

JOURNALS
of the
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
of the
Province of Saskatchewan

From 4th day of September, 1929, to 6th day of September, 1929.
(Both days inclusive)

In the Twentieth Year of the Reign of Our Sovereign Lord,
King George V.

BEING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTH LEGISLATURE OF
THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

SESSION 1929

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY



REGINA:
J. W. REID, King's Printer
1929

VOLUME XXVII.

JOURNALS
of the
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
of the
Province of Saskatchewan

VOLUME XXVII.



MEETING OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

H. W. NEWLANDS,
Lieutenant Governor.

[L.S.]

CANADA:

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

GEORGE THE FIFTH, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, KING, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

TO OUR FAITHFUL THE MEMBERS elected to serve in the Legislative Assembly of Our Province of Saskatchewan, and to every one of you, GREETING:

A PROCLAMATION

A. L. GEDDES,
Deputy Attorney General } **W**HEREAS, it is expedient for causes and considerations to convene the Legislative Assembly of Our Province of Saskatchewan, **WE DO WILL** that you and each of you and all others in this behalf interested on **WEDNESDAY**, the Fourth day of September, 1929, at Our City of Regina, personally be and appear for the **DESPATCH OF BUSINESS**, there to take into consideration the state and welfare of Our said Province of Saskatchewan and thereby to do as may seem necessary, **HEREIN FAIL NOT.**

In testimony whereof we have caused Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Our said Province of Saskatchewan to be hereunto affixed.

WITNESS: Our right trusty and well beloved **THE HONOURABLE HENRY WILLIAM NEWLANDS**, Lieutenant Governor of Our Province of Saskatchewan.

AT OUR GOVERNMENT HOUSE, in Our City of Regina, in Our said Province, this **TWENTY-EIGHTH** day of **AUGUST**, **ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINE**, and in the Twentieth year of Our Reign.

By Command,

J. W. McLEOD,
Deputy Provincial Secretary.

JOURNALS
OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1929.

10 o'clock a.m.

This being the first day of the meeting of the First Session of the Seventh Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, for the despatch of business, pursuant to a Proclamation of His Honour the Honourable Henry William Newlands, Lieutenant Governor of the Province, and dated the twenty-eighth day of August, 1929, George Arthur Mantle, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Commissioner designated by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor for administering the Oath to the members of the Legislative Assembly, attending according to his duty, John W. McLeod, Clerk of the Executive Council, delivered to the said George Arthur Mantle a Roll containing a list of the names of such members as had been returned to serve in this Legislature, which are as follows, viz.:

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, SASKATCHEWAN.

REGINA, *September 3, 1929.*

To G. A. MANTLE, ESQ.,

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan:

This is to certify that by reason of the dissolution of the Sixth Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan and in virtue of writs of election dated the eleventh day of May last, and addressed to the hereinafter mentioned persons as returning officers for the electoral divisions in the Province set opposite their respective names for the election of members to represent the said electoral divisions in the Legislative Assembly, the following persons have been gazetted as duly elected to represent the electoral divisions set forth below, as appears by the returns to the said writs, deposited of record in my office, viz.:

Division	Member Elected	Returning Officer
1. Arm River	D. Selby Hutcheon	W. F. Cameron
2. Battlefords, The	Samuel Wesley Huston	A. D. Cressey
3. Bengough	Herman Kerster Warren	Dr. G. R. L. Ireland
4. Biggar	William Willoughby Miller	E. L. Cowell
5. Cannington	Samson W. Arthur	Geo. W. Phenix
6. Canora	Anton O. Morken	Andrew W. Anaka
7. Cumberland	Deakin Alexander Hall	B. A. McAneeley
8. Cut Knife	George J. McLean	R. T. Brackenbury
9. Cypress	John Edward Gryde	Jas. M. Robb
10. Elrose	James Cobban	Hugh M. Hunt
11. Estevan	Eleazer William Garner	Jas. H. Lind
12. Francis	Samuel Norval Horner	W. O. Turnbull
13. Gravelbourg	Benjamin Franklin McGregor	Wm. A. Keyworth
14. Hanley	Reginald Stipe	George Telfer
15. Happyland	Donald McPherson Strath	J. P. Quinn
16. Humboldt	Henry M. Therres	Vincent P. Murphy
17. Ile a la Crosse	A. Jules Marion	R. B. Urquhart
18. Jack Fish Lake	Donald M. Finlayson	Charles Comerford
19. Kerrobert	Robert Leith Hanbidge	H. W. Smith
20. Kindersley	Ebenezer Samuel Whatley	A. A. Parker
21. Kinistino	Charles McIntosh	H. D. Dunlop
22. Last Mountain	Jacob Benson	D. C. Gerrard
23. Lloydminster	Robert J. Gordon	Harold Huxley
24. Lumsden	James Fraser Bryant	Albert Blackwell
25. Maple Creek	Hon. George Spence	Robt. W. Harris
26. Melfort	R. James Greaves	F. W. Clift
27. Milestone	J. V. Patterson	H. J. Burns
28. Morse	Richard Percy Eades	N. J. MacDonald
29. Moose Jaw City	{ John Alexander Merkley and Robert Henry Smith	Joseph Hallonquist
30. Moose Jaw County	Sinclair Whittaker	F. C. Bingham
31. Moosomin	Frederick Dennis Munroe	David Addy
32. North Qu'Appelle	Hon. James Garfield Gardiner	I. S. Bricker
33. Notukeu	Alexander L. Grant	H. P. Johnson
34. Pelly	R. J. M. Parker	Dr. W. A. Robertson
35. Pheasant Hills	Charles Morton Dunn	Sinclair MacDonald
36. Pipestone	Hon. William John Patterson	John A. MacKay
37. Prince Albert	Hon. Thomas Clayton Davis	S. L. Small
38. Redberry	George Cockburn	Ole Brand
39. Rosetown	Nathaniel Given	Ben T. Kaiser
40. Rosthern	Hon. John Michael Uhrich	A. H. Klassen
41. Regina City	{ Murdoch Alexander MacPherson and James Grassick	J. E. Doerr
42. Saltcoats	Asmundur Loptson	Robert Fea
43. Saskatoon City	{ James Thomas Milton Anderson and Howard McConnell	W. B. Hartie
44. Saskatoon County	Charles Agar	G. H. L. Bigelow
45. Shellbrook	Edgar Sydney Clinch	Ernest Duncan
46. South Qu'Appelle	Anton Huck	A. G. Rawlinson
47. Souris	William Oliver Fraser	Thomas Wigmore
48. Swift Current	William Wensley Smith	Charles Thoreson
49. Thunder Creek	Harold A. Lilly	A. W. Wallace
50. Tisdale	Walter Chutterbuck Buckle	Hugh E. Jones
51. Touchwood	John Mason Parker	Harold W. Bown
52. Turtleford	C. Arthur Ayre	Albert McKenzie
53. Vonda	James Hogan	George Sloane
54. Wadena	John Robson Taylor	John E. Neuert
55. Weyburn	Robert Sterritt Leslie	D. Dagleish
56. Wilkie	Alexander John McLeod	William Scott
57. Willow Bunch	Charles William Johnson	Ambrose Devine
58. Wolseley	William George Bennett	Andrew Dickson
59. Wynyard	Wilhelm Hans Paulson	Angus Robertson
60. Yorkton	Alan Carl Stewart	R. C. Spice

J. W. McLEOD,
Clerk of the Executive Council.

The said Commissioner having administered the Oath to the members who appeared, and the members having subscribed the Roll containing the Oath, they repaired to their seats in the Assembly.

3 o'clock p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber and took his seat on the Throne.

The Honourable Mr. Davis, Provincial Secretary, then said:

I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to inform you that he will defer stating the reasons for which he has summoned the Legislature until the Legislative Assembly have elected a Speaker. It is, therefore, His Honour's pleasure that the Legislative Assembly do now proceed to the election of a Speaker.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor then retired from the Chamber.

Moved by Mr. McIntosh, Seconded by Mr. Garner,

That John M. Parker, Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of Touchwood; do take the Chair of this Assembly as Speaker.

Moved by Mr. Anderson, Seconded by Mr. Whatley,

That James F. Bryant, Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of Lumsden, do take the Chair of this Assembly as Speaker.

A debate arising, and the question being put by the Clerk on the first motion for the election of Mr. Parker as Speaker, it was negatived.

The question being put by the Clerk on the second motion for the election of Mr. Bryant as Speaker, it was

Resolved, *nemine contradicente*, that James F. Bryant, Esquire, do take the Chair of this Assembly as Speaker.

The Clerk having declared James F. Bryant, Esquire, duly elected, he was conducted to the Chair by Mr. Anderson and Mr. Whatley, when he returned his humble acknowledgments to the Assembly for the great honour they had been pleased to confer upon him by unanimously choosing him to be their Speaker,

And thereupon he took the Chair and the Mace was laid on the Table.

3.35 o'clock p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor re-entered the Chamber and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker then addressed His Honour to the following effect:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,—

The Legislative Assembly have elected me as their Speaker, although I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me.

If in the performance of those duties I should at any time fall into error I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the Assembly whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their King and country, hereby humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

The Honourable Mr. Davis, Provincial Secretary, then said:

MR. SPEAKER,—

I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the Assembly to His Majesty's person and Government, and not doubting that their proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temper and prudence, he grants, and upon all occasions will recognise and allow their constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the Assembly shall have ready access to His Honour upon all seasonable occasions and that its proceedings as well as your words and actions will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

His Honour was then pleased to open the Session with the following speech:

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

It is my privilege and pleasure to welcome you to the first session of the Seventh Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The gradual return to better health of His Majesty, King George V is a cause for great rejoicing among all our people. We are thankful indeed that a kind Providence has spared him for further service to the British Empire.

My advisers are of the opinion that the results of the recent elections have rendered it desirable to summon the Legislature at the earliest moment possible, having regard for the time at which all the writs were returnable, in order that any uncertainty arising from the results of the elections, as to which political party should administer the affairs of the province, may be removed, and opportunity thereby accorded of provision being made for the future government of the province in accordance with the wishes of the electors as determined in the Legislature through their duly elected representatives. The poll taken on June the sixth has resulted, as you are aware, in the return of 26 Liberals, 24 Conservatives,

6 Independents and 5 Progressives. Two deferred elections have since been held, at each of which a Liberal member has been returned. In the circumstances, my advisers are of the opinion that the earliest possible opportunity should be given to Independent and Progressive members to declare, in accordance with known constitutional practice, to which of the two historic parties they are prepared to give their support. Pending a decision in the matter of political support, my advisers are of the opinion that it is not desirable to submit a programme of legislation for the consideration of the members.

Because of the special nature of the session it is the intention to introduce legislation providing for remuneration which will be in keeping with the time occupied in your duties.

Members of the Legislative Assembly, may Divine Providence guide and bless your deliberations.

His Honour then retired from the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker informed the Assembly that the Clerk had received from the Clerk of the Executive Council lists of the names of such Members as had been returned to serve in the Legislature as hereinbefore set forth. *(Sessional Paper No. 1.)*

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Gardiner have leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.

He accordingly presented the Bill to the Assembly, and the same was received and read the first time.

Mr. Speaker then informed the Assembly that, in order to prevent mistakes, he had obtained a copy of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, which was laid on the Table.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Gardiner, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Davis,

That the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor be taken into consideration now, and that this Order have precedence over all other business, except introduction of Bills and routine motions, until disposed of.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Patterson (Milestone),

That all the words after "That" be omitted and the following be substituted therefor:

"it is expedient that His Honour's Ministers should possess the confidence of a majority in this Assembly and such confidence is not reposed in the present Ministers of the Crown."

The debate continuing,

At six o'clock, p.m., Mr. Speaker declared the Assembly adjourned until to-morrow, at three o'clock, p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1929.

The Hon. Mr. Patterson, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly,

Report of Messrs. Price, Waterhouse and Company, of Winnipeg, on the Audit of the books and accounts of the Province of Saskatchewan as at April 30, 1929, including Financial Statements.
(*Sessional Paper No. 2.*)

The Hon. Mr. Spence, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor:—

Interim Report of the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission, 1928.
(*Sessional Paper No. 3.*)

And also,—Final Report of the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission, 1928.
(*Sessional Paper No. 4.*)

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. Anderson,

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this Assembly be printed after having been first perused by Mr. Speaker, and that he do appoint the printing thereof, and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Gardiner, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Davis,

That the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor be taken into consideration now, and that this Order have precedence over all other business, except introduction of Bills and routine motions, until disposed of.

And the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Patterson (Milestone),

That all the words after "That" be omitted and the following be substituted therefor:

"it is expedient that His Honour's Ministers should possess the confidence of a majority of this Assembly and such confidence is not reposed in the present Ministers of the Crown."

The debate continuing,

Friday, September 6, 1929.

Mr. Stewart laid on the Table a copy of a petition dated the third day of July, 1929, to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, respecting the resignation of the Government of the Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Premier of Saskatchewan, signed by the Conservative, Progressive and Independent Members-elect of the Saskatchewan Legislature.
(*Sessional Paper No. 5.*)

The debate continuing, and the question being put on the said amendment, it was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs

Whatley	MacPherson	Smith (Swift Current)
Stipe	Anderson	Given
Benson	Buckle	Munroe
Horner	McConnell	Grassick
Leslie	Bennett	Cobban
Patterson (Milestone)	Fraser	Hanbidge
Stewart	Smith (Moose Jaw City)	Miller
Huston	Gryde	Warren
Taylor	Eades	Lilly
Arthur	Merkley	Hutcheon
McLean	Greaves	Whittaker
		McLeod—34

NAYS.

Messieurs

Parker (Touchwood)	Grant	Marion
Finlayson	Therres	Loptson
Gordon	McGregor	Johnson
Spence	Hogan	Strath
Davis	McIntosh	Parker (Pelly)
Gardiner	Cockburn	Dunn
Uhrich	Huck	Garner
Patterson (Pipestone)	Agar	Ayre
Clinch	Paulson	Morken—27

And the question being put on the main motion as amended, it was agreed to

The Assembly then adjourned at 12.45 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1929.

Leave to introduce the same, without notice, having been granted the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 1—An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Session of 1929.

Hon. Mr. Davis, Second reading today.

Bill No. 2—An Act to confer Certain Powers upon Municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Davis, Second reading today.

Bill No. 3—An Act respecting the Burning of Straw.

Hon. Mr. Davis, Second reading today.

Bill No. 5—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.

Hon. Mr. Davis, Second reading today.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Davis have leave to introduce Bill No. 4—An Act enabling Municipalities to Grant Relief in Certain Cases.

The Hon. Mr. Davis, a Member of the Executive Council, then acquainted the Assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the Bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

The said Bill was accordingly received, read the first time, and ordered to be read the second time today.

The Hon. Mr. Gardiner informed the Assembly that, in view of the vote yesterday, expressing want of confidence in his Government, he had tendered to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor his resignation as Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan and had advised His Honour to call upon Mr. J. T. M. Anderson, the Leader of the Conservative Party, to form a Government.

The Premier stated that he understood it was the intention of His Honour to accept his resignation and to call on Mr. Anderson to form a Government. He stated also that he had discussed the matter with Mr. Anderson and that it had been agreed that the proceedings of the Assembly, until prorogation, would be conducted by the present Government, which would remain in office until Monday next.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole today:—

Bill No. 1—An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Session of 1929.

Bill No. 2—An Act to confer Certain Powers upon Municipalities.

Bill No. 3—An Act respecting the Burning of Straw.

Bill No. 4—An Act enabling Municipalities to Grant Relief in Certain Cases.

Bill No. 5—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the undermentioned Bills:—

The following Bills were severally reported without amendment, read the third time and passed;

Bill No. 1—An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Session of 1929.

Bill No. 2—An Act to confer Certain Powers upon Municipalities.

Bill No. 3—An Act respecting the Burning of Straw.

Bill No. 5—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.

The following Bill was reported with amendment; considered as amended; read the third time and passed;

Bill No. 4—An Act enabling Municipalities to Grant Relief in Certain Cases.

5 o'clock p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,

This Legislative Assembly at its present Session passed several Bills, which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour, and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

The Clerk of the Assembly then read the titles of the Bills that had been passed severally as follows:—

An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Session of 1929.

An Act to confer Certain Powers upon Municipalities.

An Act respecting the Burning of Straw.

An Act enabling Municipalities to Grant Relief in Certain Cases.

An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.

The Royal Assent to these Bills was announced by the Clerk:—

“In His Majesty’s name, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor doth Assent to these Bills.”

His Honour then delivered the following Speech:—

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

It is my duty now to relieve you from further attendance at this the First Session of the Seventh Legislature.

I congratulate you upon the expeditious manner in which you dealt with and reached a decision in regard to the business for which you were summoned.

I note with pleasure the steps you have taken to cope effectively with the problems resulting from the long period of dry weather in some parts of the Province.

In taking leave of you I express the sincere hope that Divine Providence may continue to bless our Province and I give to you and to all our people my heartiest greetings.

The Hon. Mr. Davis, Provincial Secretary, then said:—

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the despatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

JAS. F. BRYANT,
Speaker.

INDEX

TO

JOURNALS

SESSION 1929.

FIRST SESSION, SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

Province of Saskatchewan

ABBREVIATIONS

1 R.—First Reading.	Com.—Committee of Whole or Select
2 R.—Second Reading.	Standing or Special Committee.
3 R.—Third Reading.	S.O.C.—Committee on Standing Orders.
P.—Passed.	S.P.—Sessional Paper.
A.—Assent.	

B

	Bill No.	1 R.	2 R.	Com.	3 R. & P.	A.
BILLS, PUBLIC: Respecting—						
Administration of Oaths (<i>pro forma</i>)..	..	11
Burning of Straw	3	14	14	15	15	16
Local Improvement Districts Relief..	5	14	14	15	15	16
Municipalities, To confer Certain Powers upon	2	14	14	15	15	16
Municipalities Relief, 1929.....	4	14	14	15	15	16
Sessional Indemnity, 1929.....	1	14	14	15	15	16

BRYANT, JAMES F.:
Elected Speaker, 9.

C

CLERK OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

Receives notification of elections, 7.
Administers Oath to members, 9.
Declares Speaker elected, 9.
Reads titles of Bills to be assented to, 15.
Announces assent to Bills, 16.

CLERK OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

Advices Election of new members, 7.

CROWN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Announced *re* Money Bill, 14.

D

DIVISION:

ASSEMBLY DIVIDES:

On Amendment to motion respecting consideration of Speech from the Throne, 13.

L

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

Convened by Proclamation, page 5. Prorogued, page 16. Members elected, page 8.

STATEMENT OF WORK OF SESSION:

Number of Sittings.....	3
Number of Evening Sittings.....	1
Number of Public Bills introduced.....	5
Number of Public Bills passed.....	5
Number of Sessional Papers Tabled.....	5
Number of Divisions.....	1

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR:

Proclamation, 5.
 Requests that Speaker be elected, 9.
 Grants to Assembly its constitutional privileges, 10.
 Speech from Throne at opening of Session, 10.
 Speech from Throne at close of Session, 16.
 Gives Royal Assent to Bills, 16.
 Prorogues Legislature, 16.

