on the time of the House by elaborating further on this matter. I think there is general recognition of the need for a Dominion-Provincial Conference and to have a complete revision of the provisions of the tax-rental arrangements.

When I spoke, the other day, on the amendment to the amendment, I suggested that we might have clarified the situation by dropping both the amendment and the sub-amendment and just passing the motion. But apparently that was not acceptable to the mover of the amendment. I thought it might be possible to amend the amended amendment in such a way that would make it generally acceptable to the members on all sides of the House.

I would therefore, like to submit the following amendment to the amended amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

“That the proposed amendment as amended be further amended by striking out all the words after ‘Tax-Rental Agreements’ in the third line and substituting therefore:

in the form of additional financial assistance to local governments, and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.”

And so it would read:

“a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements in the form of additional financial assistance to local governments, and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.”

**Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake):** I haven't seen a copy of the amendment to the amended amendment. I would like to ask the mover whether the words: “and we commend the Government of Saskatchewan”; etc., still remain.

**Premier Douglas:** Yes, it is not possible to amend that due to the fact that the House has already expressed an opinion on that matter by passing it in the form of a sub-amendment. The only thing that can be amended now is something on which the House has not expressed an opinion.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is a strange thing that the Premier took such strong exception to the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) here; and then, he comes in here today and proposes an amendment to the amended amendment, and as such, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely out of order; absolutely out of order.

**Premier Douglas:** No, it isn't.

**Mr. Danielson:** Certainly it is under the rules of this House and the rules of any Legislative Assembly; you can go to Bourinot; you can go to the Parliamentary Guide, and I have both of them at home. I have studied these things a good deal more than some of the members of this House might think and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is absolutely no way whereby you can vote on one resolution with an amendment to an amendment; and then an amendment to the amended resolution again. There must be an end somewhere, and the only thing you can do is follow the parliamentary rules, and according to them this amendment is out of order.

**Premier Douglas:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is quite within the rules of this House or any other deliberative assembly to amend an amended amendment, providing that you do not change any words which have already had an opinion expressed upon by the House. You cannot put new words in or strike words out in that case. You cannot make the House reconsider its decision regarding such a motion. But other new words can be either struck out or new words can be added. I think, Mr. Speaker, an examination of the rule book will show that the amendment is in order.

**Mr. Danielson:** It is not in order.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald:** Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order – not to the amendment. Here we are suggesting that we strike everything out after “Tax-Rental Agreements” in the third line; and that would mean that we would be striking out the words: “to the payment of unconditional grants to the municipalities.” Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are changing the meaning of the amendment to the amendment by this suggested amendment to the amended amendment. For the life of me I cannot see how this can be ruled in order and I would like to know what your ruling is before we proceed any further.

**Mr. Loptson:** These unconditional grants to the municipalities are the basis, the whole body of the thing.

**Premier Douglas:** Unconditional grants were not in the sub-amendment; we only voted on the sub-amendment.

April 7, 1959

**Mr. McCarthy:** Pardon me, it is.

**Premier Douglas:** The sub-amendment was only to substitute the word “commend” and put in the word “for.” “Unconditional grants” was in the amendment, not in the sub-amendment.

**Mr. Cameron:** Further to the point of order on this may I point out that this amendment as amended which is before the House now, has the payment of unconditional grants to the municipalities part of the amendment to the amendment.

**Premier Douglas:** No.

**Mr. Cameron:** Yes, it has been voted on. That part is clear. The decks are gone, and it would negative this whole amendment if we should take out the words “unconditional grants.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** On the point of order, I have here Beauchesne 2nd Edition. On Pages 172 and 128, Rule 402:

“To an amendment, when proposed from the Chair, an amendment may be moved, but only two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question.”

Now at the present moment there are two amendments proposed to this question.

“Some limit is necessary and the meaning has grown into law that an amendment to an amendment is allowable, but that no motion to amend further can be entertained until one of the two amendments is disposed of. There is no limit, however, to the number of amendments to a question, provided they come within this principle.”

I would also like to refer you to Page 127, Rule 396:

“An Amendment on a question must not be inconsistent with a previous decision on the same question, given at the same stage of any Bill or matter.”

