

The Budget—Amendments to Motion

waterworks and extensions of service in power and lighting. I would point out—the government already know it—that all the loans made, running into millions, were paid back in full and the interest was paid in full; not a dime was defaulted.

I cannot see for the life of me why the government decided to discontinue such a valuable service to municipalities that would bring to them in turn splendid returns on their investment. Not only would this money loaned at 2 per cent help the municipalities in their present plight, but it would allow them to take part in the relief of unemployment. Unemployment relief is also a municipal burden that has been unfairly thrust upon them, and the government could assist them by loaning them money immediately for public works of this nature to take care of the unemployment within their municipal boundaries.

A fifth way would be by federal aid for education. The cost of education is one of the great burdens of our modern municipalities. This could be a most effective method of dealing with this question. As this matter has already been dealt with very fully and in detail by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Knight), I shall not go any further into it, but I would recommend that the cabinet find out to what extent the suggestions made by the hon. member for Saskatoon could be carried out, with a view to relieving the crushing burden on the municipalities.

I pass these suggestions to the minister for his earliest consideration. Municipalities, I feel, must be given a new and fair deal. I trust that members of all parties will see the fairness and the justice of this subamendment, and will give it support. It does not matter to what party you belong when the vote is called. I know that the municipalities of British Columbia—and, I take it, the rest of Canada—all deserve financial support through the medium of this subamendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Before putting the question may I tell hon. members that shortly after the amendment was moved I had some concern as to its regularity. As hon. members know, as soon as an amendment is moved it is in order to move an amendment to the amendment. Recognizing the fact that if the amendment is out of order the amendment to the amendment must fall, I searched the authorities and my soul as well.

Considering the fact that on the budget wide latitude is always given, and that the main reason the amendment could have been

declared out of order was the fact that the amendments to the address in reply had covered a variety of subjects, I decided not to intervene. I know hon. members may feel at this moment that it might be a matter of some fancy on my part for me to make these remarks. But I want to tell hon. members that if they look at certain rulings that have been made in the past they will see that the matter of similarity of amendments as between one which is moved on the address in reply and one which is moved on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means or supply is something that has been considered seriously by my predecessors.

There were some borderline cases, and there is one I have here with which Mr. Speaker Macdonald had to deal. His statement is to be found in the *Journals* of February 28, 1950, at page 47. I should like hon. members to look also at the ruling made on November 22, 1932, which appears at page 113 of the *Journals*, by Mr. Speaker Black.

Hon. members will see that because the subject of unemployment had already been dealt with by the house in one amendment and was later again submitted to the judgment of the house in another amendment, Mr. Speaker Black not only considered the matter of the similarity of the two amendments but also looked at the arguments put forward in the debate, and came to the conclusion that the house having refused to condemn the government's policy on unemployment by rejecting the amendment moved to the address by the leader of the opposition, the house could not be called upon to decide the same question again.

Hon. members may refer, for information on this point, to Bourinot at page 328 and citation 357 of Beauchesne's third edition.

As to the other point, which is to the effect that any irregularity in any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular and that therefore the amendment to the amendment should fall, citation 330 of Beauchesne will be found to be specific on the subject.

As I said before, I do not want to create any difficulties at this moment. I had considered the amendment shortly after it was moved and felt that I would perhaps do as my predecessor did in 1950 and say that in future hon. members should be extremely careful in the moving of their amendments on the address in reply because otherwise, the house having given its judgment on the various points brought forward then, if later other amendments are moved which touch