P

PREMIER:

Hon. J. G. Gardiner announces resignation of his Government, 14.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY:

Announces that His Honour desires a Speaker elected, 9.
 Announces that His Honour grants to the Assembly its constitutional privileges, 10
 Announces prorogation, 16.

PROCLAMATION:

Convening Legislature, 5.

R

RESOLUTIONS: Respecting—

Consideration of Speech from the Throne; and amendment thereto, expressing want of confidence in the Government, 11, 12.
 Printing of Votes and Proceedings, 12.

S

SESSIONAL PAPERS:	S.P. No.	Present'd
AGRICULTURE:		
Royal Grain Inquiry Commission Interim Report.....	3	12
Royal Grain Inquiry Commission Final Report.....	4	12
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:		
Notification of Elections.....	1	11
TREASURY:		
Report <i>re</i> Audit by Messrs. Price, Waterhouse & Co....	2	12
PETITION TO LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR <i>re</i> RESIGNATION OF GOVERNMENT.....	5	12

SPEAKER:

Motion nominating J. M. Parker, Esq., 9.
Motion nominating J. F. Bryant, Esq., 9.
Election of J. F. Bryant, Esq., 9.
Announces his election to His Honour, 10.
Announces elections to Representation, 11.
Reports Speech from the Throne, 11.
Presents Bills to Lieutenant Governor for Assent, 15.

SPEECHES FROM THRONE:

At Opening of Session, 10.
At Close of Session, 16.

V

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS:

Ordered printed, 12.

SESSIONAL PAPERS

First and Second Sessions of the Seventh
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

1929 AND 1930

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY



REGINA
PRINTED BY ROLAND S. GARRETT
KING'S PRINTER
1930

SESSIONAL PAPERS

1929 and 1930

Contents

Session 1929

	Page
"WANT OF CONFIDENCE" IN GARDINER ADMINISTRATION:	
Speeches of—	
Hon. T. C. Davis	1
Hon. W. J. Patterson	25
Hon. J. G. Gardiner	41
Mr. E. S. Whatley	57
Mr. A. C. Stewart	58
PETITION TO LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR (S. P. No. 5)	59

Session 1930

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD:	
Annual Report, December 31, 1929. (S.P. 3)	62
FARM LOAN BOARD:	
Annual Report, December 31, 1928. (S.P. No. 26)	105
Annual Report, December 31, 1929. (S.P. No. 33)	109
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION:	
Report of Trustees, February 6, 1930. (S.P. No. 28)	114
ADDRESS IN REPLY TO SPEECH FROM THRONE:	
Speeches of—	
Mr. R. P. Eades	117
Mr. J. R. Taylor	123
Mr. J. G. Gardiner	127
Hon. J. T. M. Anderson	146
Hon. H. McConnell	164
Mr. J. M. Uhrich	179
Mr. R. J. M. Parker	195
Mr. W. J. Patterson	200
Hon. W. W. Smith	216
Mr. E. W. Garner	233
Hon. W. C. Buckle	240
Mr. J. Benson	251
Hon. A. C. Stewart	264
Hon. M. A. MacPherson	281

THE BUDGET:

Speeches of—	Page
Hon. H. McConnell, Provincial Treasurer	295
Hon. J. F. Bryant	308
Hon. J. A. Merkley	330
Hon. A. C. Stewart	341
Mr. D. A. Hall	355
Mr. Geo. Spence	359
Mr. E. S. Whatley	381
Mr. J. G. Gardiner	390
Hon. H. McConnell (<i>Closing debate</i>)	409

CANCER COMMISSION:

Speech of—	Page
Hon. F. D. Munroe	419

IMMIGRATION:

Speeches of—	Page
Mr. Chas. McIntosh	430
Mr. C. M. Dunn	439
Hon. A. C. Stewart	445

NATURAL RESOURCES AGREEMENT RATIFICATION:

Speeches of—	Page
Hon. J. T. M. Anderson	449
Mr. T. C. Davis	453
Hon. M. A. MacPherson	458
Mr. J. G. Gardiner	463

SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1):

Speeches of—	Page
Hon. J. T. M. Anderson	473
Mr. J. G. Gardiner	477
Mr. Nat. Given	505
Mr. J. M. Uhrich	508
Hon. J. T. M. Anderson (<i>Closing debate</i>)	514

SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2):

Speeches of—	Page
Hon. J. T. M. Anderson	516
Mr. T. C. Davis	519
Hon. J. T. M. Anderson (<i>Closing debate</i>)	529

TELEPHONE DEPARTMENT:

Speech of—	Page
Mr. W. J. Patterson	530

SESSIONAL PAPERS

SESSION 1929

HELD FROM SEPTEMBER 4 TO 6, 1929.

(Both days inclusive)

SPEECHES ON

"WANT OF CONFIDENCE"

IN THE GARDINER ADMINISTRATION OF THE
GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN.

THE HONOURABLE T. C. DAVIS, K.C.

(Attorney General)

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1929.

The Honourable Mr. Davis, in speaking to the amendment, moved by Mr. Anderson (Saskatoon City) and seconded by Mr. Patterson (Milestone):

"That all the words after "That" be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

"it is expedient that His Honour's Ministers should possess the confidence of a majority in this Assembly and such confidence is not reposed in the present Ministers of the Crown,"

to the motion moved by the Honourable Mr. Gardiner, seconded by the Honourable Mr. Davis:

"That the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor be taken into consideration now, and that this Order have precedence over all other business except introduction of Bills and routine motions, until disposed of." said:

Mr. Speaker,—Speaking on the amendment and following the line of argument already advanced by the Premier, I submit that this amendment, involving as it does the confidence or lack of confidence of this Legislature in the present Government, permits of the fullest possible discussion not only of the record of the Government but also all the reasons relating to the situation that has arisen in this province and in this House. If my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is trying to shut out discussion of these matters by attempting to muzzle speakers on this side of the House, it is a very reprehensible thing for him to do and one which should be called to the attention of the people of this province.

I had proposed to speak on the Address but, since an amendment to the motion is now before the House, I intend to discuss the various matters which are raised by the present situation along the lines I would have followed had I been speaking to the Address.

Let me, first of all, congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to the high office which you have been called upon to fill in this House, and I hope and trust that, in any division of opinion that may arise in the course of this debate, you will be true to the statement you made upon your election to your present high position and that you will be fair and unbiassed in your decisions throughout your career as Speaker of this Assembly. I honestly believe (and I am sincere when I say it) that you will live up to the letter of your statement and you will be fair and just in your treatment of those on this side of the House.

We are gathered here, today, Mr. Speaker, under circumstances which are unique in the political history of the Province of Saskatchewan. Ever since the province was formed, 24 years ago, there has been only one political party in charge of the affairs of the province and that party always has enjoyed, until the present time, a clear majority over all other parties or groups represented on the floor of the Legislature. It is unique, too, by virtue of the fact that no political party that went to the people as such on June 6 last, was returned with a clear majority in this House.

The discussion which is bound to arise during this debate, as a result of this condition of affairs is more or less a technical one to which members of the legal profession in the House will, more particularly, address themselves. It so happens that I am the only lawyer on this side of the House whereas they have five or six on the other side even after having eliminated you, Mr. Speaker, by electing you to your high office. The duty, therefore, devolves upon me to discuss the matters that have been prominently before the people of this province since June 6, last, from the legal standpoint for those on this side of the House. Naturally, Sir, I approach the subject with a considerable degree of diffidence as I see confronting me on opposition benches such legal luminaries as the honourable member for Regina (*Mr. MacPherson*), the honourable the junior member for Saskatoon (*Mr. McConnell*), the honourable member for Kerrobert (*Mr. Hanbidge*), who sit with the Conservative group, and the honourable member for Yorkton (*Mr. Stewart*) who sits with the Independent group. I shall confine myself, Mr. Speaker, to the constitutional question more particularly as it has been set forth in the independent press (might I say?). Before entering into this discussion, however, there are a few matters I would like to touch upon which, as they are strictly non-political, no one can take any exception to if I refer to them as I go along.

Let me, first of all, express on behalf of those sitting on this side of the House, our pleasure in the restoration to health of His Majesty the King. When we last met here he was in a precarious condition of health, struggling in the throes of a dangerous disease, but since that time, by reason of his splendid vitality, he has practically recovered and has returned to his manifold duties. Upon his return to London, he was accorded the greatest ovation that any living Englishman has ever received in the present generation. We believe that, not only by virtue of his position, but from the personal esteem in which he is held, not only in the British Isles but throughout the Empire, he well merited this expression of popular acclaim.

Turning to another matter, it is only natural that at the opening of each new Parliament, we have to greet newcomers to public life and, at the same time, note the absence of individuals who had been members previously. To those who are new in the House, I wish to express a welcome, as individuals, and to express the hope that, irrespective of what may occur in political life in this province, and so long as we all occupy seats in this Legislature, we will try to maintain all debates and all actions on a high plane.

I also wish to express my regret at the absence from this House at this time of many members who were present in the last House and more particularly of those who had been members for many years but who are no longer here. I propose to refer to one or two of these, and I think I can speak in a strictly non-controversial manner in that connection. I believe all members, at least on this side of the House will regret the absence of Mr. Thomas Garry, former member for Yorkton whose passing from this Legislature severed the last link between the old Assembly of the Territories and the new Assembly of the Province. He was the only member in the House who was elected to the first Legislature in the province and thus through his departure, there is severed the last link between the old and the new Assemblies.

I think also that every member will regret the absence of the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr. C. M. Hamilton, who devoted many years of his life to the public service and who, in all that time, gave of the best that was in him. Especially was that so during the period he was in charge of the Department of Agriculture in the administration of which, I believe, he achieved outstanding success. During the time that he has been at the head of that department, he has made a real contribution to the advancement of agriculture in this province. Fortunately, however, his services have not been lost to the public of Canada and, by reason of his recent appointment, he will still be able to use his great talents in the interests of the people of Canada and, more particularly, of the people of western Canada.

Let me also say this, and here again I believe I speak for all the members of this House, when I extend sincerest sympathy and express our great sorrow to the honourable member for Redberry (*Mr. Cockburn*) on the sad loss he has sustained in the past few days.

One other face I miss at this time — the face of one who for many, many years graced a seat in this Legislature, and for many, many years occupied a prominent position in the Government of this province. I refer to the Honourable S. J. Latta. For twenty years he sat in this Legislature, and, irrespective of the many battles in which he was engaged on the floor of the House, there was no one on this side who ranked higher in the esteem and friendship of the other side than Mr. Latta. Naturally, Sir, I am sorry that the people of his constituency have seen fit to turn against him and his case is an outstanding example of the sacrifice that a man makes in entering public life. He is not only subject to all the abuse that apparently goes with the presence of one in public life, but, after devoting the very best years of his whole life to the public welfare, he then finds himself in his later years bound to start life all over again at a time when it is most difficult for him to do so. I only hope that when my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition comes over here (if he ever does) that he will remember the promise he made at last session that, when he appoints an Agent-General in London, that position will be given to Mr. Latta. I only hope that that will be the first promise he will fulfil — God knows, he made enough of them! I sincerely hope that some way may be found to show Mr. Latta that his long services to the people of this province are not going to be totally unrecognised.

Now, Sir, as I said at the outset of my remarks, the present political situation in the Province of Saskatchewan is a unique one in the history of the province. For the first time since the province was created, we sit in this chamber under conditions wherein no political party or group has a clear majority over the other groups. The result of the last election shows that 28 members of the Liberal party were returned; 24 members of the Conservative party; five members of the Progressive party and six Independents, making up the total membership of 63.

The popular vote in the province in that ill-fated election, not taking into consideration the vote in Ile a la Crosse and Cumberland, was as follows: Liberals, 149,731; Conservatives, 104,080.

Dr. Anderson: How many candidates had we?

Hon. Mr. Davis: You answer that! They were your candidates!

Dr. Anderson: We had 40 to your 63!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Too many!

Mr. MacPherson: One was nearly too many for you!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. He was 415 too little. But to continue: Progressives polled 23,985 votes and Independents, 35,661. I propose to deal with this membership and this popular vote, in order to set forth my viewpoint of what I believe the voters of this province intended to indicate. In making that analysis, I propose to deal with the four groups that make up this House.

Let me deal, first of all, with the group of individuals who designate themselves as Independents. I understand that members of this group adopt the attitude that they were elected in opposition to the Government. I say that, if they now adopt that attitude, they are not, in my opinion, Independents. An Independent, as I understand it, is one who is independent of all political parties and of all groups and, I presume, of each other. He was not elected in opposition to any political party or in support of any political party. It surely cannot be claimed that a man, at one and the same time, can be an Independent and also a Opposition candidate! If he is an Opposition candidate, then he is not an Independent. In my opinion, none of the Independents were elected as supporters of the Liberal Government of this province; nor were they elected as supporters of a Tory Government, nor yet of a Progressive Government. On the other hand, I cannot see how they can claim to be elected as opponents of a Tory, Grit or Progressive administration. I believe that this argument is irrefutable and, on this basis, I propose to deal with the case before us and, therefore, for the purposes of my argument, I do not intend to take into consideration either the Independent members sitting in this House or the popular vote cast for them.

Let me say, further, that not one individual ran in the Province of Saskatchewan at the last election as a Coalition candidate and not one individual ran as a Co-operative candidate and not a single ballot was marked for a Coalition candidate or a Co-operative candidate who went to the polls as such, and, naturally, not one member was elected as a Coalitionist or a Co-operationist. If they had been, one would have expected that the first thing they would do would be to be truly co-operative.

What is a Co-operative Government? As I understand the term, it means a Government formed from all the groups in this House. It embraces all parties and all groups, with the leader chosen from the largest group. An attempt is being made, as I understand it, to designate a government formed from the three groups opposite, as a "Co-operative Government," but they may as well come out in the open and throw off the camouflage. If such a Government is formed, it will be a Coalition Government not a Co-operative Government in the strict meaning of the term because it cannot be a Co-operative Government in the strict meaning of the term unless it embraces all parties and we, who constitute the largest party in the House, have not been invited to participate.

Dr. Anderson: We may ask you yet!

Hon. Mr. Davis: You do not need to ask me, I'm telling you. The point I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, is this: A Government made up of three groups in this House and ignoring the largest group, might be termed a "Coalition Government" but it cannot truly be termed a Co-operative Government. The further point I wish to make is that, prior to the election, there was no suggestion of a Coalition Government in this province and the only suggestion of a Co-operative Government was that put forward by the Progressive party when they suggested a Co-operative Government formed from all the groups represented on the floor of the House. Let me repeat: No Coalition or Co-operative Government was contemplated or voted for at the last election.

Now, Sir, eliminating the Independents in the House for the purpose of my argument and dealing with the three remaining groups, the Liberals, the Conservatives and the Progressives, let us consider the position in which these three groups find themselves. Let me, first of all, deal with pre-election positions. These three groups went into the recent election as separate entities, under separate leadership and with separate and distinct policies and principles, with no coalition, no co-operation proposed to the people of Saskatchewan. In the election, Liberals opposed both Progressives and Conservatives; Conservatives opposed both Liberals and Progressives and Progressives opposed both Liberals and Conservatives. The best evidence of this fact is that in the following constituencies all three parties had candidates: Bengough, Biggar, Estevan, Lloydminster, Lumsden, North Qu'Appelle, Saskatoon County and Yorkton. In those constituencies, a candidate of each party opposed the other two. There was no question of co-operation; no question of coalition. It was a battle by opposing forces of all three parties.

The general result in the province insofar as the Progressives are concerned was that five Liberals were elected in contests where Progressives were opponents; five Progressives were elected against Liberal opposition and three Tories were elected against Progressive opposition. The very Leader of the Progressive Party, Mr. C. E. Little, was defeated by a Tory in the constituency of Bengough. I, therefore, fail to see how it can be argued that the two sides of this House, as presently seated, went into the fight as units opposing each other. The results indicate, it seems to me, that, so far as Conservatives and Progressives are concerned, they went to the people not as coalitionists or co-operationists; they went to the people as opponents and not as political allies.

In order to ascertain whether the Progressives and Conservatives went into the election as allies and on common policies, let us examine statements made by the leaders of these groups prior to the election. From the speeches into which I have gone fully, and from some of which I intend to quote, it will be seen that they show conclusively that they went into the election as political foes not as political friends, under different leaders, and on different policies. I find there is, above all else, one fundamental difference between them and that is their idea as to the form the Government should take in this province.

So far as I can gather from the Conservative platform and Progressive platform, there is that fundamental difference between the two groups. The Conservative party, as I understand it, is committed as a party to the party system of government, as we have heretofore experienced it in this province. This fact is borne out by the fact that the very first plank in the Tory platform, as enunciated at Saskatoon last March, makes this statement and I have heard the Leader of the Conservative Party on the floor of this Legislature say that the party form of government is the only form of government.

In reading the debates of the House of Commons at a session very much similar to this which was held in 1926, I find that the Honourable R. B. Bennett, Leader of

the Conservative party in Canada, speaking on January 11, 1926, and reported in Hansard, 1926 Session, Volume 1, page 45, quotes with approval the following extract from Lord Bryce's "Modern Democracies":

"Parties are inevitable. No free large country has been without them. No one has shown how representative government could be worked without them Where there are small groups each becomes a focus of intrigue, in which personal ambitions have scope. The groups make bargains with one another and by their combinations, perhaps secretly and suddenly formed, successive ministries may be overturned, with injury to the progress of legislation and to the continuity of national policy. Since there must be parties, the fewer and stronger they are the better."

This question arose in the House of Commons in 1926 and all through that famous debate Tory speakers stressed this thought and voiced their approval and faith in the party system of government.

The Progressives in the House of Commons are opposed to the party system of government. In that particular, their views are divergently opposite to those of the Conservative party and I propose to quote statements made by Progressive leaders during the election campaign to prove this contention. In the same debate in the House of Commons, Progressive leaders from this province strongly emphasised their opposition to the party form of government. As I understand it, the fundamental principle of the Progressive party is that government should be carried on in this Legislature as it is in a municipal council. In other words, they want the Legislature run as a municipal council is run.

Dr. Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the Honourable the Attorney General is introducing something quite unnecessary and not at all pertinent to the matter which is before the House. He is delving into past history and then he proposes to go over the whole election campaign in a lengthy appeal to the Progressives, apparently. I think the honourable minister should be asked to confine himself to the question before the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The whole question being one of "confidence," opens up the discussion as wide as any discussion possibly can be. This is the first attempt ever made in this Legislature to muzzle debate.

Dr. Anderson: There is no attempt being made to muzzle debate. I am simply asking that the rules of debate be followed in this case, and that you ask the Attorney General to stick more closely to matters which are relevant to the question before the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What should I say then?

Premier Gardiner: I think that when the question before the House is a "want of confidence" motion, it is perfectly proper to discuss any matter that pertains to the actions of the Government as it was constituted during the last 24 years. I presume that a motion of censure, if it is based on anything at all, is based on the record of the Government.