**Mr. Cameron:** That is inconsistent.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** This proposed amendment to the amended amendment does not change, in any way, a decision which has already been made by the House when we voted on the previous amendment to the amendment. This amendment does not affect that decision; it doesn't take those words out at all; it still leaves those words there that were put in. So I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is perfectly



in order and after this sub-amendment is dealt with, then any other member of the House can offer an amendment to the amended amendment, provided it doesn't strike out anything that has already been voted on by the House. I can go on and on. There was no decision by the House on this question of 'unconditional'; it was in the amendment proposed by the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) and it is still in the amendment as amended. There has been no decision on that question yet.

**Mr. Loptson:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this amendment has been accepted by the House.

**Premier Douglas:** No.

**Mr. Danielson:** Yes.

**Mr. Loptson:** I thought it was voted on.

**Premier Douglas:** No, we only voted on the sub-amendment.

**Mr. Loptson:** The amendment as amended was voted on.

**Premier Douglas:** No, no, it wouldn't be on the Order Paper if it had been voted on.

**Mr. Loptson:** Secondly, this amendment is entirely changing the meaning of the amended amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order! I would refer the House to Beauchesne, Rule No. 361, which reads as follows:

“After a decision has been given on an amendment to any part of a question, an earlier part cannot be amended. In like manner where an amendment of any part of a question has been proposed from the Chair an earlier part cannot be amended unless the amendment so proposed be withdrawn.”

The part which seems to me significant to the present situation is: “After a decision has been given on an amendment to any part of a question, an earlier part cannot be amended.”

When we look at those various questions which have been before the House and which are now before the House the previous sub-amendment moved by Mr. Fines, seconded by Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), and if you will examine the amendment while I am reading this:

“That the word ‘urge’ in the first line be struck out and ‘commend’ substituted therefore”;

and further:

“That the words ‘to give consideration to allotting’ be deleted, and the words ‘for giving’ be substituted therefore.”

April 7, 1959

Now the present amendment deals with something which has not been amended because it follows "Tax-Rental Agreements" in the third line, and consequently this question has not yet been before the House.

In view of my interpretation, at least, of Beauchesne I can only rule the present proposed amendment to the amended amendment as being in order.

**Mr. McDonald:** Well, Mr. Speaker, according to your ruling then there is nothing to prevent us from amending the amendment which is before us at the moment.

**Mr. Danielson:** But, Mr. Speaker, it is just . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** On a point of order, the ruling has been given.

**Mr. McDonald:** Mr. Speaker, this is a new one on me. The Government finds itself, through one of their own amendments, to be in such an embarrassing position that now they want to amend their own amendment. For once the arguments of the Opposition must have come home to roost, and the Government now no longer feels they could be justified in supporting their own amendment – and I don't blame them, because, after all, we all know, including the Government, that unconditional grants have not been made by the province of Saskatchewan to municipalities.

I was rather amazed when the Premier, in his address earlier in this debate, said I had stabbed the province of Saskatchewan in the back because I wouldn't go along with this amendment to the amended motion. Surely to goodness the Premier, and all members of this House (and the press included), realize that I very carefully prevented placing myself in a similar position an earlier date on this particular motion. I said that, if I were to claim that the payments that are made by Ottawa to the province of Saskatchewan for different services were unconditional grants, then I would be placing myself in the same ridiculous position that the Government has placed itself in, and now find itself in, and have had to amend their own amendment in order to remove themselves from that position. I certainly did not stab the province of Saskatchewan in the back.

I am committed to supporting the original resolution and, as I mentioned at an earlier date, I think every citizen in Saskatchewan would want to support that original motion. We as a people, not as a political party, would like to see this province given a fairer share and a greater share of the total tax revenues of the country as a whole. So I want to make that point clear; but, by the same token, I must criticize the Government opposite for claiming as unconditional grants payments which are not unconditional grants. Unconditional grants have never been made by this Government to the municipalities, never in the history of this administration. Of course, the Government knows that, and now they find themselves in the embarrassing position; they have finally realized that they have placed themselves in a position where they have had to support something that was not truthful; and that is the reason they have asked for this amendment to their own amendment.