Dr. Anderson: But the honourable gentleman is not discussing the record of the Government at the moment!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am doing exactly the same thing as was done in the Dominion House in 1926 when a similar motion was moved in the Federal House of Commons. On that occasion, members were permitted a wide range of subject, and the question then involved, as it does today, the difference in principle between the groups composing the House. I contend that the rights of this matter cannot be ascertained without the fullest possible discussion.

Dr. Anderson: I think it is quite in order for members of the Government to say what they can in order to suggest why they should have the confidence of this House. At the same time, the matters he is introducing are of no concern to this House. The Opposition groups have got together to oppose the present Government and if he has any doubts on that point, he knows all that he has to do. If on the other hand he feels he has a duty to perform on behalf of the Government, let him get up and tell why the Government should have the confidence of the House and confine himself to

that discussion. We are not going to stand for any reflections upon members who were elected to this House.

Mr. Speaker: I happened to be one of those who were present at the session of the House of Commons at Ottawa to which the honourable gentleman has referred and at which that debate took place. Mr. Lemieux gave the widest latitude in that debate; all matters pro and con were introduced and the records of that session are there to prove that that is so. Any honourable member can satisfy himself on that point by consulting the records of that debate. I consider it quite in order for honourable gentlemen in this debate to discuss the past record of the Government for it is not only necessary to know "who" but also to know the reason "why." I think that the honourable member should be allowed to go on. I close with this statement: This is a British Parliament. We are not in Russia. At the same time he should stick to that which is relevant.

Mr. McIntosh: I think the honourable the Attorney General stated at the outset that he intended to discuss the correctness of the course taken by the Government following the election and I respectfully suggest that we should find out by giving the honourable gentleman a hearing, whether or not these remarks to which objection has been taken have a bearing on the constitutional matter. He is pointing out that one party in the opposition adheres to principles diametrically opposite to those held by another party on that side of the House, and that is a point which might justify the Government in taking the course it did. For that reason I think the Honourable the Attorney General is in order in bringing these points out.

Mr. Stewart: The motion now before the House is not exactly parallel to that at Ottawa. This of ours is a negative motion and that does not justify the wide latitude the speaker is taking in this debate. It is not the constitution of the new ministry that is before the House. That is a matter for the Lieutenant Governor. I submit the debate should be limited to the present administration.

Premier Gardiner: There is some truth in what the honourable member for Yorkton says with regard to the 1926 session at Ottawa, but, if he will look up the British Hansard of 1924, he will find there a "want of confidence" motion in the Baldwin Administration almost in the same words as the amendment now before the House. In speaking to the amendment to the motion the Prime Minister (*Mr. Baldwin*) at that time, and since, made a speech which will bear me out when I say that the constitutional question can be discussed on a motion of "want of confidence." He used these words:

"We have been criticised this afternoon for having placed our fate in the hands of this House, and for not having resigned in December. It was a fine point to decide because there was no precedent . . . My own personal desire would have been to have taken a holiday as soon as possible, and I think probably the desire of most people in my position would have been the same. But, after consulting various authorities, I was convinced that the proper constitutional course in a case like this, with three parties of varying strength, and none of them in an absolute majority, was to submit to the will of this House. I may say this, that I do not think that anyone who has seriously considered this question would deny that it has been a great benefit in this novel position that we have had a month for quiet reflection."

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I do not read that statement in order to raise an argument on the point but rather to call attention to the fact that in similar circumstances in the British House of Commons, the constitutional question was discussed.

Mr. McConnell: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman wishes to discuss the record of the Government we are quite prepared to listen patiently to him. But I contend it is not in order for the Attorney General to introduce matters which cannot be construed otherwise than as casting aspersions on political parties in this House which are opposed to his party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cast no aspersions.

Mr. McConnell: The matter he has introduced is the business of the Progressives and Independents alone. It is none of his business and if he wants to know whether or not his Government enjoys the confidence of this House, I can tell him that right away. There are 35 over here and 28 over there.

Premier Gardiner: If the honourable gentleman will only remember some of the remarks made in the discussion on the original motion, he will know that certain matters were raised. When a motion of "want of confidence" in a Government is moved, those who move that motion are trying to prove that some other groups in the House have the confidence of the House. We are in this position, that we have 28 elected members on this side whereas there are 35 on the other side, those 35 being divided into three different groups. The next largest group is 24 in number and the question that has been prominent in our considerations since June 6 has been this: Whom the Government of this province should recommend that the Lieutenant Governor should call upon to form a Government to succeed this one. If that is the case, then we should be permitted to discuss the matter freely as to why there should be or should not be confidence in this Government so that we can arrive at a decision as to what we shall recommend to the Lieutenant Governor. If you do not permit full and free discussion, it seems to me that we cannot arrive at that decision and we shall not know whom to recommend that the Lieutenant Governor should call upon.

Dr. Anderson: As the member who brought on this lengthy debate, I am quite prepared to allow the honourable gentleman to proceed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. Speaker: "General debate should be strictly relevant to the matter before the House" — but since the honourable member for Saskatoon has waived his point, the honourable minister may proceed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I am discussing the constitutional issue, and I am trying to give reasons why the Government has acted as it has done. Had all 35 members elected to the other side been Conservatives, the proper course would have been for the Government to resign at once. But as no single group has a clear majority in the House, and the opposition was elected in three different groups, my contention is that the Government did the proper thing in carrying on until we reached a proper decision on the floor of the House.

Before I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to indicate that on the fundamental principle of party government, two of the groups composing the present Opposition in this House, and presumably pledged to co-operate in forming a Government, are just as opposed as the two poles. As a matter of fact, on that particular principle, the Grits and Tories are closer together than the Tories and Progressives. Absolutely!

Now I am going to quote a few statements made by Progressive leaders in the province to show that, in their opinion, my honourable friend the leader of the Conservative party and his party are just as black as we are. First of all I would quote from a letter appearing in the *Regina Daily Star* of January 2, 1929, addressed by C. E. Little, as President of the Saskatchewan Progressive Association, to the editor of that paper. Mr. Little in the course of that letter states as follows — I may say, before starting to read, that as he refers to you, Mr. Speaker, by name, I use it in a non-controversial way.

" Mr. Bryant referred to a meeting, last spring, where we were invited to meet the Conservative executive to consider the possibility of avoiding three-cornered contests. We advised the Conservative leaders that nothing could be done which would interfere with the liberty of our supporters in each constituency to nominate a candidate if they so desired. Solely in the interests of our movement it seemed advisable to concentrate our strength where we had the best chance of success. The matter was brought before the Progressive provincial convention held shortly after in Saskatoon and it was decided unanimously that in view of the danger of misunderstanding and possible misinterpretation of our attitude we should make no arrangements whatever with either the Liberal or Conservative party. Mr. Bryant must have been fully aware of the above decision through the press.

"It is apparent that the only object of the Conservative party is to oust the Liberal Government and take the spoils of office for themselves. If our only object in the coming election were to defeat the Liberal Government we might well consider dropping out and leaving a clear field to the Conservatives, but although we will do our best to prevent the Government being returned to power, our chief object is to establish a co-operative system of government"

Mr. Stewart: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do not cheer too soon! There is something more to swallow in a few moments:

" to establish a co-operative system of government along the lines of a municipal or city council, in which all groups would have a share in the administration of our public affairs. This would naturally involve co-operation after the election with both the Conservative and Liberal groups."

I note that does not go down so well with my honourable friend.

Mr. Stewart: It won't be long now!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And it won't be long after you do get over here!

"We are convinced that the present party system as upheld by both Conservatives and Liberals has retarded the development of our province, promoted inefficiency and extravagance in administration, and is breeding discord and disunity amongst our citizens. It entirely fails to give us either representative or responsible government. Therefore, although the Conservative platform so far as it goes, is fairly satisfactory to our supporters, some of the planks being old friends, it will be seen that there is a fundamental difference between our object and that of either the Conservative or the Liberal parties."

That is the statement of the leader of the Progressive party — before the election; I understand that the honourable the senior member for Saskatoon is now the leader of the party. You will note that he definitely points out that the Progressive party was opposed to both the Liberals and the Conservatives and the fundamental difference between them and the Progressive party.

Then again, Mr. Little, as reported in the *Regina Daily Star* of October 30, 1928, made the following statement:

"A great number of the forward-looking people of the province, after following the abusive addresses delivered in the Arm River campaign by both Government and Opposition speakers,' added Mr. Little, 'have come to the conclusion that it is high time for a political spring-cleaning in Saskatchewan. The low plane on which the campaign was conducted by the leaders on both sides and the fact that personalities rather than issues were placed before the electors as material on which they were to exercise their judgment and franchise gives the people of the province little to hope for in the future from either side.'"

I told my honourable friend that we were both in the same boat.

Then my honourable friend the member for Kindersley (*Mr. Whatley*), speaking in Lumsden, is reported in the *Saskatoon Star* of December 10, 1928, as follows:

"Sam Whatley, M.L.A. for Kindersley, gave a resume of the tactics employed by both parties in the recent Arm River by-election. He explained the need of a Progressive movement in Saskatchewan politics. It might have the effect of purifying them, he said. He pointed to the waste of time in the Legislature under the two-party system, and showed the advantage that would accrue under a co-operative form of government, a method fully tested and found to work well in the municipal bodies of Saskatchewan."

During the election campaign, the three political parties published their "Point of View" on the political issues in that campaign in the *Regina Leader* and the following is an extract from the Progressive "point of view" as published in the issue of May 27, 1929, and written, I believe, by Mr. Little:

"On the other hand the only point of contact the Conservatives have with the Progressives is the school question. The Progressive platform states simply: 'Freedom of our public schools from sectarian influences with increased emphasis on moral training.' The Conservative reference to this question leaves the mind delightfully vague as to their intentions. Read it and see for yourselves.

Lack of Definiteness.

"The discussion of either of the old party's platform always brings one to the same conclusion: a lack of definiteness in the wording of their programmes of promises; a suspicious lack, as if they wanted a loophole to escape their fulfilment. The common man who is so busy trying to obtain all he can out of the economic struggle in this life wants something clear-cut, something about which

there can be no doubt in his own mind and which he knows can be implemented without any 'ifs' or 'buts'.

"But what can be expected from either of the two old parties. Let us trace the road of thorns travelled by the successful candidate of one of the old parties from his constituency to the Legislature. His constituency not being able to nominate him and his election furrow being ploughed for him by a machine well-oiled by central slush funds, he has nothing much else to do himself except make promises. He is elected and takes his seat in the Regina Legislature when parliament opens.

Best Intentions.

"If this is his first political essay into the political world, he will have the best intentions in the world with regard to these promises and will be anxious to live up to them. Most of the rank and file of our backbenchers started their parliamentary careers that way. But the time will not be long before he will be sadly disillusioned. He will find that he is to be herded, that there will be no independence of thought, of speech or of action. Party discipline requires this and he will find that these limitations will be issued from his party caucus.

"The caucus is a secret conclave of his party members held to decide the destinies of our province. It is nothing more nor less than a secret society which meets to determine how this province will be governed, how the public funds — yours and mine earned by the sweat of the brow — are to be divided. However much these policies arrived at in secret may differ from the interests of his constituency the party member finds that now his hands are tied. He cannot, rather he dare not, speak against or vote against these policies when it comes to the time for their discussion on the floor of the House.

Deplorable Conditions.

"All party members must be aware that these deplorable conditions exist. What do they do about it? So far we have no evidence that they intend to do anything about it, being rather content to allow this state of affairs to continue. This is much to be regretted and if one of Regina's Liberal candidates finds it a matter of regret that so many Liberals have left the ranks of Liberalism for those of Progressivism, how much more is it to be regretted that more worthy Liberals have not seen the light.

Ineffective Rubber Stamps.

"And so the rank and file of the old party members become ineffective rubber stamps, but until the electoral body, as a whole, sees that Saskatchewan has not true representative government so long will this province be burdened by the evils of the party system and by legislators who cannot legislate. If the present Government is turned out of office and the electors return a Conservative Government to power the same evils will continue to burden us."

That is, if you come over here and we go over there, the same evils will continue to burden us.

"The question has been asked, 'But what would the Progressives do in power?' If a Progressive group were returned to power that group would have to abide by the principles laid down in their platform. There would be no secret caucuses. Group committee meetings would be open to every member of the Legislature no matter to what party or group he owed allegiance; and therein lies the germ of co-operative government. There could be no minority dictation brandished by large minority interests such as we now have. Voting on the floor of the House would be a real majority vote dictated by the majority wish of the provincial electors, nor could there be that unequal partition of public funds because such partition would take place on the floor of the House in the light of open day.

Would Represent People.

"Thus would parliament truly represent the people. Why work longer for 'rubber stamps'? And this expression puts one in mind of the story of the Irishman who, wishing to travel to our capital city, asked the ticket agent for a one-

way ticket and, he added, 'I want to travel freight.' 'But what do you want to travel that way for?' demanded the station agent. 'Because,' replied Pat, 'I cannot express myself'; and the rank and file of the old party members fall exactly into that class.

"It is a sad comment to have to make that the largest economic group in this province which has seen fit to build up the greatest and most successful selling co-operative agency in the world has not yet awakened to the fact that the same co-operative ideals which guide their economic destinies apply equally well to their political existence."

Again, in the same paper also under the heading "Progressive Point of View," on March 10, 1929, the Progressive leader, Mr. Little, made the following plea to the people of the province:

"We are opposed to the Government not because it is Liberal but because it conducts its legislation and administers its departments on a party basis. We are equally opposed to any other political party carrying on our public affairs in the same way. We contend that the party system through the secret campaign funds and the elaborate system of patronage necessarily involved in it has insidiously robbed the people of representative and responsible government. We hold that the citizens of Saskatchewan must eliminate this wasteful, inefficient, and usually corrupt, system of administering our public affairs. It has created unnecessary divisions amongst our citizens that constantly endanger our national unity owing to the repeated injection of racial and religious issues to obtain support.

"We will have a safe, sound, business-like administration only when we have established government on the following principles:

- "1. Giving equal rights to all citizens and eliminating special privileges.
- "2. Maintaining constituency autonomy with candidates selected and elected on a democratic basis responsible solely to their constituencies and not to a political party organization.
- "3. Eliminating the present competitive system in our Legislature with all power concentrated in one group, and introducing another system which will reflect the collective intelligence of the entire Legislature through co-operation.

"We are also appealing to the people of the province for their support of a policy in relation to the manufacture and sale of liquor."

That is, Mr. Speaker, the nationalisation of the breweries and other concerns manufacturing liquor:

" in relation to the manufacture and sale of liquor, education, health, highways, public utilities, and primary industries which we consider is essential to the welfare and future progress of the province.

"We appeal to all citizens in their own interests as well as in the general welfare to support our candidates or others holding similar views in order that we may eliminate politics from the whole business of government."

That article is signed by Mr. C. E. Little, as President of the Saskatchewan Progressive Association.

Then I have another quotation here. This is from a speech by J. L. Dobie, the Progressive candidate in Saskatoon County (adjacent to the constituency of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition) as reported in the *Saskatoon Star* of April 12, 1929, and I quote it to show that there was no indication of co-operation between him and my honourable friends from Saskatoon. The item is headed "FAVOURS ONE LANGUAGE," and reads in part as follows:

"He told the meeting that a vote today for the Conservative party would be construed as a sign that Saskatchewan was swinging towards Conservatism, which would have a detrimental influence on the rest of the country."

Then again:

"In 1919 a Progressive convention had passed a resolution that it had no faith in either of the older parties. The situation was unchanged, Mr. Dobie said. There was a tremendous amount of unrest today among the people of the province and

Conservatives predicted a movement towards their party. There had been a similar unrest at the time the Progressives organised, and the Conservative party had not gained then, nor would it under present circumstances, the candidate prophesied.

"Could anyone conceive of people who were disfranchised by the War Time Election Act, sponsored by the Conservatives — people who came originally from other lands, but some of whom had been here 25 years and were as loyal as any at this meeting — swinging towards the Conservative party? Mr. Dobie declared he could not."

Then Mr. Little once again, speaking in the city of Saskatoon, as reported in the *Saskatoon Star* of April 5, 1929, made the following statements:

"Mr. Little then discussed at some length the fundamental difference between the various parties. Liberals and Conservatives were essentially the same, he declared. Both thrived on the stupidity of the average person who believed blindly in the 'grand and glorious traditions of my party.' He warned his audience that both of the old political parties would have splendid policies to offer in the light of other years when similar promises had been broken and disregarded. He criticised the present system of government, for all party differences were artificially made. They were artificial divisions of the people and many politicians who were in the game were in it for what they could get out of it. The others were blind partisans who could not see very far. 'The old parties had no principles,' he said, 'politics to them was solely a dollars and cents proposition'

And that applies equally well to you on that side of the House as to us on this side.

"He urged the convention to choose a candidate and then to pledge him to very few things. He should be sworn to rid politics of the party system for that was the very foundation of Progressive ideals. Progressivism believed in choosing the best interests of the whole province. It did not believe in special privileges to capital or privileged classes."

Those are expressions of opinion by leaders of the Progressive party in the province.

Turning now to the Independent group, some members of that group went into the election with somewhat the same idea, and did not hesitate to state their opposition to party government. To indicate that this was so, I am going to quote the report of a speech by the honourable member for Yorkton (*Mr. Stewart*) made at Oak Hills School in Yorkton constituency, May 31, 1929:

"Mr. Stewart said there was no more need for party government in Saskatchewan than there was need for a party system of government in our municipal politics. Great cities like New York, Montreal, Toronto and others did not have a party system of government in their municipal affairs, so why did we in Saskatchewan need it? The population of New York City was much greater than the population of Saskatchewan."

Speaking again at Yorkton, as reported in the *Yorkton Enterprise* of May 21, 1929, the present member for Yorkton made the following statements with respect to party government:

"There is no more need for party government in Saskatchewan than there is need for a party system of government in our municipal politics. Great cities like New York, Montreal, Toronto and others do not have a party system of government in their municipal affairs, so why do we in Saskatchewan need a party system. The population of New York City was much greater than the population of Saskatchewan.

"This view is also held by such men as Professor John F. Coar of the University of Alberta, Sir Andrew McPhail and Ira McKay of McGill University, Lord Grey, a former Governor General of this Dominion, David Lloyd George, Ramsay MacDonald, one-time Premier of Great Britain and the man who may be the next Premier, Wm. E. Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Bonar Law, Woodrow Wilson, Abraham Lincoln and others. Listen to what Raymond Poincare, Premier of France, had to say in his address of February the second, last: 'At the root of the debacle which last year plunged France into complete chaos lay blind partyism and if we had continued to tolerate the damnable system, France was destroyed. How did I save the situation and how was it brought about by a simple, natural and business-like process? I proceeded to form a co-operative government which included representatives from all parties and groups.' . . .

Say 'hear! hear!' to that, my honourable friend! (to Mr. Stewart).

" and after the destructive party system had ceased to function and we all began to work for France instead of working for party supremacy, the situation was saved. France need not fear outside influence. The greatest enemy is at home — blind partyism. Party prejudices and passions can destroy France more effectively than any outside power."

Then he goes to criticise what the Premier had said a day or two before:

"Last night the Premier spent hours criticising Dr. Anderson and his tactics, and showing why you should not support him. We are not asking you to support Dr. Anderson. We are independent and belong to no party."

That is, before the election the honourable gentleman was prepared to repudiate Dr. Anderson although, apparently, he is prepared to adopt him now.

Then we have the Tory point of view, wholeheartedly in favour of the party system, as pronounced by the honourable the junior member for Saskatoon City (Mr. McConnell), speaking at Saskatoon and reported in the *Saskatoon Star* of April 17, 1929:

"Giving arguments for the party system, Mr. McConnell said the governments in that country, or anywhere, did not originate all ideas. They would find that where a great man had done something which was praiseworthy some friend of his had made the suggestion to him and he got the credit for it. Every bit of legislation passed in their province, Mr. McConnell said, had been passed as a result of representations made to the Government, not by members of the Government themselves, but by citizens of the province through their organisations. The party system and the discipline which was the result of that party system and caucus, which was nothing more or less than a committee meeting, resulted in a cabinet being able to say to the people coming to it and wanting particular things: 'We can give you this,' or 'We cannot give you this.' That could not be done where there was no party system. 'Another argument,' Mr. McConnell stated, 'in favour of such a system, was that it was the main bulwark against despotic government and against bad legislation.'"

Now, I believe that these quotations I have given conclusively prove that these groups went into the election absolutely opposed on this fundamental issue and that they went in as opponents and not as the political allies they declare themselves now to be. I contend that, in determining what advice it should give the Lieutenant Governor, it was the duty of the Government to give more consideration to what had been said by the leaders of these groups before the election than was said after the election, because it was upon their pre-election statements that the people of the province pronounced their judgment.

Then, if you will examine the various resolutions passed by the Progressives and compare them with the platform of the Conservative party, you will find that they have very few points in common. I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition if he endorses every plank in the Progressive platform! I contend that, prior to the election, the Progressives and the Conservatives opposed each other, had different platforms, advocated different policies, and, I submit, that, irrespective of what they say now, the Progressives were as much opposed to Tory administration as to a Liberal administration.

What did the popular vote say? Look at the figures! The popular vote was against a Tory administration. 149,731 Liberals opposed a Tory administration and 23,000 Progressives opposed a Tory administration, or a total of 173,716, which is considerably more than half of the total vote polled.

Now if you combine the Tory vote of 104,000 against a Liberal administration with the 23,000 Progressive votes, that gives you a total of 127,000 which is nowhere near a majority of the popular vote.

The question for the Progressives to decide, therefore, is whether or not they are going to assume the responsibility of putting a Tory Government in power — camouflage it as you will, call it by any other name you like, there is not a Tory in Saskatchewan but will consider it or look upon it as a straight Tory government! — If they do that, they will continue the party system against which they have pronounced judgment — or they have it in their hands to say that party government should go.

That is the position. The Progressives hold the balance of power in this House. They cannot form a Government because they have not sufficient numbers but they can say whether the province will be administered by a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government. They have no authority, no mandate from the electorate to join either political party to form a Government, but, when they commence to pick and choose between a Tory administration and a Liberal administration, they should remember that 150,000 voted for Liberal Government and only 100,000 for Conservative Government.

Now I want to consider for a moment the constitutional question that has been raised and what the Government should have done after June 6, in view of the position of the parties in the House and the fact that all three parties opposed each other prior to that date and went to the country under different leaders and policies. What should the Government have done, and what advice should it have given His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor — or could it have given His Honour. In dealing with this matter, I shall have occasion to refer to the meetings held, the pilgrimages to Government House, the comments of the *Regina Daily Star* and so on.

Now what should the Government have done after June 6?

The Government could have resigned, in which event it would have been in duty bound to recommend a successor to His Honour. It is not the business of the Lieutenant Governor to say who shall form the Government as the member for Yorkton has suggested. The minute His Honour does that, he enters into politics. It was our duty and is our duty to recommend our successor and, naturally, under the circumstances, the only man we could have recommended would be the leader of the next largest group provided we were satisfied he had a sufficient backing to command a majority in the Chamber. We knew the leader of the Conservative party could not carry on a Government alone and therefore it became necessary for us to enquire whether the Conservatives and Progressives were allies rather than opponents. Looking at the fundamental differences between the Conservative party and the Progressive party and reading the statements that I have quoted, which prove the two parties were absolutely divergent in aims and policies; and knowing that if either party stands by its principles that the two are as far apart as the poles

Mr. Stewart: We have listened to all that already.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You should go back and tell your constituents that four days after the election you were prepared to swallow everything you had said before the election, at a meeting in the Saskatchewan Hotel!

In view of the facts I have cited, Mr. Speaker, we could not recommend a successor. It was impossible honestly to recommend under the circumstances that the Lieutenant Governor should call on Dr. Anderson to form a Government.

The only alternative to resignation and recommendation of a successor was the calling of the Legislature into session at the earliest possible moment so that the members elect, in Legislature assembled, might express themselves by their votes on the floor of the House whether they wished the present Administration to continue or another Administration to take its place. We feel that we are entitled to a public statement from both groups that they are one and, particularly, a public statement from the Progressive group. As I said a moment ago

Mr. Stewart: An hour ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have only been here since three o'clock. If the honourable member is here long enough he may learn a little about the dignity of the House.

As I said a moment ago, the parties had expressed totally divergent viewpoints on fundamental principles, and we feel that, if we are to recommend Dr. Anderson to His Honour, it should be done only after a public declaration by the Progressives in the House that they have abandoned their ideas on the party system of Government and that they are now joining a political party, that they are allying themselves with him and are pledging him their consistent support. Such a declaration can be properly made only on the Floor of the House, and if they are not prepared to make that declaration then Dr. Anderson is in no better position than we ourselves are — in fact he is worse off, because we constitute a larger group than his particular group.

I propose to discuss at a later stage the effect of the resolutions passed, subsequent to the election, by the opposition groups and the petition presented by them to His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

The so-called "independent" newspaper in Regina, ever since June 6, has been referring to the Government as "usurpers of office" and has persistently alleged that we improperly advised the Lieutenant Governor. I contend that, in view of the situation arising as a result of the election, we not only had a perfect right but it was our duty to carry on until a definite decision was reached on the floor of the House. I propose now to deal with the legality of the Government's decision to call the Legislature into session.

There is abundant precedent for the action of the Government. As a matter of fact, the Government, having the largest group, had no other choice if the matter were to be settled in a constitutional manner. I am going to quote a few of the precedents and a few of the authorities, including even the Hon. R. B. Bennett. By way of authority let me first quote from Todd on "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," second edition, at page 70:

"Modern constitutional practice has sanctioned a deviation from the rule which forbids an appeal to any other tribunal than that of Parliament itself to decide upon the fate of ministries. Up to the year 1868, 'the general current of precedent' was decidedly 'in favour of a minister, beaten at a general election, accepting defeat only at the hands of Parliament; and this custom was grounded on the salutary doctrine that it is only through Parliament that the nation can speak.'

"But, in 1868, and in 1880, the Conservative Administrations, and in 1874, the Gladstone Administration, respectively resigned office, soon after the adverse result of their appeal to the constituencies was apparent. In 1892, however, the Salisbury Administration adopted the old method of accepting defeat in Parliament. Before the elections, the Conservative majority stood 116; after it, the opposition were shown to have a majority of 40; the Government being defeated on the Address, August 11, 1892."

In those cases the two-party system was in vogue.

Now I have some other precedents to quote in support of our action, and these happened since the cases I have already quoted:

In 1910 in Great Britain, Mr. Asquith was in power and appealed to the country. The result of the election was: 275 Liberals were elected; 40 Labourites; 82 Irish Nationalists and 273 Conservatives. The Government was in a minority in the House, but having the largest group it met the House and was sustained.

In December 1916, again under Mr. Asquith, the Government went to the country and the general election resulted as follows: 272 Liberals; 42 Labourites; 82 Irish Nationalists; 272 Conservatives. The Liberal Government in a minority and exactly equal in numbers to the Conservatives, met the House and was sustained.

In 1923, Mr. Baldwin was in power and appealed to the country and, after the elections the new House was composed of 258 Conservatives, 191 Labourites, 157 Liberals and 9 other members. The Conservative Government, in a minority but with the largest group, met the House and was defeated on the Address.

Then we have the Canadian precedent of 1925-26. In 1925, Mr. Mackenzie King with the second largest group met the House, the Tories emerging from the election of that year with the largest group, and this very question was debated to the very fullest extent at the time and it was argued by Mr. Bennett and Mr. Lapointe that, constitutionally, Mr. King was entitled to meet parliament. Here is the statement made by Mr. Bennett, an authority more than all others who should be satisfactory to my friends of the Conservative group. Speaking in the House of Commons on January 11, reported in Volume 1 of Hansard, 1926, at page 48, Mr. Bennett stated as follows:

"Let us content ourselves with those two principles for the moment and see if we can find any authority or precedent that will warrant our concluding that, when the Prime Minister took the course he did of meeting parliament rather than resigning, he was breaking with parliamentary practice and procedure established in parliament for nearly a century. Until this House met the other day without the Prime Minister, his course was, in my judgment, legally sound.

I have no hesitation in saying that the language employed by my learned and honourable friend the Minister of National Defence (*Mr. Macdonald*) as to the right of the Prime Minister to meet parliament rather than to resign is absolutely legally correct."

And again at page 49, Mr. Bennett says (and I do not suppose my honourable friends would want any better authority than him):

"Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Wilfrid Laurier both resigned office as, indeed, did the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Meighen*). These are precedents that mark the situation in Canada. I do not, however, question at all the legal right of Mr. King if he so desired to advise His Excellency to meet parliament. And he has done so."

I think, that it is absolutely clear from the constitutional point of view that the attitude of the Government was absolutely correct.

I have discussed the question heretofore in its relation to the conditions that applied prior to the election. I now want to consider events which have occurred since the election, as result of conferences between members of the groups opposite. In the first place, the three groups met apparently at the Saskatchewan Hotel on June 11, 1929 — that was five days after the election. It would appear from the public press that the Conservative members met together, and the Independent and Progressive members met together, but originally they met separately from the Conservative party. The Independents and Progressives passed a resolution calling upon the Government to resign and after that, as I understand it, they went to the room where the Conservatives were meeting in caucus (quite obviously I take it), and presented the same resolution and after that members of each group apparently signed this resolution.

Dr. Anderson: I do not like to interrupt my honourable friend and I do not like to raise objections and I have not objected when I might well have done so, but I would like him at this stage to tell also of Government meetings in which they sought to buy the support of members of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry to disappoint my honourable friend, but there were no meetings held by the Government to buy the support of anybody! If the support of members opposite is for sale, as his remarks imply, then it would appear that my honourable friend has been the successful purchaser.

After these two meetings were held (and I am only going by what I read in the public press), the three groups meeting together decided to form a Co-operative Government. But the interesting feature in this connection is that no signed statement to that effect was given to the public press. The only statement as to the decision to form a Co-operative Government was furnished by two members of the Tory party, and no signed statement to this effect was given to the press by the Independent or Progressive members.

I wish to state, too, that there was no courtesy shown in the manner in which this resolution, to which I have referred, was sent on to the Government or to the Lieutenant Governor. The gentlemen who signed the memorial to the Governor were not at the time sworn in as members of the Legislative Assembly. They were to all intents and purposes simply a group of citizens not meeting in an official capacity but apparently taking it upon themselves to conduct the affairs of this province in a bedroom of the Saskatchewan Hotel — affairs that only should be conducted in the Legislature of the province. They could not function as members of the Legislature until they had taken the oath of office, and they did not take that oath until this morning. They were just 35 citizens meeting in a bedroom . . .

Dr. Anderson: May I correct the honourable gentleman; we met in the ball-room.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I accept the correction, but I would say that such actions would be more properly conducted in the basement.

Let me repeat: They could not function in their capacity as members of this Legislature until they had been sworn in. We could go down to the Hotel Saskatchewan and legislate until the crack o' doom and it would be of no effect. The only place to legislate is in this room here, for the members of this Assembly can only legally function as such at a legally convened session of this Legislature. If they want the Lieutenant Governor to listen to them as members, they must speak officially,

but no attempt was made to officially communicate these decisions to the Government or to His Honour. Apparently they assumed that the King's Representative and the Government of this province should base their decisions and their actions on newspaper reports. And, when the Lieutenant Governor did not fall in with their wishes, through the editorial columns of the *Regina Daily Star*, they cast aspersions on the Lieutenant Governor of this province . . .

Dr. Anderson: I take strong exception to the statement that any member of this Opposition cast aspersions on His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I withdraw it, absolutely. I am very glad indeed to find my honourable friend repudiating the *Regina Daily Star*.

Dr. Anderson: The honourable gentleman is putting something into my remarks that I did not put there. I implied nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then you are not repudiating this editorial?

Dr. Anderson: I am not repudiating anything published in the *Regina Daily Star*. I am repudiating the statement of the honourable member that members of this Opposition cast reflections on the Lieutenant Governor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think you should repudiate some of the statements that have appeared in the *Regina Daily Star*: for instance, the following statement, that everyone who voted for the candidates over there were British and those who voted for members over here were anti-British:

"Outrageous circumstances call for stern measures.

"Four weeks ago the Gardiner "machine" government went to the public to ask for a renewal of office to complete its programme for the betrayal of Saskatchewan to anti-British influences.

"By an overwhelming majority — by 164,357 to 149,787 to be exact — the pro-British voters of Saskatchewan, without regard to party lines, voted to dismiss the Gardiner machine government. They elected 35 anti-Gardiner machine candidates and 28 Gardiner machine candidates. That there should be no possible loophole for doubt or equivocation, each one of the 35 anti-Gardiner machine candidates immediately after the election pledged himself over his own signature to a statement calling upon Mr. J. G. Gardiner, M.L.A. for North Qu'Appelle, to resign, to enable His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to call upon Premier-elect Dr. Anderson to form a popular government."

Now, the Government recommended to His Honour that the Legislature be called into session and a statement to that effect was published in the press on June 17, 1929. Then on July 3, the Government recommended to His Honour that the Legislature be called into session on September 4, and then came the editorial in the *Regina Daily Star*, from which I have already quoted, and which, in its closing paragraphs, was nothing less than an attempt to browbeat the Lieutenant Governor; a violent attack upon the representative of His Majesty the King in this province:

"That Mr. Gardiner, M.L.A. for North Qu'Appelle, should seek to usurp office is not strange, in view of his dictator-like attitude during the days of his legitimate premiership. But that His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor should be a party to this defiance of the popular will is a matter for comment and straight speaking.

"The Gardiner machine government was voted out on June 6. The present Newlands-Gardiner-Cameron coalition has no standing in truth or law or ethics. It is an affront to the public will, and the 35 men who were elected on June 6 to restore constitutional government to this province are expected to take necessary action to enforce the popular will. They must tell His Honour, if need be, that if he desires to take part in party politics he must vacate Government House and seek a nomination of a position on the staff of the machine.

"There is only one pretext His Honour can offer for sustaining this defeated Ministry in power in defiance of the popular will. He can plead ignorance of the fact that the 35 Opposition members were all pledged before election to oppose Gardinerism. He can plead that he is too busy reading detective stories to con the daily papers and is not aware that the 35 Opposition members have, since election day, held a joint caucus, elected Dr. Anderson as their leader and publicly called upon the defeated government to resign.

"The thirty-five Opposition members"

Dr. Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: If the honourable gentleman contends this editorial is a reflection upon the Lieutenant Governor, it should not be read in this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is the very place to read it.

Dr. Anderson: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wish to discuss the point first. I quite understand that if a statement were being made that cast reflections on His Honour it would be entirely out of order. But I am simply reading from the Conservative press something which apparently reflects the opinion of the Opposition.

Dr. Anderson: Not at all. It may simply be the opinion of the press.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The opposition press. It makes certain recommendations and from their own actions, I cannot see much difference between the Opposition and the opposition press. Presumably, my honourable friend is repudiating the article in question.

Dr. Anderson: I need repudiate nothing in the press. I maintain that, if it casts any reflection on His Honour it should not be repeated in this House. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Gardiner: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker: If the Attorney General maintains that certain things in connection with this article actuated certain actions he has a right to discuss them. The Leader of the Opposition apparently would deny him the right to go further and dispute the action recommended. I take it that all the Attorney General proposes to do is to read to the House this article and then discuss the effect of what a newspaper in this province actually did say in regard to the Lieutenant Governor and the action it recommended. Surely, if it makes a recommendation and discuss that recommendation, it is an argument which has been put in the minds of the people of this province, and we should have the right to discuss it fully.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It makes a certain recommendation as to a course of action, and that course of action was followed, the following day, by honourable members opposite.

Mr. Speaker made his ruling to the effect that the article in question could not be read.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does that ruling mean that no newspaper article can be read on the floor of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Not when it reflects on any part of the Government; and the Lieutenant Governor is part of the Government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let us then follow up the next step to this editorial to which my honourable friend takes exception, and rightly so, I think. The next day, my honourable friend starts out on a pilgrimage to Government House — the most unusual pilgrimage that ever took place in any British country. He had with him a petition asking the Lieutenant Governor to dismiss the present Government and institute another in its place and to name him as the leader of that Government! This petition specifically requested the Lieutenant Governor of this province to dismiss the Government and call on J. T. M. Anderson (my honourable friend!) to form its successor! Never in any British country, at any stage in their political history, had such a thing been done before!

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is a proper method of communicating with the representative of the Crown, under the British system of Government, and that is not through the press or by hiking to Government House. The proper medium for communication between the Crown and Parliament is the Prime Minister for the time being, and the proper medium in the present case was the Premier of this province. If you read through that speech of Hon. R. B. Bennett which I have already quoted, you will find that he stresses this throughout, and if you read what Hon. Mr. Meighen said in the same debate, reported in the same volume of Hansard at page 15, you will find that he has this to say with regard to the functions of a Prime Minister:

"He is the spokesman and the only spokesman of the nation. He is the sole via media between Parliament, as Parliament, and the Crown or the representative of the Crown."

And further on on the same page, he states:

"and all concur that the Prime Minister's position is one not only of supremacy in the cabinet but of primacy; that he alone can speak with authority as between Parliament and the Crown. While His Honour the Speaker may, as between the House of Commons and the Crown, be the via media here, as between Parliament in the collective sense and the Crown, the Prime Minister is the sole medium, except when the Houses for grave reason resort to joint address."