Now they expect the Opposition to “commend” the Government for having done something that they themselves have decided they haven’t done. What a position! And when we have accused this Government of being a caretaker Government, for not being alive to what is happening to the province of Saskatchewan, not even realizing the situations that exist, well now, we have definite proof that the members of the Government realize themselves they are in that position.

Mr. Speaker, how could you expect the Opposition to give support to a Government that does not know where it is going itself? By their very admission here this afternoon, they have demonstrated to you, Mr. Speaker, surely, they have no idea where they came from or where they are going, and now they want the Opposition to be a party to this. Never can the Opposition be a party to giving support to a wandering and lost Government!

What does this amendment mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that the Opposition are going to “commend” the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a “reasonable share.” Who on earth said it was a reasonable share? The Opposition has never said that. The municipalities have never said that. They have continuously complained to this Government that they are not getting a reasonable share of any grant that may be made to the Province of Saskatchewan by the Government of Canada.

Then this resolution would go on to read:

“ . . . a reasonable share of money from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental agreements in the form of additional financial assistance to local Governments, and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.”

We have no complaint with the latter part of this amendment. We, too, believe that the members of local government or representatives of local government, ought to sit in on any Dominion-Provincial Conference because, after all, as I have said before and I want to say again, in the Dominion of Canada we have three levels of government, not two. There is the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and Municipal Government, and I for one believe that the municipalities ought to have representation in a Conference taking into consideration the division of tax-dollars and of responsibility in this country. But we could never give our support to “commend” this government for something they have not been doing, that they have refused to do.

We had a panel discussion here on TV during the Urban Municipal Convention, when at least three members of that panel asked for unconditional grants. Did they get them? No! But now the Government want us to join with them and say, “Why, you people in the municipalities are getting enough now.” We are not going to join with that, Mr. Speaker. We condemn this Government for not giving a fair share of the revenues of this province to the municipalities. Certainly the municipalities are creatures of the province of Saskatchewan. We created them; we assigned responsibilities to them. But we find that

the Provincial Government have one 'mulligan stew' of their own as far as collecting revenues is concerned. Now they want to put the municipalities in exactly the same position. They have said to the municipalities, "If you want additional revenues, why don't you go out and put on new taxes?" They have suggested to the municipalities that they could put an additional gasoline tax; that they could put on a frontage tax; that they could put on thousands of different taxes. If it is the belief of the present administration that the municipalities ought to get into new tax fields in order to meet their requirements, then would it not be equally fair for the Government of Canada to say to Saskatchewan, "If you need additional revenues, why don't you get into some other tax fields?" This is passing the buck, Mr. Speaker.

Wouldn't we have a conglomeration in Saskatchewan if the municipalities were to take the advice of the Government of this province? Wouldn't we have a mulligan stew if every municipality were to go and impose a gasoline tax, or municipality 'A' were to impose the gasoline tax, and municipality 'B' were not to impose it? The same thing can be said with respect to automobile licences. What would happen if the city of Regina, for instance, decided to impose an automobile tax on the cars in this city but the surrounding municipalities decided not to? Wouldn't you have a mulligan stew?

The whole idea of the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreement is to take care of this, and all we ask is for the Government to treat the rural municipalities and the urban municipalities of the province of Saskatchewan in the same manner as the Government of Canada is treating the provinces of Canada. Let us have one general tax rate. If the Provincial Government have not got that courage, then, I say, they have no right to sit in the position they are in at the moment, and put a strangle-hold on every urban and rural municipality in Saskatchewan.

The municipalities are faced with tremendous problems. We gave them those problems; and it is up to us, as a province and as a Legislature, to help them out of the difficulty in which they now find themselves. I doubt very much if there is any level of government that has spent their money more wisely over the last number of years than the municipal governments have.

**Opposition Members:** Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** I don't think for one moment that we should be hesitant in giving additional revenues to the municipalities, because of the good record they have had in providing services to their ratepayers with the limited resources they have at their disposal. Therefore, I think that the first move that a Government of this province ought to make is to make additional and sufficient revenues available to the municipalities to carry out the responsibilities we have assigned to them. That is our job and our responsibility. This Government even failed to recognize that this responsibility exists, let alone being prepared to deal with it; and now they would like to have the Opposition place themselves in the same embarrassing position that they themselves find they are in. We will have no part of it, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Nicholson (Nipawin):** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I would like to request a copy of that sub-amendment.