That is the statement of the Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen explaining the attitude that should exist between the Legislature and the representative of the Crown in this province. Therefore, I contend that if there was to be any communication between the Opposition and the Crown, it should have been done through the Premier — it should have been transmitted to the Premier and by him transmitted to the Lieutenant Governor. So far as I can ascertain, there is only one recorded case at all similar to the actions of the Leader of the Opposition in this connection and that occurred in South Australia in 1871 and the report of this instance is to be found in Todd's "Parliamentary Government in British Colonies" at page 66 and following pages. In that year, fifteen members of the parliamentary opposition in South Australia addressed the Governor remonstrating against the conduct of the Administration, the communication being in the form of a memorial handed by the Leader of the Opposition to the Governor. The latter sent it back on the following grounds:

"The Opposition, while pressing their views so strongly, must remember that others have claims to consideration besides themselves. I shall always be found ready to pay the greatest deference to the opinion of parliament, but that opinion must be expressed by the majority of the Assembly in their legislative capacity, and not by a minority without the walls of the House of Assembly."

Try to visualise a similar situation developing in the motherland. Imagine if, in 1923 when, as a result of the general election in Great Britain, Mr. Baldwin, leader of the largest group, was in a minority in the House, Ramsay MacDonald, leader of the second largest group, had secured a petition signed by all members of the Labour and Liberal parties, calling upon His Majesty the King to dismiss Mr. Baldwin and appoint him, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, as Prime Minister. Imagine the reaction in public opinion if Mr. MacDonald had marched down Piccadilly and out to Buckingham Palace, knocked on the door and demanded an audience with the King and then presented his memorial asking the King to dismiss Mr. Baldwin and appoint him in his stead! I venture to say that, under those circumstances, Mr. MacDonald, or any other British statesman, would not last very long in the public life of Great Britain.

Yet, this is the condition which prevailed in this province — the leader of a minority group marching to Government House and presenting a request in writing that the Governor dismiss the Premier and instal the leading petitioner in his place. This is an exhibition of an insensate greed for public office, entirely improper and wholly unconstitutional.

The question also arises as to the real reasons back of those resolutions asking the Government to resign. The first reason, of course, was to secure the resignation of the Government; but the main reason so far as I can see was that, if the Government complied with this request, it would then be the duty of the Premier not only to resign but to recommend his successor. Under those circumstances he could only recommend the leader of the Conservative party and then the responsibility of putting a Tory Government in power in this province, representing a minority in the Legislature and a minority in the popular vote, would have rested upon this Government

and not upon the Progressive or Independent groups. In meeting the Assembly, if this state of affairs is to come about, then the responsibility of placing the Conservative party in power in this province is shifted to the members of the Progressive party — a responsibility which, in my opinion, they sought to avoid by means of those resolutions. We have put the onus where it should be and, God knows, we are not going to howl if they put us out!

Dr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the language the honourable gentleman is using. He should not use the words "God knows" on the floor of this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was the reason that underlay these petitions. They wanted to shift the responsibility upon the shoulders of the Liberal party. They wanted to avoid the responsibility that is properly theirs as holders of the balance of power, so I contend we have done what is right and proper in putting on them the onus of saying which Government shall be in power in this province.

I want now to deal for a few moments with the result of an adverse vote upon this particular question. I want to discuss the attitude that should be adopted by this Government if it is defeated in this House, in view of the pre-election statements of my honourable friends and the post-election statements of my honourable friends.

Mr. Speaker: Six o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Continuing, Thursday, September 5, 1929, Hon. Mr. Davis said:

Mr. Speaker,—When the House adjourned last night, I was just about to conclude my remarks but, unfortunately, the clock beat me to it and I was not able to do so. I was about to conclude the last subject, namely, as to what the happenings may be if the motion of my honourable friend is carried; and the question I would like to discuss is the attitude the Government ought to take in that eventuality.

Now, as I see it, there are two courses of action open to the Government. The first course is for the Government to resign and to recommend a successor; the second course is, that the Government can recommend dissolution of the House, if it finds itself in a position where it cannot resign and recommend a successor. It is only the duty of the Government to resign and recommend a successor provided the Government is entirely satisfied that the successor it recommends can carry on the affairs of the province in the Legislature. Now, the Government is aware that there is no single group in the Legislature numerically strong enough to maintain a Government by itself and, therefore, particularly in view of the fact that the three main groups were elected in opposition one to another, upon divergent policies and principles, then I say the Government must be satisfied by an expression of opinion in this Legislature by the members of the different groups that they have agreed upon a common line of policy which unites them as one party. We must know whether the Progressive party has foresworn its views with respect to party government . . .

Dr. Anderson: I maintain, Mr. Speaker, this is entirely irrelevant to this debate. We are not here to hear irrelevant questions discussed, and the matters the honourable member is introducing are entirely out of order. The whole question hinges on who commands a majority in this House. On the ruling made, yesterday, indulgence was granted to members opposite to state what they had to say in defence of the Government's record, but we are not here to hear irrelevant questions. I would ask you to rule that the honourable member proceed along the lines laid down.

Mr. Gardiner: On the point of order: I have the volume here to which reference was made, yesterday. British "Parliamentary Debates", 1924, Volume 169, and on page 302, you will find an amendment to the Address moved by Mr. Clynes, a distinguished member of the Labour Government at one time. Mr. Clynes moved in terms which are almost identical word for word with the amendment now before the House:

"But it is our duty to submit to Your Majesty that Your Majesty's present advisers have not the confidence of this House."

I state that that amendment is almost identical with the amendment now before the House, and if you follow the speeches all the way through in this volume from page 302 on towards page 700, you will find that a full discussion of the record of the Government and its activities was permitted. It starts off with a reference to the

relations with foreign powers and all matters pertaining to Government as carried on by Mr. Baldwin are discussed. You can carry on a discussion on all such matters, and any member who rises in his place is entitled to do likewise. You can also take the Canadian Hansard for 1926, when a similar question was before the House, and it was discussed by the last Leader of my friend's party and by the present Leader, and also by Leaders of the Liberal, Independent and Progressive parties. What I would like to know is this: Why all this alarm about the activities of the present Government when my honourable friend assures us he has 35 members behind him?

Dr. Anderson: I maintain the conditions are absolutely different. The speech of Mr. Clyne was made and the amendment moved when the consideration of the Throne Speech already had begun and had advanced some distance. In this case, only the mover and seconder had spoken, and we would not expect, therefore, that the discussion would range over all the subjects possible in the debate on the Address, but would be confined to the subject matter of the amendment. But if a parallel case is cited at Ottawa, when he refers to the Rt. Hon. Mr. Meighen (and sometimes he refers to him in scathing or sarcastic terms), if he reads Hansard he will find that Mr. Meighen confined his attention to the subject matter of the amendment. He says we should have a full discussion of the record of the Government, but I would remind him that it was placed before the people very fully prior to June 6, and on June 6, the people gave their verdict upon that record and I would say the less we hear of it now the more the people of the province will be pleased. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just before you give your ruling, I wish to cite what took place in the Manitoba Legislature when a similar situation arose and when a similar amendment was moved, and at that time the whole record of the Government was discussed, in the same manner as I say this amendment should be discussed, with the widest possible latitude allowed to members. I cannot, for the life of me, see why he should want to stifle discussion.

Dr. Anderson: There is no attempt on our part to stifle discussion. We simply want to follow the rules that have been laid down in the past four years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: While you are looking up the rules, Mr. Speaker, and in continuance of my remarks as to what group the members of this House have confidence in, particularly in view of the fact that no group in this House has a clear majority, I am just going to quote a precedent that took place in Manitoba, where a situation very like our own existed in 1922. The Liberal Government of the Hon. T. C. Norris was in power in the province and appealed to the electorate by way of a general election in 1920. As a result of that election, four or five groups were returned to the Legislature but none of these groups had a majority in the Legislature. The Liberal group was the largest group but was in a minority in the Legislature, of one. The Hon. T. C. Norris in his capacity as Prime Minister, elected to meet the Legislature as he was constitutionally entitled to do. He met the Legislature and was sustained. He carried on and got through with the first session, and started into the second session in 1922, when he met defeat. When he tendered his resignation to the Lieutenant Governor, His Honour Sir James Aikens, requested the Premier to hold up his resignation, to pass supply, and then took it upon himself to recommend dissolution. That is, Sir James Aikens instructed Mr. Norris to continue to transact the business of the House and then himself recommended dissolution. His letter which this recommendation

Dr. Anderson: We are not concerned about the constitutional arguments. That was not the reason for this special session. We were called in to decide one question and that is contained in the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I have been asked for a ruling. The honourable member for North Qu'Appelle (*Premier Gardiner*) has quoted a precedent in Ottawa when a similar motion was under consideration. I refer you to Volume 1, of 1926, where the Speech of His Excellency is under consideration, and an amendment was moved by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Meighen in practically the same circumstances, which reads as follows:

"That the following words be added to the Address:

'We desire respectfully to express regret that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication of policy designed to enlarge the volume of employment in Canada, and particularly to give to the producers of farm products, coal and other primary products the advantage they are, under present world conditions, entitled to enjoy in the markets of this country.'

The amendment, as moved by the honourable member for Saskatoon, is in the following words:

"It is expedient that his Honour's Ministers should possess the confidence of a majority in this Assembly and such confidence is not reposed in the present Ministers of the Crown."

I hold that, under the motion as made by Mr. Meighen in amendment, the matters as discussed were pertinent as the matters referred to were matters discussed in the election in the country and all matters discussed in the election were therefore pertinent to the debate. The amendment as moved by the member for Saskatoon is in the words I have quoted. The amendment therefore is entirely different as it deals not with any matter of the election but with the confidence of this House. "The Ministers should possess the confidence of a majority in this Assembly, and such confidence is not reposed in the present Ministers of the Crown." These are the words. The situation, in my opinion, is entirely different and the rule applying, as I see it, is contained in Bourinot, 4th Edition, at page 97:

"This Address may be debated and amended like any resolution, under the old practice. A general debate may take place on the Address, but when an amendment is proposed the discussion should be strictly confined to the subject-matter of the amendment."

The rule in Bourinot is fortified by other authorities, some of whom I would like to quote. I now quote the ruling of Mr. Speaker Edgar, given in the Canadian Hansard of 1899, at page 1565. At that time, the Reply to the Address was being considered, and discussion had arisen and an amendment had been introduced dealing with certain irregularities in connection with the Yukon district. The question was asked by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davis:

"Does the honourable gentleman (*Sir Charles Tupper*) propose to go into a dissertation on the whole policy of the Government, or will he confine himself to the amendment? I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable gentleman (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in order?"

Sir Charles Tupper: I have a word to say as to that.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries: I take the point of order.

Sir Charles Tupper: You cannot ask for the Speaker's ruling without my speaking to the point of order. I am dealing with the Minister of the Interior now; I have already shown what he did before he had any standing in public life, and I am going to show that from his very inception in public life, he has adopted a course calculated to destroy the confidence of this House in a fair and just administration by him of that great department under which the Yukon district comes.

Mr. Speaker Edgar: Following the precedents of the latest date, it must be distinctly held that until this amendment is disposed of, the debate must be limited to the substance of the amendment. Let us understand that to begin with."

I desire also to quote in fortification of Bourinot's rule, the English Hansard of 1886, Volume 308, pages 413 and 414. Again this is dealing with the Address in answer to Her Majesty's most gracious Speech.

The point is taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Randolph Churchill, that Mr. W. E. Gladstone, in speaking to the amendment, had no right to "travel to any extent wide of the definite terms of that amendment", and the Speaker's ruling on the point taken is this:

"The ruling of the Chair has been that when the general debate on the Address appears to have terminated by the introduction of an amendment, then the general discussion on the Address is closed; and when an amendment is proposed the discussion is confined to the amendment."

Mr. Gladstone objected to the ruling of the Speaker, and apparently the honourable gentleman had been dealing with certain matters as if speaking on the Address. Here is the reply of the Speaker to the objection:

"I really think I must, for the convenience of the House, state this much. Though I do adhere to the ruling I have given, that, after an amendment has

been proposed discussion should be relevant to that amendment, I must remind the right honourable gentleman that, when the amendment is concluded, the Address is again open to amendment in the interval between that amendment and possibly a subsequent amendment. But when an amendment is before the House I am only interpreting the rules by saying that the discussion must be generally relevant to the subject-matter of the amendment."

I have tried to look into the ruling, and I think the rule set out by Bourinot is correct, namely, that the speaker should confine himself to the subject-matter of the amendment now before this House.

Mr. Gardiner: If you will permit a word, Mr. Speaker: In Bourinot and the other authorities quoted, it is stated:

"A general debate may take place on the Address, but when an amendment is proposed the discussion should be strictly confined to the subject-matter of the amendment,"

as was already pointed out. But I would like to point out that, in the present instance, it is not the Address that is being amended. It is the motion "that we take the Speech of His Honour into consideration now" that is being amended. Bourinot is dealing with an amendment to the regular motion having to do with the Address but we now have before us a direct "want of confidence" motion, and an amendment of "want of confidence" is different from the specific reference as in the cases cited. I understand that, if an amendment to the tariff, say, was brought in on the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that would be the only subject to be discussed on the amendment until it was disposed of. But the matter here involves the whole administration of this Government. That is the matter under discussion now — whether or not the members here should or should not support this Government. That surely involves all the activities of the Government since the present ministers have been members of the Government.

Hon. Mr. Spence: It is customary with new Speakers, Mr. Speaker, to allow them a certain time to give consideration to weighty matters of this kind, and, while we do not wish to dispute your ruling, I would suggest to you that you take a little time to consider it, look up more authorities, and so on, and in the meantime we could carry on until such time as you are ready.

Dr. Anderson: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you have quoted more authorities in support of your ruling than we have had quoted in this House for some years.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Saskatoon press the point that the matters referred to or proposed to be referred to are without the ambit of the amendment?

Dr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the record of this Government is known and known too well, and it was known on June 6, last, when the people of this province passed their verdict upon it. The honourable gentlemen are simply speaking to supply material for the Liberal press of this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has disclosed his hand. He is a real Tory leader of a real Tory party. I have never seen so flagrant an effort to stifle discussion.

Dr. Anderson: As I said before, there is no attempt being made to stifle discussion. We simply ask that the discussion be confined strictly to the subject-matter of the amendment, as the Speaker has ruled in accordance with previous rulings.

Premier Gardiner: I quite agree with practically all the remarks that have been made, but might I remind the honourable Leader of the Opposition that the rules of this House or any other House, as set forth in Bourinot, are not made to obstruct discussion but to facilitate it. This is the first time in my 15 years' experience I have seen efforts put forth to obstruct discussion of a motion. Motions are made to be discussed and the ruling in this case would prevent any further discussion of a question which involves whether or not the present Ministers have the confidence of the House. Let me point out again, that 151,000 people of Saskatchewan voted to keep this Government in power and no other party in this House has a vote behind it two-thirds as much as that. There has been, therefore, no want of confidence on the part of the people. The decision of the people of this province in the Government of this

province has been given. The only objective we have in mind at the present time is to have the decision of the members, through their votes, as to which of the groups shall lead the Government, and what discussion there is is not entered into with any desire to avoid the vote as will be demonstrated immediately the vote is taken. I am quite sure that many of my friends of the Progressive group, and many of my friends of the Conservative group, also, have no desire to close off discussion. It is a well known fact that, when a question of confidence is raised in any Legislature, the Government has the right to defend itself, and members have the right to proclaim to the House whom they desire to place in office.

There is another point I would like to make. There seems to be a conception that a member of this House is simply a delegate to this House. There is no ground for the conception that a member of this House is simply a delegate or a representative sent here to represent the people of his constituency or to represent the people of his own particular group or party, but he is a representative sent here to represent all the people of the province of Saskatchewan and to exercise his right on the floor of the House to discuss anything that may affect the interests of the province and, after taking part in the discussion or listening to the discussion, to stand up and vote according to the decision he has reached from the merits of the discussion. I contend, therefore, that in relation to any action with regard to confidence or want of confidence in which the whole record of the Government is concerned, there should be the fullest possible discussion and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give a ruling for the fullest discussion of this subject which, as I say, involves the whole record of the Government.

Dr. Anderson: One statement made by the Premier I must take exception to. He says there was no want of confidence in his Government recorded by the people of Saskatchewan in that 151,000 voted to retain his Government. Let me tell him that 163,000 voted against retaining his Government.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member is outside the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On the point of order, in view of the statement of my honourable friend that we cannot discuss the record of the Government which involves also the right to discuss the statements and position of gentlemen opposite who may be called upon to form a Government, will you indicate to me what I can discuss. I suppose if I discuss blueberry patches or some such matters, it will be all right with him.

Mr. Speaker: Or Prince Albert National Park.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, the best in Saskatchewan or in any part of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Speaking as a new member and speaking without previous experience of the position I now occupy, I have tried to fortify the ruling I have given by quoting from acknowledged authorities and given acknowledged precedents. In doing so, I took no instructions from any member of the Opposition, or from any member of the Government either. Further to what I have already quoted, I would refer to page 203 of Bourinot, 4th Edition, where the statement is laid down:

"Each House is bound by every consideration of self-interest and justice to observe strictly its rules and standing orders, and to rebuke every attempt to evade or infringe them."

That policy I believe to have been adhered to in the ruling I have given. As I understand the debate, the honourable member, speaking on the amendment, was proceeding to discuss what the action of the Government should be in the event of the House adopting the amendment. Is that correct? If that is correct, the point taken by the honourable member for Saskatoon is well taken, namely, that debate should be strictly confined to the subject-matter of the amendment. I believe that what the Government can or can not do, is not a proper subject for discussion on this amendment.

Premier Gardiner: Do I understand that matters having to do with the future cannot be discussed, but that anything to do with the record of the Government in the past can be discussed?

Mr. Speaker: No. I am dealing only with the point raised, that the matters referred to by the honourable member for Prince Albert, or about to be referred to by him, are without the ambit of the amendment. I am dealing with that point only, and I rule that the point is well taken.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that, at the point at which I was stopped, I was about to read a statement sent by Sir James Aikens, Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, to the then Premier, Hon. T. C. Norris, and by him read to the Manitoba House and so it became part of the records of that House.

Dr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I take it that your ruling was that such matters were inadmissible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I took it that no future action of the Government could be discussed but that the fullest discussion was permissible of the past. If that is not so, I would be totally at sea as to what I can discuss.

Dr. Anderson: There is no reason why any member of the Government should be impertinent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I take exception to that.

Dr. Anderson: The honourable member referred to blueberry patches, with obvious sarcasm.

Mr. Speaker: I did not recognise the sarcasm in the statement of the honourable member for Prince Albert.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot understand how the honourable member got the idea of sarcasm from my remark. I did not intend to be sarcastic. However, as I cannot discuss what I was going to discuss I am through with all I am going to say, so, in conclusion, I will briefly recapitulate what I have said.

I contend and did contend first of all that, instead of resigning as a result of the election of June 6, last it was the bounden duty of this Government to meet the Legislature. Second, the document for the appointment of my honourable friend as Prime Minister presented to the Lieutenant Governor was unconstitutional, unethical and entirely out of order. Third, I contend that the Progressive and Conservative groups were elected in opposition one to the other upon different platforms, with different policies and principles. Fourth, that members of these parties have no mandate subsequent to the election to combine or coalesce and change their policies and principles in order to meet on common ground necessary to a coalition or combination. I further contend that, in the event of the defeat of this Government in the House, it is the duty of the Government to resign and recommend a successor but only if it is satisfied that the groups have reached a common agreement on policies and principles, making them one, which will enable them to carry on. Further, I contend that, in order to secure the information necessary to so advise His Honour, it is necessary that the members of these parties clearly indicate their stand in this regard upon the floor of the House and I submit it is necessary for them to do so before this Government takes any action for, failing satisfactory assurances in this regard, it is the duty of the Government to recommend a dissolution. The onus, as I see it, rests on the Progressive members.

This special session has been called in order to give them every chance to state their views in the proper place, for the duty and responsibility clearly is placed on their shoulders. It is for them, the members of the Progressive group, to tell the people of Saskatchewan whether a Liberal Government will be in power in this province for the ensuing term or a Conservative Government will be in power.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE W. J. PATTERSON

(Provincial Treasurer

and

Minister of Telephones and Telegraphs)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1929.

Mr. Speaker,—I am not rising to a point of order, and, to show that I am not, let me first compliment you upon the high office to which you were elected yesterday. It is a matter of congratulation I think, that, in this your first session in this House, you should be chosen to occupy that high office. If you maintain the impartiality and dignity of that office as previous holders of it have done in this House, we, on this side, shall have no fault to find. I suppose that, in some measure at least, it was exacting a great sacrifice of you to remove you from your position on the floor of the House and place you in a non-partisan position such as that of Speaker. I presume, too, that it was with some degree of hesitancy, to say the least, you decided to change from being one of the outstanding Conservatives in this province to become a "Co-operator." . . .

Mr. Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has no right to refer to you in such a manner. I would say as a member of this House and as member for the City of Saskatoon, and speaking on behalf of those on this side of the House, that we strongly object to the manner in which the Provincial Treasurer has referred to you.

Mr. Speaker: The point is well taken, but, in view of the fact that I have received the endorsement of the Government as well as that of the Opposition, I can claim to be the chief co-operative member of the House.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Hear! Hear! The amendment which the House is now considering concludes with these words: "and such confidence is not reposed in the present Ministers of the Crown." In discussing that topic, Mr. Speaker, surely those Ministers of the Crown should have a reasonable opportunity of defending themselves on the floor of the House. The attitude that has been adopted by some members on the opposite side is that they have come to this session with no intention of hearing the past record of the Government discussed or considering any of the matters that ought to be taken into consideration when discussing a matter of such importance as this. I would say, Sir, that if they approach their duties in that manner, it is not our business, but I do think that they should hear a discussion of these matters so that they may be in a position to exercise sound judgment in reaching their decision on this occasion.

I suggest that a motion of this kind, that is, of lack of confidence — and my contention is supported by British parliamentary procedure — should not be confined so far as discussion is concerned to a simple statement that "I have confidence in such a Government," or "I have not confidence in such a Government." I contend also that the people who are pressing this motion should also place their case before the people of this province. A motion of lack of confidence, if adopted by this House, expresses directly a lack of confidence in the Government but by implication it also expresses confidence in the Opposition, and the people of this province cannot have a full appreciation of the situation unless honourable members do consider the possible results of acceptance or rejection of the motion. To my way of thinking, that is the crux of the whole matter. If it is not going to make any difference to the people of the province, why discuss the matter at all? But, because of these results, because acceptance of this lack of confidence motion implies confidence in the Opposition, I contend the matter should be discussed fully by both sides, so that both sides may place their cases before the people. In other words, a vote of confidence in this Government implies a lack of confidence in the other side and from that vote and the discussion upon it, the opinion of the people of this province will largely be formed. From the attitude taken by the Opposition members the idea we have to take out of their actions since coming here is that the implication is more important than the motion itself. I would like the Progressive and Independent members, particularly, to consider carefully and thoughtfully what this motion implies — it implies not only lack of confidence in the past record of the Government and lack of confidence in its

future policy but indirectly it would imply confidence in the past record of the Opposition, in the present policy of the Opposition and in the future policy of that Opposition.

I cannot support this amendment, because it implies confidence in certain things that have happened recently in this province. During the past few weeks, we have had a number of visitors in this province. First we had the Hon. Mr. Marler, first Canadian Ambassador to Japan, following him we had the first French Ambassador to Canada (*M. Knight*) and following him the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill. Just the day after his visit, we had a large party of representative citizens from Kansas and the following week a group of Nebraska farmers. Now these visits, if they indicate anything to me, indicate that the people in different countries are taking a greater interest in the people of other parts of the world and it would indicate a desire for a better feeling as between the different peoples in the world. I regret to say, however, that a contrary feeling seems to exist in the province of Saskatchewan or at least in certain quarters of Saskatchewan. The result of the election came largely from an appeal to sectarian or religious issues not conducive to good government and, because of the activities of the Opposition in raising that appeal, I am not prepared to vote for the amendment and what it implies, namely, confidence in that Opposition. Since the election there has been maintained a continuous campaign in the Opposition press in the city of Regina, dividing the constituencies of the province into British and non-British in accordance with whether they voted for opposition members or voted for members sitting on this side.

Mr. Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I submit statements appearing in the press are not relevant to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The point is well-taken. The "Opposition press" is not before the House.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: We are discussing a situation which involves the maintenance of this Government in office, or its replacement by a new Government, and I submit I have a right to discuss this matter which is one of the most important and essential questions before the people at the present time. If by this resolution, this Legislature puts itself on record as voting for that kind of thing, and for what this Opposition has done, then I want to know it. I certainly do not like to see press references to half-breeds, sneeringly made. They are citizens of Saskatchewan, many of them descendants of our oldest settlers. During the campaign, Opposition speakers referred to them as "wonderful fellows," but now they are referred to, sneeringly, as "half-breeds." I . . .

Mr. Anderson: I again maintain that the honourable gentleman is entirely out of order. We are not discussing "half-breeds" but want of confidence in this Government.

Premier Gardiner: What is the point of order? There is no point of order raised.

Mr. Anderson: My remarks are that the remarks of my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer are out of order.

Premier Gardiner: State your point of order.

Mr. Anderson: The Speaker already has ruled on the same point.

Premier Gardiner: I still submit there is no point of order.

Mr. Anderson: It is quite clear. I think that, if you claim a statement is irrelevant, it is a point of order. The campaign conducted by the Opposition during the election has nothing to do with a vote of want of confidence in this Government.

Premier Gardiner: If that is the point, I would remind the House that 24 Conservatives, 28 Liberals, 5 Progressives and 6 Independents were elected on June 6, last, and now compose this House. Surely, if we are going to arrive at a reasonable decision we should be permitted to discuss in the House those things used to influence the electors to vote as they did.

Mr. Anderson: Notwithstanding the applause from the Government benches, the people of this province on June 6, last, registered their approval or disapproval of the Government and this is not the place to discuss what happened on the hustings. The question before the House is confidence in this Government or want of confidence. If you are going to discuss it in the terms the Provincial Treasurer is seeking to introduce, you are opening up the entire field.

Hon. Mr. Spence: There is no point of order raised. I have in my hand Alpheus Todd on "Parliamentary Government in England." Mr. Todd is recognised as a great English authority on parliamentary procedure. I wish to read this from Todd, Vol. 1, page 17:

"The policy of an administration charged with the government of the British Empire must indeed, of necessity, be a reflex of the best-informed opinion of the nation. But this opinion 'is expressed, not by the clamorous chorus of the multitude, but by the measured voices of all classes, parties and interests. It is declared by the press, the exchange, the market, the club, and society at large. And it is subject to as many checks and balances as the constitution itself; and represents the national intelligence rather than the popular will.' And, after all, it should be remembered that while public opinion, in a free state, must ultimately determine into whose hands authority shall be entrusted, and what shall be the general policy of government, it is chiefly within the walls of Parliament that the contest for power between the rival candidates for office is conducted; and that one of the most important functions of Parliament is that of being 'an instrument for the instruction of the nation, and for enabling it to arrive at just and wise conclusions on matters affecting its welfare.'"

Mr. Anderson: I agree, Todd is correct and the honourable member is correct, but I contend the matter is not applicable here. A certain resolution has been moved, and speakers must, according to the Rules, keep to the subject-matter of the resolution. True, Parliament is the place to discuss public matters, but in this case only one phase is under discussion in this House at the present time, and so, I contend, the authority quoted by my honourable friend does not apply.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Can my honourable friend tell me this: Can any issue be put before this House that offers a wider range for discussion than a want of confidence motion? Surely, we have to discuss past records if we are to decide whether or not we can have confidence in future policies, and we should be put in a position where we are permitted to do that. If my honourable friend is not prepared to have the election record of his party discussed

Mr. Anderson: We are not ashamed of our election record, nor of our past record in this House. You are going beyond the subject-matter of this resolution.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Does the honourable gentleman know of any issue that could offer a wider range of discussion than a want of confidence debate?

Mr. Anderson: I know none that can be settled more quickly, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Gardiner: The Leader of the Opposition has said that this House is not concerned with the policies of the Government. He now says he is not concerned with the policies of the groups opposite as stated during the election. It is absolutely impossible, Mr. Speaker, for us to reach a reasonable conclusion unless we discuss the policies and record of this Government. On the other hand, if we are to reach any definite conclusion as to what the policies of a new Government may be, in which we are to place confidence, we must discuss the records of the groups opposite. If they eliminate this discussion, there is no way by which the people of the province will know what the policies of the new Government may be.

Mr. Anderson: I contend that it is not necessary for the honourable gentleman to draw deductions as to what the future policies of a new Government may be. It is merely his duty, if he is defeated in this House at this time, to go to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor and make certain representations and give certain advice. A majority of this House is opposed to his Government, but it is not the duty of this Opposition to get up and state what they are prepared to do if called upon to form a Government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What can we discuss then?

Mr. Anderson: That is for Mr. Speaker to say.

Mr. Speaker: In regard to Todd, quoted by the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Hon. Mr. Spence*), I agree with that authority. I have read not only Vol. 1 but also Vol. 2, but the reference quoted is not applicable to the point taken. As I understand the situation, the honourable member for Saskatoon (*Mr. Anderson*) raised an objection to the honourable member for Pipestone (*Hon. Mr. Patterson*) quoting an editorial from a newspaper which he refers to as the "Opposition press." I hold the "Opposition press" is an issue not before the House. If it is a question

of the discussion of the policies and record of this Government, that is different. If it is a question as to who did support this Government or who did not support this Government, that is admissible, but so far as reference to items appearing in what is alleged to be the "Opposition press," that has no point so far as this debate is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I contend that it confirms my contention in that, having ruled that it is proper to discuss the number of people who voted for this Government or against this Government, I can quite properly discuss the motives and the methods by which these votes were secured. Naturally, the one follows the other. Our Opposition friends apparently want us to accept a vote of want of confidence in us and of confidence in them, without letting the country know what to believe and what it might expect, and I think I am justified in the position I take that they should set forth their position so that the people may judge for themselves. I cannot support a motion which implies approval of the political inconsistencies of honourable gentlemen opposite. That is something I do not care to countenance and to accept the motion now before the House would be to approve of these gentlemen meeting in the afternoon as Progressives, Independents and Conservatives and coming out overnight as "Co-operators." Acceptance of this amendment would approve of men running in an election as Progressives, Independents and Conservatives in opposition to one another and subsequently becoming political allies. I say that kind of political inconsistency would be approved by the acceptance of this amendment. It would approve also of the transfer of the Legislature to a bedroom in the Saskatchewan hotel . . .

Hon. Mr. Davis: Ballroom!

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Members of the opposite side do not wish to have these matters discussed. They wish to make people believe that they have come here with their minds made up and, without discussing the issue, they desire to register their approval of an amendment when that approval is, by inference, approval of improper and unconstitutional methods. I think the action taken by the co-operating groups in presenting a petition to the Lieutenant Governor is an improper and unconstitutional procedure. I cannot agree with such a course because it puts His Majesty, the King's representative in an impossible position. Acceptance of this motion would approve of the Lieutenant Governor being the subject of attacks by a certain newspaper in this province. It would approve further of the journalistic tactics followed by the Opposition press

Mr. Anderson: The attitude of any press in this province has nothing whatever to do with this amendment, Mr. Speaker. The press, I presume, expresses its own opinions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does not *The Regina Star* reflect your opinion, too, my honourable friend?

Mr. Anderson: That has nothing to do with the question. The Speaker already has ruled that the "Opposition press" is not before the House.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Apparently, the honourable gentleman by his action at the time approved of *The Star's* article, or authorised it — now he is repudiating it.

Mr. Anderson: I am not! I do not have to repudiate anything that appears in the press. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have already ruled that the "Opposition press" is not within the ambit of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: All I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, is that members who support this amendment approve (indirectly it is true) the very things of which I have complained, and I leave that thought with my honourable friends of the Progressive and Independent groups.

Mr. Anderson: Do not forget us!

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I have not much hope of you. I would further state, however, that acceptance of this amendment would constitute an expression of want of confidence in a Government which has a long record of wise and useful legislation to its credit. I ask the members to your left, Mr. Speaker, to name a single item of legislation which was subject of criticism in the last campaign! There was certainly no criticism of those items referred to by the honourable member for Pheasant Hills (*Mr. Dunn*); not one of them will get up and criticise the anti-tuberculosis legislation. Not one

member of this House will stand up and criticise adversely any legislation having to do with public health, and it is well-known that the public health legislation and administration in this province is unequalled in the Dominion of Canada. Other provinces have copied, not only our public health legislation, but our administration of that department of Government as well. It is well-known that the legislation affecting municipal organisations is efficient as is also the administration of the department which has to do with municipal matters and which is concerned with the relations between our various municipal organisations. It is well known also that this Government has a good record in connection with public institutions. We have two mental hospitals, one of which was subject to a certain type of attack prior to the election, but I think the author of this attack was ashamed of it for he dropped it. But the administration of these public institutions is acknowledged to be efficient, and that is something to the credit of this administration, something to the credit of this Government. A vote of want of confidence implies a condemnation of these matters. It is well known that the member for Saskatoon (*Mr. McConnell*) said that the percentage of cream in the milk served at the Old Folks Home at Wolseley was not all that it might be, but we have a fine home there, efficiently managed, and, if retained in power, we will undertake to see to it that, if he goes there, he will find the milk as good as he gets at home . . .

Mr. Speaker: I must ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I have no objection to doing that, Mr. Speaker. I only hope that the time will never come when he will have to go there if conditions are as bad as he would have us believe.

There has been some criticism of the school system of the province. We have enacted up-to-date legislation for our schools and we have a standard of education suited to and in keeping with the conditions that exist in this province. We are not ashamed of it, and we are prepared to defend our administration of the Department of Education. I venture to state that we will not hear one-tenth of the statements with regard to education on the floor of this House that we heard from the Leader of the Opposition on the hustings.

Mr. Anderson: Oh, yes. You will!

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Time will prove that. I could go through all the departments of government in the same way. We have to have goals in this province, and we have outside information to prove how well and capably they are being conducted. We have a most efficient Agricultural Department, despite the fact they did not see fit to start an agricultural education branch as recommended by a member opposite. The recent appointment of Mr. C. M. Hamilton, who so long presided over the Department of Agriculture, to the Board of Grain Commissioners of Canada has been received, I would inform honourable members, with acclaim by the press from one end of Canada to the other, their tributes to Mr. Hamilton being, in my opinion, a favourable reflection upon this Government's policy with regard to the development of agriculture in the province. I say that acceptance of this amendment is a registration of protest against this record of legislation and administration.

Then this Government has a long record of service to its credit in connection with co-operative marketing of agricultural products. Not only has it assisted by educating the people in the necessity for and advantages of co-operation, but in every possible way it has fostered and encouraged co-operative enterprise on the part of the people. Not only by loans, not only by legislation, not only by the personal aid of members of this Government, but by all of these and other ways, this Government has helped in the development of such enterprises.

This Government also has made considerable progress toward the elimination of private gain from the sale of liquor in this province, which should receive the support of the Progressive members in the House. It is quite true that the Government has not gone so far as to take over the breweries and other plants in which liquors are made, but it has ensured that the gain from the sale of liquor goes into the public treasury of the province and not into the pockets of private individuals.

We have given this province sound and careful financial administration, also, and I propose to deal in detail with the Government's record in that respect, because, after all, a sound financial position is the best evidence that a Government is sound. I submit, Sir, that in private institutions and financial organisations, as in government, examination of a balance sheet will very promptly show whether or not the administra-

tion of that institution or financial organisation, or that government, is sound; and by that criterion the Government of this province is proven sound.

During the election campaign, a great many misleading and untrue statements were made regarding the financial position of the province. A night or two before the election, a prominent member of the Conservative party at a public meeting in the city of Regina is reported to have made the statement that the Government was spending \$1,000,000 of the public funds for election purposes, leaving the impression that this Government was dipping into the public treasury to finance its election campaign. Now, Sir, this is merely a sample of many equally reckless and absurd statements made during the election campaign, and it is perhaps unfortunate that, if you make that kind of statement often enough and vehemently enough, some people are going to believe it — and, no doubt, such statements had some effect on the result. While the excellent financial position of this province is very well known to and appreciated by every person in Canada who has made any study of government finances, or who has had any dealings with governments, the great majority of our citizens are not in a position to verify for themselves the necessarily complicated and elaborate statements which record the financial position of a business such as that in which we are engaged. It is imperative, in handling a business of between twenty and thirty million dollars a year, that the financial statement of a business of this size must of necessity be complicated and I say, without disrespect, that it is no easy matter for the average citizen to analyse these statements for themselves.

Because of the doubt raised in the minds of the people of this province by statements such as that I have referred to, the Government decided to secure from an unbiased and unprejudiced source a report on the finances of the province which could be accepted by everyone as a true and correct statement of its position. Consequently, arrangements were made with Messrs. Price, Waterhouse & Company to prepare this report.

Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I spoke this afternoon in connection with the filing of this report, and I pointed out that this is a special session called for one purpose and one purpose only. I maintain that the honourable gentleman cannot refer to that report, because it is not properly before the House, as it has not been properly tabled and accepted by you, Mr. Speaker. Further, I would state this: The Government has been guilty of contempt of this Legislature in that, appearing in the *Regina Post* this afternoon is a copy of this report, which in some way had come into their possession.