**Premier Douglas:** I'm sorry; we only have two copies.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, before the vote is put, I would like to state first that, after the vote is put on the amendment to the amended amendment, then I would like to adjourn the debate to put an amendment to the amendment as amended. I understand from your ruling that we are within our rights in so moving. Before I do that . . .

**Premier Douglas:** Providing it doesn't strike out any words that have been put in.

**Mr. Cameron:** The Premier says "providing it doesn't strike out any words that have been put in." I cannot see why that limitation should be placed on us, when he has struck out 'payment of unconditional grants to municipalities.'

**Premier Douglas:** It was not voted on.

**Mr. McDonald:** It sure was voted on.

**Premier Douglas:** No. We voted on striking out the word "urge" and substituting the word "commend" and on striking out "to give consideration to allotting" and substituting "for giving."

**Mr. Cameron:** Then, Mr. Speaker, in view of all this confusion I would ask permission to adjourn the debate now.

**Premier Douglas:** No, Mr. Speaker, we can drag this on for days. If the hon. member wants to adjourn the debate until after this amendment is dealt with, and the sub-amendment is dealt with . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** All I want to do, Mr. Premier, is this. It is very clear that I have the right to move an amendment to this new amendment, according to the new House rules which we have had interpreted here now, or a new enlightenment of the House rules, or a new knowledge of these House rules – let's put it that way.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order! Order! I ruled the proposed sub-amendment in order on the grounds: (1) that the question before the Assembly was the amendment as amended; (2) that the Assembly had voted only to alter certain words in the first part of the proposed amendment; (3) that the sub-amendment now proposed to strike out certain words in the latter part of the amendment as amended and to substitute other words therefore, and (4) inasmuch as the Assembly had not yet expressed an opinion on the part of the amendment to which the sub-amendment related, it was within the competence of the mover to move the proposed sub-amendment.

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** Mr. Speaker, I have some responsibility for this, and I certainly do not want to commend the Government for something they have not done. I am not too familiar with the

April 7, 1959

rules of this House, but certainly under any British system they surely cannot be able to amend an amendment of mine and make it the exact opposite to what I wanted to do, and get by with it. I certainly do not want to commend these fellows for something they have never done. In all fairness I think there should be an opportunity to take that out. After all, these rules of the House have been laid down over a long period of years for certain purposes, and when you can turn around and negative a motion, and put it in my name, there is something wrong with the fundamental rules.

I want to make it quite clear that it is not according to British Parliamentary procedure that you can turn around and make me, through some jiggling of the rules, commend the Government for something which they haven't done.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order! For the benefit of the hon. member I take pleasure in reading Citation No. 340, Beauschesne's Parliamentary Procedure, which says:

“An Amendment to alter the main question by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative, and may be moved.”

That, I think, should explain the House rules in this respect.

**Mr. McCarthy:** No, it doesn't in my opinion.

**Mr. Cameron:** Mr. Speaker, might I ask for an interpretation. This is just for my guidance; I am not objecting in any way to your ruling. Am I to take it that after this amendment to the amendment is voted on, and, I presume, that it is passed, then am I within my rights to bring in an amendment to the new amendment as amended?

**Premier Douglas:** Sure.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, providing it is in the form of an addition.

**Mr. Cameron:** Well, that will be my responsibility. I would have the right to bring in an amendment to that amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** Yes, but you can't do it now.

**Mrs. Batten (Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member for Maple Creek asked for leave to adjourn. Certainly I am not prepared to vote on the amendment; I haven't got a copy of it. I guess I am one of those people who can hear but I cannot understand it until I see it in black and white, especially when it is an amendment to the amendment.

**Mr. Cameron:** Why wouldn't I have the right to adjourn the debate? Just to justify this, Mr. Speaker, the Government has had this motion standing for some days to get themselves out of the quandary. They have gone through Beauschesne and all the books with a fine-tooth comb, and now they have come in with something, and we cannot be expected to interpret that with only one copy of the amendment before all of the Opposition. Because

of that, and the confusion which exists here, I would like permission of the House to adjourn the debate, so that we can give some study to the matter, too.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m., without question put.