Premier Gardiner: While it may be true, Mr. Speaker, that this session was called primarily for the purpose of determining one thing, it is also true that it is a regular session of the Legislature. We are here to hear statements on both sides of this question and to reach a decision with all the facts before us. I would suggest this to members of the Opposition, more particularly those who were members previously, that there are a considerable number of members on both sides of the House who have not been in close touch with affairs of the province. There are only two members of the eleven who represent the Progressive and Independent groups who have previously been members of this House and as such have kept in touch with affairs, the remainder having been able to keep in touch from the outside, and they have proved that they have been able to do that or they would not be here now. But there are certain matters they could not possibly know, and, when a member of the House gets up and says that ordinary routine is out of order because he has it in his mind that this was called as a special session, I want to disabuse their minds. It is a session of the Legislature. Whenever a summons is sent out for the Legislature, and that summons is responded to by the members and they appear on the floor of the House and the Lieutenant Governor presents his speech, that does not prevent any other matter being brought before this Legislature. I submit there is no such thing as a special session — no such thing. Now, I submit, Sir, that the new members are not fully acquainted with the whole record of the Government particularly the record as to its financial administration, and they should have the advantage of the opinion of any group of men anywhere in the Dominion of Canada who have had the experience and the opportunity of making thorough study of these matters of finance. A government, if it bases its claim as a sound government on one thing more than another, it is on its handling of the people's money and the financial business generally. Members of the House should have an opportunity of studying this report and the opinion of men well qualified to judge on the financial affairs of the province. Surely the Provincial Treasurer was quite within his right to table this report, and he should be placed in a position to discuss the findings, and the House should be placed in position to study the findings of any group of competent men with regard to the finances of the province.

With all due respect to your previous ruling, Mr. Speaker, when there has been a press in this province which has been destroying public confidence in this Government and, more particularly, since this session was called has been making even more extravagant statements as to the finances of the province, I think the need is greater than ever before that the Legislature should be placed in possession of the facts regarding the financial standing of the province.

Mr. McConnell: I should like to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the report is properly before the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Surely this Government has a right to place the report before the House and to discuss the report before the House. It has been suggested in the "Opposition press" that we have stolen \$4,000,000 of the people's money. Surely there is no better way or place to refute such extravagant and reckless statements!

Mr. MacPherson: The point of order is taken that the report has not been tabled. If it has not been tabled, then it is not proper to discuss it, and it is, to say the least, a most peculiar co-incidence that it has been released to the "Government" press before it has been tabled in the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The other press had an equal opportunity, I presume.

Mr. Anderson: No press, whether Government or Opposition, should have received a copy of the report before it was tabled in the House.

Premier Gardiner: I do not know how the report reached the press. That is a statement of fact. I do not know where they got the statement. Nor do I know where the *Regina Star* got their statement, but it purported to be a true statement . . . There is no ruling in this House nor is there any other House in the British Empire where they have a ruling of the kind suggested. If there is such a ruling I would like to hear it quoted. I venture to state that nowhere else in the British Empire will you find a newspaper publishing on its front page, as news items, editorial comments such as those which have appeared in the *Regina Star*. We have been carrying on the Government for a year under conditions such as that, and if we are not permitted to discuss these matters of finance while still the Government and in defence of our record, then the sooner we are on the Opposition side, where we shall be able to discuss these matters so that the people of the province may know about them, the better I will be satisfied.

Mr. MacPherson: The honourable Prime Minister has not been talking to the point of order at all. The point is whether or not this report is properly before the House.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I must suggest that the document was tabled and is still on the table so far as I am concerned. As it has not been returned to me as the Minister in charge of the report, I have to assume that the report was duly accepted and that you, Mr. Speaker, have not declined to accept it.

Mr. Speaker: So far as the document being before the House is concerned, it may be due to lack of experience on my part as Speaker, but I was of the opinion that, no serious objection having been taken, the document was tabled and recorded. Having been tabled and recorded, as I understand it, the honourable Minister is right in referring to it. I might further say, with reference to the point taken, that, in view of the terms of the resolution, it might be vital to the vote cast, as no doubt it is vital to the life of the Government, that these facts be brought out. I shall rule that the report may be referred to.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I shall continue from the point where I was interrupted. The Government retained the services of Messrs. Price, Waterhouse and Company for the purpose of preparing this report on the financial condition of the province. It is hardly necessary for me to refer to the qualifications of this firm for conducting this type of work. The company is well-known as a firm of auditors and chartered accountants which, I understand, was first established many years ago, in London, England. I understand also, that three generations have elapsed since the firm was established and that grandsons of the original promoters are now connected with its management. In any event, this British firm is now international in its operations and carries on business in practically every country of the world. It has branches throughout Canada, at Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, and one reason for choosing this firm was because it is not a Saskatchewan firm. By that I mean it has not even a branch in Saskatchewan, has no office here, no resident

employees and therefore could not in any way be interested in the political situation in this province. Its Winnipeg office audits the balance sheet and treasury books of the Province of Manitoba, and wherever the firm does operate, wherever business is done throughout the civilised world, the certificate of Price, Waterhouse & Company on a balance sheet is accepted by financial men without question or reserve. No person can question the ability, integrity, or impartiality of this firm. If I remember rightly, the honourable member for Regina City (*Mr. MacPherson*) at the last session of this Legislature, suggested this firm as a suitable and proper firm to undertake a work of this nature.

The Government engaged Price, Waterhouse & Company to do two distinct and different things. In doing that, we had in mind mostly the necessity for restoring the confidence of the people of this province in the financial administration and the financial condition of the province after all that had been said; and we also realised that we might be coming to the end of a long period of Liberal rule and in the light of experience in other provinces we thought we were justified in finding exactly how we stood. We, therefore, asked Price, Waterhouse & Company to perform two duties:

First, to conduct an audit of the books and accounts of the Government as at April 30, 1929, and prepare a balance sheet as of that date;

Second, to make a general survey of the revenue and expenditure accounts to ascertain whether the provincial system of bookkeeping and auditing was adequate and efficient.

I may say that, in connection with both these matters, no limitations were imposed. They were instructed to make such audits, searches, inquiries or investigations as they considered necessary. The books, records and accounts of the province, from its establishment up to the present time, were made available to them, no questions were asked, no suggestions were made. In every way, they were given a free hand and, I may say, that they had no hectic scenes with members of the Government or with officials of the Government, as has been reported. I did not have to spend "all my time in my office for two weeks" to see that everything would be favourable. As a matter of fact, when the representatives of the firm came to my office, they were only there for half-an-hour and I told their chief supervisor then that he had, absolutely, a free hand, that he should go ahead and report as he found things. I also asked him to let me know if there was anything he wanted. I did not see that gentleman again, or any of his staff, until the afternoon he left the balance sheet, and then there were only one or two items we did have a discussion about. But I did not ask him or any of his staff to change a single item. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, their instructions were to report on things as they found them.

The work was carried out by a staff of twelve men under the general supervision of Mr. Young, one of the Canadian partners from the firm's Montreal office. Now, at this date, the first of the duties assigned to them has been completed — that is, in connection with the balance sheet, and we have their certificate in regard to that. It was that portion of their report which I tabled in the Legislature this afternoon. Before dealing in detail with their findings, I would like to make a few general observations.

The Government of the Province of Saskatchewan is a very large business. It is one of the largest businesses in the province. There may be larger business, but none with such widespread ramifications. Between twenty-five and thirty million dollars pass through the Consolidated Fund of the province each year. In additions to the ordinary revenues and expenditures on Revenue and Capital Accounts, there are various Trust Accounts, Sinking Funds, and Special Advances Accounts. Practically every department collects some revenue, and, of course, every department makes expenditures. In the last fiscal year, the Treasury Department issued over 200,000 cheques. In a business of this magnitude and these ramifications, it could not be expected that every detail would be absolutely perfect or that errors could not be discovered. We knew this when we engaged Price, Waterhouse and Company, and asked them to report on things just as they found them.

In Saskatchewan, we have always presented our accounts and balance sheets on a "cash" basis. This is in accordance with British and Canadian practice, but some of the provinces report on a "revenue" basis. As a matter of fact, our Treasury records are kept both ways and the Provincial Treasurer always knows the "revenue" position of the province as well as its "cash" position, but the Public Accounts were published on the "cash" basis. This was done for several reasons: In the first place, it follows the British practice, the Federal practice and the practice of the older

provinces; in the second place, it makes the financial statements simpler and more easily understood, and my contention is that it is the purpose of Public Accounts to acquaint the public with the financial condition of the province and I think it quite proper in publishing reports of this kind to make them as easily understood as possible; in the third place it prevents a manipulation of accounts to provide a fictitious "book" surplus, and I may say it is possible to produce an artificial (perhaps I should not say that)—a "book" surplus when books are kept on the "revenue" basis. In a fourth place, we kept them on a "cash" basis because we knew that a "revenue" statement would show the province in an even more favourable position than the "cash" statement.

The books and accounts of any ordinary business are properly kept on a "revenue" basis and, in theory, this also applies to a government. But with a government, it is a matter of policy which practice will be followed and we have adopted the "cash" basis for the good and sufficient reasons I have stated. That is, if my friends opposite wish to change to a "revenue" basis, if and when they come over here, it is perfectly all right for them to do so. The honourable member for Hanley (*Dr. Stipe*) has been advocating the change, but I have never heard him say anything that would indicate that he knew the difference between keeping records on a "revenue" and on a "cash" basis.

We gave Price, Waterhouse & Company an absolutely free hand and no conditions or limitations were placed on them in the conduct of their work. Not being concerned with any question of government policy, they prepared a balance sheet and report on a "revenue" basis. I am pleased to be able to say, Mr. Speaker, that their report, which I tabled this afternoon, confirms, yes! more than confirms, every statement and claim we have ever made regarding the financial position of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The honourable member for Weyburn (*Mr. Leslie*), speaking at Meadow Lake on July 13, complained that he could not make the figures on pages 17, 19 and 26 of the Public Accounts balance. If he finds difficulty in understanding the comparatively simple statements of the Public Accounts as published in the past, it will probably be beyond my ability to make him understand the much more elaborate and intricate statements prepared by Price, Waterhouse & Company.

Mr. Anderson: Why waste time trying then?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I expect it would be waste in your case.

Our balance sheet in the past has always consisted of one balance sheet, with capital and current assets on one side and capital and current liabilities on the other. But Price-Waterhouse have prepared theirs in two sections, "Capital" and "Current." Now the capital assets of the Province of Saskatchewan include Dominion Debt Allowance, and it is the common practice in all provinces of Canada to capitalise that as it is a fixed sum. In some provinces, they follow the practice of capitalising other Dominion subsidies as well, but we have never done that, nor did Price, Waterhouse in this instance. Capital assets also include the moneys in the School Lands Trust Fund with School Lands, Public Works and Undertakings, Loans and Advances to the Farm Loans Board and so on, Sinking Funds and some miscellaneous items. Capital liabilities are, of course, the outstanding Bonds, Debentures and Treasury Bills. I am glad to say that, on the Capital section of the balance sheet, the surplus of assets over liabilities is \$61,440,963.03 according to the statement prepared and certified to by Price, Waterhouse and Company.

The Revenue section of the balance sheet includes in the assets, Cash on Hand, Interest due on School Lands, Taxes Receivable, Accounts Receivable, Supplies, etc. Revenue liabilities are accrued interest on Government Securities, Accounts Payable, Reserves, and Revenue received in advance. The surplus of assets over liabilities on current account, according to the balance sheet as Price, Waterhouse has prepared it, is \$1,855,474.18. The total surplus of the province, therefore, as determined by Price, Waterhouse, is \$63,296,437.21, after making every provision they considered necessary for bad and doubtful debts or other contingencies.

A balance sheet for the same date prepared on the "cash" basis, as has been our practice in the past, would show a surplus of \$46,136,175.44 instead of \$63,296,437.21. That the position of the province is and always has been actually better than our reports claimed is now conclusively proved for Price, Waterhouse gives the province credit for a surplus greater by \$17,160,261.77 than the Government claimed.

But I wish to be fair, Mr. Speaker, and that is more than most of our critics are willing to be. In the statement we are considering, the auditors have credited an asset which we did not include. That is the "estimated value of unsold school lands." Our practice was to make a note at the foot of the balance sheet stating that there was an estimated number of acres of unsold school lands but we did not include the estimated value of these unsold lands in the balance sheet totals. The auditors decided, and this without any request or suggestion from us, that the estimated value of these lands should properly be included as an asset.

Mr. Anderson: At what value?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: In their statement the sum of \$14,806,444 appears opposite this item; that is figured on a basis of \$15 an acre in the settled portion of the province and \$1 an acre in the unsettled portion. Even allowing for this item, however, and deducting it, the surplus as determined by Price, Waterhouse is \$2,353,817.77 greater than we claimed it to be.

These facts do not give much satisfaction to those (and some of them are sitting opposite me now) who have tried to persuade the people of this province that its finances were in a hopeless condition, that the Government was following improper practices in an attempt to cover up the real condition of affairs and that an independent audit would reveal shortages of \$4,000,000 and more. But, never before in the history of Canada has an independent audit proved the position to be better than the Government statements themselves have claimed it to be.

Let us examine this balance sheet in greater detail. First it will be noticed that only the Federal Debt Allowance has been capitalised. Some provinces capitalise all the various subsidies as I stated before, but only the Debt Allowance principal is fixed by statute and for that reason it is the only one which can properly be included as an asset. The unsold school lands are entered at a reasonable valuation.

The Capital section also reveals that there is a capital asset for every dollar of the Public Debt. Money has been borrowed only for proper capital purposes. Expenditures for relief, seed grain, grants to organisations and institutions or loans which are not likely to be collected have not been made out of capital moneys but have all been provided out of revenue in accordance with good business practice. There is no item "intangible assets." That heading does not appear, although it is used in other provinces. Sinking funds in the province stand at a little less than \$3,000,000 which is more than sufficient to retire all loans maturing during the next six years; refunding will not be necessary in that time.

An examination of the Current section shows the province with approximately \$2,000,000 of cash actually on hand at the end of the fiscal year and, for the peace of mind of the honourable member for Hanley (*Dr. Stipe*), I may say that it clearly indicates that no capital moneys have been used in Revenue Account nor has there been any borrowing by way of Treasury Bills or otherwise for revenue purposes.

Dr. Stipe: What is the total of Treasury Bills out at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Approximately \$4,000,000. There has been no borrowing by way of Treasury Bills or otherwise for revenue purposes. On the contrary, Capital Account is indebted to Revenue Account for a small amount, some \$12,879.78. It further shows that, at April 30, last, there was \$1,922,738.78 of liquor profits in the Consolidated Fund which had not been allocated or expended. Had the Government of Saskatchewan ceased business on May 1, last, there was sufficient cash in the Treasury to pay every dollar that it owed for any purpose or account, except the principal amount of the Public Debt, without collecting any part of the more than \$3,800,000 which was due it from various sources. That was the position of the province on May 1, 1929.

As I have already stated, the surplus on Current Account is \$1,855,474.18 and this is after making due provision for all bad and doubtful debts. The last available statements of Manitoba and Alberta, those of April 30, 1928, show both these provinces with deficits on Current Account amounting, in the case of Alberta, to over \$4,000,000! Consequently, our position is unusual for western provinces in that it shows a surplus on the current side of the balance sheet, and those who doubt that statement, I would advise to study the balance sheets of those other provinces.

The balance sheet prepared and certified by Price, Waterhouse is supported by inventories and exhibits showing in detail how the various totals are made up. To sum up, the balance sheet as presented proves the following facts:

1. The surplus of assets over liabilities is \$63,296,437.21 which is over \$2,350,000 in excess of our claims even after making allowance for the inclusion of unsold school lands;

2. Capital Account borrowings have been used only for proper capital purposes and three is a proper capital asset for every dollar of the Public Debt;

3. Assets have not been inflated and proper provision has been made for accounts payable, accrued interest and uncollectable accounts;

4. Revenue Account has borne all proper revenue expenditures without borrowings and has not been assisted at the expense of Capital Account;

5. \$1,922,738.38 of liquor profits, which had not been expended or allocated, were available for extension of Government activities or to be applied on the Public Debt;

6. The financial position of the province will bear comparison with any province in Canada and testifies as to the sound financial administration of its affairs during the past twenty-four years.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock, I now leave the Chair.

Resuming at 8 o'clock p.m. and after recapitulating the points made with reference to the balance sheet, Hon. Mr. Patterson said:

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to read to the House the certificate which accompanied the balance sheet. It is as follows:

"PRICE, WATERHOUSE & Co.

Winnipeg, August 28, 1929.

To the Honourable

The Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Sir:

We have examined the books and accounts of the Treasury Department for the purpose of determining the financial position of the Province of Saskatchewan at April 30, 1929. It was not possible in the time placed at our disposal prior to the presentation of the Public Accounts, to prepare Revenue Accounts, or to verify the Cash Receipts and Disbursements of the past year.

We have made an investigation into the status of the outstanding loans, advances and accounts receivable, and have verified the sinking fund and other investments and bank accounts. The balances carried on the Treasurer's books as receivable from the Telephone Department, Farm Loans Board, Liquor Board and Power Commission, are in agreement with the statements furnished by these Departments, but the books and accounts of these Departments have not been examined by us.

We have prepared and attach hereto, a balance sheet as at April 30, 1929, with relative exhibits, which, in our opinion, is properly drawn up so to show the true financial position of the province at that date. In preparing this balance sheet we have made such provision for bad and doubtful accounts as the results of our investigation and the information available indicated was necessary, and we have included all known liabilities at April 30, 1929. The surplus of assets over liabilities shown on the Capital section of the balance sheet, is subject to any provision which may be necessary for depreciation of public works and undertakings.

The books of the Treasury Department are in good order and well kept, and so far as our investigation extended, we found that the disbursements had been made under proper authority.

We would recommend that the accounting system be revised so that the books may be kept, and the Public Accounts presented, on a "revenue" basis, in place of the basis of "cash receipts and disbursements" which is now followed. We would also recommend that the sinking fund for the debenture issues should be established on an exact actuarial basis.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

PRICE, WATERHOUSE & Co."

Commenting on this, I may point out that the auditors certify that the balance sheet is, in their opinion, properly drawn up to show the true financial position of the province, that provision has been made for bad and doubtful accounts, and that all known liabilities have been included. They further state that the books of the Treasury Department are in good order and well kept and that disbursements had been made under the proper authority.

In addition to this certificate which accompanies the balance sheet, there is a written report, which is a very lengthy document and which I do not propose to read to the House. I propose, however, to deal with some of its most important features. Before doing so, I again wish to remind the House that Price, Waterhouse & Co. were asked to do two things — First, to prepare a balance sheet; second, to make a general survey of the revenue and expenditure accounts with a view to ascertaining whether the provincial system of bookkeeping and auditing was satisfactory. Up to the present, they have only had time to complete the first of these duties and it is our intention to have them proceed with the second as soon as possible. When that has been done a number of the matters referred to in this report will have been subject to more thorough investigation and we will all be in a position to discuss them more intelligently.

Now, in the report which I have read and in the larger report which I have in my hand, Price, Waterhouse recommends that the books and accounts of the province be kept on a "revenue" basis instead of a "cash" basis. As I have already stated we have kept our books on a "cash" basis and I explained the reasons we had for doing so. But I wish to remind the House, again, that the Treasury has also kept "revenue" records and, while these may not have been in the detail that an adoption of the "revenue basis" would require, they were sufficient to give us, at all times, the position of the province under either system. While I can agree with the reasons given by Price, Waterhouse in support of this change, I am still of the opinion that there is a sound, practical reason for the British practice of "cash" statements and even if balance sheets and financial statements are prepared on the "revenue" basis, the electors still will expect their Finance Ministers to present Budget statements giving details of actual cash receipts and expenditures, and, I submit, a Provincial Treasurer must stick to the "cash" statement if he wishes to make himself intelligible to the great majority of the people of the province.

The next question raised in the report has reference to Sinking Funds. The auditors report that they have checked the securities held by the various trustees and failing any comment we must presume that they found them correct. They do suggest, however, that the sinking funds be placed on an actuarial basis. That is, that an annual charge be made against revenue account each year which would be sufficient to retire each debenture issue as it matures. I do not know that any province in Canada is following this practice, but in any event, it is a matter of Government policy and the policy of this Government has been definitely stated on many occasions. In addition to providing out of revenue the annual amounts required in connection with those issues which have specific sinking fund provisions, the Government pays into the sinking fund all receipts from the sale of properties, repayments of loans or any other special revenues. Also since 1927-28, when the Premier announced the policy, 10 per cent. of liquor profits have been paid over to sinking funds. So long as the province remains in the liquor business this will provide a very substantial annual payment to the sinking fund with a view to ultimate payment of the Public Debt and it should not be necessary to make any direct charge on Revenue Account for this purpose. As I said before, there is almost \$3,000,000 in the sinking fund of this province at the present time.

In the Current section of the balance sheet, the auditors refer to the large amount of "Accounts Receivable" consisting largely of accounts due by patients in various provincial institutions. They set up a large reserve for uncollectable accounts and suggest that, in connection with these, a full inquiry should be made to ascertain the collectability of the accounts and to institute a system of keeping a close watch on them. This is a matter that the auditors will, no doubt, go into more fully when they return to complete the other part of their work. I admit the amount is large, but I am going to ask reasonable men (and I may say that I consider honourable members as reasonable men) if it is not to be expected that there would be some difficulty experienced in collecting accounts of this nature. Many of these have reference to people in the Old Folks Home at Wolseley, in the Mental Hospitals and other institutions, and while the appearance of the records might be improved by the writing off of many of these accounts, the province has profited by keeping the accounts alive until every possibility of collection has been exhausted. It has sometimes hap-

pened that after an account has been run up for maintenance, the patient becomes a beneficiary in an estate and we have been able to collect. But this is also a matter of policy and we are satisfied that the policy followed in the past, with some minor improvements and changes, is the best one for the province, and this is one case at least in which good commercial practice does not apply to government finance. As we have never taken credit on our balance sheet for these accounts receivable, it cannot be said that they were ever used to create a favourable balance.

The auditors advise that they have not examined the books of the Liquor Board, the Power Commission, the Farm Loan Board or the Telephone Department but have satisfied themselves from auditor's statements and departmental reports that their balances and those shown in the Treasury records agree. I may mention that, in connection with two of these "outside" activities, their books now are being audited by private auditors. It is our intention, however, to have Price, Waterhouse make an examination of these activities before they complete their work. The large report concludes in these words — and I quote this because of what has appeared in a newspaper in the city of Regina:

"In the meantime we are pleased to state that we found the books and records of the Treasurer's Department in good order, and that all the officials and employees with whom we came in contact afforded us all the facilities for the conduct of our work."

Some of the Opposition, when announcement was made of the engagement of Price, Waterhouse & Co. took a great deal of credit to themselves and said that the Government had adopted the Opposition policy with respect to an independent audit. I do not know how that could be for, up to the present, we do not know just what their policy is. During the last six months, there has been a good deal of talk about an independent audit but very little information, and there has been some question raised as to the reason for the Government conducting an investigation of this kind and as to our authority for doing so, and there has been reference to the "tremendous cost" of this audit. Our Tory friends have adopted this issue so recently that I doubt very much if, as yet, they know just what they mean by it; we do not know very definitely what their platform is on it. The member for Saskatoon (*Dr. Anderson*) used the phrase a year ago, but he did not tell us very much of what he had in mind. At the session held early in 1928, the honourable member for Regina (*Mr. MacPherson*), chief financial critic for the Opposition, made quite a lengthy speech on the Budget criticising it in considerable detail without referring in any way to the matter of an independent audit. In July of the same year, the Conservative Party in Convention at Saskatoon, did adopt it as a plank in their platform — but like some other documents — copies of that platform are not now to be had.

Mr. Anderson: There was too big a demand for it.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: That might be; but, on the other hand, they may have been taken off the market!

Then in the Arm River by-election, the honourable member for Tisdale (*Mr. Buckle*) earned a good deal of applause advocating an independent audit but, as this was coupled with his testimonial to the merits of "Beer by the Glass," it is difficult to say which of these ideas was being cheered.

During the election this year, some of the Progressive candidates also adopted the slogan, but I may point out that, as yet, there is no reference in the Progressive platform to an independent audit and so far it is not a part of their official policy.

Mr. Anderson: It is not in the Liberal platform either.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: No. It is not. From the report which I tabled this afternoon, you will learn that this Government had nothing whatever to fear from an independent audit. But we did feel justified in having one, and I shall tell you why.

During the election, many wild, extravagant and untrue statements were made regarding the finances of the province, some of them so extreme that it is surprising the authors would expect intelligent people to believe them. Unfortunately, some of these falsehoods were believed; some of the people were disturbed and the credit and reputation of the province did suffer. We felt that, if these things were not answered, and answered unequivocally, even worse might happen. To set aside all doubt, to re-establish public confidence and to confirm that pride which most of our citizens have in all that has to do with the Province of Saskatchewan, the Government engaged a reliable and reputable firm of auditors. We gave them a free hand;

we made available to them every book or record which they required and asked them only to report what they found. They have completed the first half of their task and their first report is now available, and, Mr. Speaker, the "whisperers of death" will find little consolation in it. We believe this firm's qualifications are so widely known that their findings will be accepted by the people of this province without question and without demur. We intend to have the same firm at once take up the other half of the work entrusted to them. The knowledge already gained will enable them to make a most efficient examination and survey of our revenue and expenditures, to make suggestions and corrections. They will be treated in exactly the same manner as on the work already done and asked only to report the conditions that actually exist. When their final report is received, I am confident, Sir, that it will be equally satisfactory to all those who have and do now entrust us with their confidence; I am satisfied it will justify our action toward re-establishing confidence in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The members now have the facts before them and on these facts we are prepared to be judged. I would remind them that this vote of want of confidence would indicate that they have no confidence in Price, Waterhouse

Mr. Anderson: Nonsense! Will the honourable gentleman tell us when he expects to have Price, Waterhouse start on the second part of their report?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: Yes. Just as soon as the honourable member returns to Saskatoon.

(Reference to authority for holding audit.)

I may say the total cost of this audit to date is \$16,104 and I am going to ask honourable gentlemen opposite, as I am going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether or not it was worth \$16,104 to the people of Saskatchewan to learn, on undisputed authority, that the finances of this province are in excellent condition. Irrespective of his political affiliations, every member surely will admit that that information is worth that much to the people of Saskatchewan.

Dr. Stipe: Will that amount be charged to revenue or capital?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: To revenue, of course — and I am satisfied the people of Saskatchewan will not criticise this Government in expending this money if, in so doing, we have re-established confidence in the integrity and worth of our provincial securities. I doubt very much if an independent audit ever has produced a report as agreeable and favourable to any province as that laid on the table of the House this afternoon.

Now, Sir, I stated at the beginning of my address that adoption of this want of confidence motion would indicate confidence in the Opposition — confidence in what they stood for in the past, in what they do in the present and what they will do in the future. I said that particularly to my Progressive and Independent friends, and I maintained that this Government is entitled to confidence in respect of its legislative record as well as for its administration of public institutions, of public health and all those things that contribute to the happiness and prosperity of our people. I hope I have established that we are entitled to confidence in regard to our administration of the financial affairs of the province.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker: In discussing a resolution of this kind, its effect, whether in the end it be rejected or adopted, should be considered. Now, Sir, every member knows that if the resolution is adopted the Government will resign office and a new Government will accept office for the King's Government must go on. I think, therefore, we must consider the effects of the resolution if it is adopted

Mr. Anderson: No, Mr. Speaker, I object to any discussion on what the result of the vote may be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does my honourable friend think he is Speaker of this House as well as Leader of the Opposition?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: May I point out that the honourable gentleman has taken objection to everything I said except when you, Mr. Speaker (to put it bluntly) sat on him.

Mr. Anderson: He'll have to sit again then.

Mr. Speaker: The point is well taken. I have to rule that it is without the ambit of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. This House has before it a certain resolution of want of confidence in the present Ministers of the Crown, which resolution has been offered for consideration by the Leader of the Opposition who has announced himself as chief candidate for the premiership

Mr. Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I have made no such announcement.

Hon. Mr. Patterson: On these points of order: The people of this province are directly, vitally interested in this matter and I am somewhat surprised that the man who shortly expects to be Premier of this province should attempt to cut off discussion on a matter of this kind. I cannot understand why limitations and restrictions should be placed on anything that reflects on the policy of the Government or of the party that may form the Government in the future. Mr. Speaker, you have had wide experience at the Bar in this province, appearing in trials of one kind and another and in a great many cases you have acted for the defence. I am not going to agree that I am on the defence tonight, but I would suggest to you that every latitude is given the defence to establish its case. I am going to argue that the results which will follow the decision of the Legislature on this motion are pertinent to the discussion and I do not see why we, in this House, cannot take cognisance of the conditions that will follow the adoption of the resolution. The people know the record of this Government; they know its activities in the past and what they might expect in the future. Now I would assume that they are entitled to the same information in respect to gentlemen sitting now on the opposite side who may form a Government, and I suggest that they should have some consideration at this time while the motion is before the House. For instance, this Government has a power policy. They know the Government is committed to a policy of public ownership and they know that a start has been made in that policy, and I would suggest that, before the Progressives and Independents recommend which party shall sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, they consider very carefully whether they wish anything done that would interfere with the policy to which this Government has given expression. I would remind them that the power policy is one of the things on trial at this time and we have no record of the power policy of the Leader of the Opposition. I would want to know, too, if they have no confidence in the Government's policy in regard to co-operative marketing, and if they are assured that the Conservatives will be more willing to encourage and promote that form of marketing as a Government than they have been as an Opposition. Our record in regard to the natural resources question is also well known. We are prepared to make a reasonable and satisfactory settlement of the natural resources question with the Federal Government. Some of our opponents desire to take the matter to the Privy Council, and I want to ask my Progressive and Independent friends which of the two policies they will support. This Government's policy in respect to highways is also well-known and I am going to ask them whether they are going to support our policy or those three paved roads across the province that our Conservative friends are advocating. I can assure them that the statement of Price Waterhouse will not look so well after those three roads are paid for.

I understand that the three groups comprising the present opposition are prepared to co-operate on four points: First, that the Government resign only on a direct vote of want of confidence; second, that the groups retain their identity; third, that they retain the right to act independently in Federal matters; fourth, that they institute Civil Service reform, and apparently the first item in this programme was to be the method of choosing a Premier; in future, the Lieutenant Governor has to accept recommendations from other than his constitutional advisers!

Mr. Anderson: Is that a joke?

Hon. Mr. Patterson: No. It is too serious to be a joke, because it is a direct violation of sound constitutional practice and it is the first time in the history of the British Empire in which a candidate for the honour has approached the King's Representative and made application to be made Premier!

As regards the maintenance of identity in Federal matters, I am afraid those of us who are not in their confidence (and there are quite a number of people who are not) will have difficulty in deciding when the Leader of the Opposition is speaking as Leader of a Co-operative group and when he is speaking as a member of the Conservative Federal party.

Now the Opposition has taken the attitude that their decision in this matter is nobody's business. They have kept silent and by their silence indicated that they

take the stand that nobody is entitled to inquire into their decision. But the actions of a man who hopes shortly to be the Premier of this province can scarcely be described as nobody's business. It is true that what may be done in securing a cabinet is a matter for himself, but I say this: The people of this province do expect a statement of policy not only from the Leader of the Conservative group but from the Leaders of the other groups as well. I am going to say that the people of this province are entitled to some indication of policy at this time and under the peculiar conditions that exist. The people have been advised that the groups will co-operate to carry on the business of the province, but, surely, it is of some interest to the people to know what policies will be instituted and whether or not the new Premier can count on a majority to carry out those policies and conduct the affairs of the province! The present Government of the province was not afraid to face this Legislature and place its record before the people. It is not afraid to face a vote on that record, nor is it afraid to enter into a discussion of its record and its policies. It is not afraid to stand by those policies and, what is more, we as a Government are content to accept the decision of this Legislature when that is properly and constitutionally done. No man claiming to be a Liberal can object (and we do not) to the registration of public opinion when that is done in accordance with the law, in a proper and constitutional manner.

The purpose of my remarks has been to lay emphasis upon certain matters before the Legislature which, I believe, should be most carefully considered before the House reaches a decision on this motion. Any member of this House, who is not affiliated with one or other of the older parties, should give most careful consideration to these matters and not commit himself unless and until he is satisfied that what he is doing is in the best interests of the province. Let him vote intelligently on the facts at issue.

We, as a Government, are not ashamed of our record. I believe we are entitled to confidence on the strength of our financial administration, as well as on our record of general administration.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE J. G. GARDINER, B.A., LL.D.

(Premier and Minister of Education)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1929.

Mr. Speaker,—May I join with other members of this House who have already spoken in congratulating you upon the high honour conferred upon you, yesterday, in being chosen, unanimously, as Speaker of this House. We have chosen Speakers on previous occasions in this House, and on all these occasions we have been unanimous in our choice. We did not reach that choice, yesterday, by the same course as on previous occasions but, nevertheless, we did reach it eventually, and what I wish to state at this time is that we appreciate the very practical way in which you have conducted yourself since you took the Chair. I venture to state that, if you are to be Speaker throughout the term of this Legislature, we will all benefit from your knowledge of parliamentary procedure and other matters having to do with the conduct of the House.

Members of the House have commented, from time to time, upon the record of this Government and also on the motion which is now before the House and which calls for a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Before going on to deal with matters which have been discussed, may I call attention to one brief remark made by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, when he read his Address in the House, yesterday. That reference was the one made to the Throne in Great Britain and, more particularly, to the King upon the Throne.

We in the Dominion of Canada and, more particularly, in the Province of Saskatchewan, have been very much concerned over the reports which have come from time to time, from the Old Land with regard to the health of our Sovereign. We have been drawn closer and closer to the centre of the Empire because of the sympathy that has gone forth from this province and the general anxiety felt with regard to the health of the King. We are indeed pleased to learn that the health of the King has been improved and that he has been spared to continue the good work with which his reign will always be associated.

We in Saskatchewan, at the present time, have other reasons for a greater interest in the Mother Country, because of the political conditions which exist in the province at the present time. There was a time in the Old Land when they had only two great parties, and it was either a Liberal or a Tory party which held the reins of power in Great Britain. There was also a time in the Dominion of Canada when similar conditions existed in the Federal House, when either a Grit or Liberal or Tory or Conservative party (whichever terms you prefer to call them by) was in power. There was a time in Canada when one or other of these great parties held office; and it was similar in Saskatchewan, one of the great political parties held sway with considerable power. There also was a time, and that not so long ago, when very similar conditions existed in the Dominion of Canada as exist in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time where neither one nor other of the old political parties can claim to dominate the political opinion of the province to which we belong.

We, in Saskatchewan, are confronted with a new set of conditions. We have represented on the floor of this House, four different groups — a condition similar to that in Great Britain from 1868 on where they have had three, four and sometimes five groups in parliament at one time in that period. In the Dominion House, since 1917, there have been more than two parties represented in the House of Commons in considerable numbers — in numbers sufficiently large indeed that the Government of the day has had to take into consideration the different groups represented on the floor of the House of Commons.

In the Province of Saskatchewan during the greater part of the fifteen years I have had the honour to represent my constituency, we have had one party sitting on the Government side of the House. For a short period, we had two parties; one member, a Labour member in the person of Mr. W. G. Baker, from the city of Moose

Jaw, sitting and voting, for the most part, with the Government. We have had for a considerable period one party, at other periods, two parties and again three parties, represented on the Opposition side of the House. We have in the Chamber at the present time, an Opposition composed of the representatives of three different organisations; three different groups (Conservatives, Progressives and Independents), with twenty-eight members sitting on this side of the House and thirty-five on the other. That is not a new condition in a parliament in the Dominion of Canada. Some reference was made on the opening day of the House to the condition that existed in the Parliament of Canada from 1921 down to 1925. I remember going down to Ottawa and taking my place in the galleries from time to time and listening to the discussions there. And listening, I noted that while the largest group sat to the left of Mr. Speaker and the smaller on the right, the Government was able to carry on because one of the groups on the left, holding the balance of power, exercised its right. The Government at the time, it so happened, was a Liberal Government and it was maintained in power because one of the other groups in the House, holding as I say the balance of power, by voting with the Government, kept it in existence.

Now you may ask me what have these things to do with the situation in this province!

We have been accustomed in this House since the formation of the province to a distinct line of division between the Government party and those who formed the Opposition. That distinct line of division gave the impression to some that the British system of government necessitated such a line of division. As a matter of fact, constitutionally, the British system does not recognise parties at all but only majorities upon the floor of the House. All this emphasises the fact that we who have been returned to this House as members have not been sent here as mere delegates to advocate the views of the parties to which we belong or the constituencies that sent us here. A member is a representative elected to meet other representatives upon the floor of the House, to discuss and listen to discussion of public questions and to act through his vote to the best of his ability in the interests of all the people of Saskatchewan. In other words, we are here to discuss and consider all problems of the province to which we belong and not to represent only the point of view of our respective constituencies, nor the point of view of the party organisations which may be responsible for our being here, but to consider these questions from the point of view of the welfare of all the people of Saskatchewan. We may have different views as to how that welfare can be best promoted, but whatever our views we are all striving for the same thing — that what we do and the things we accomplish shall be for the improvement of conditions in the province and for the benefit of all the people in it. So I repeat, a member of this House, of the Dominion House or of the Imperial House is not a delegate. He comes here not to act for an organisation outside the House. He comes here not to represent the viewpoint of one particular constituency. We are elected for one purpose — to do our best for all the people of all the province. Any member who is "tied" before reaching the Legislature will find it difficult to function under our system.

It is true that in times gone by (and it will continue in the future) we have gone about our constituencies and have tried to create opinions in the minds of the people of our constituencies favourable to the views we ourselves hold and we have promised to serve and have tried to serve our own constituencies while members of this House in accordance with the views we have expressed. But this fact should be apparent to all of us — that we are only acting in our capacity as members when we are on the floor of the House.

Now I want to make that plain because there have been discussions throughout the province and in the press because of certain actions of certain members outside the House, and we have been called upon from time to time to consider what effect should be given such actions. I want to emphasise the point, therefore, that outside we act as members of organisations or parties and we do not act in our capacity as members of the Legislature except upon the floor of the House.

People throughout the British Empire have organised themselves into parties built upon certain sets of principles known as "platforms" and within those parties organisations have been built up whose function it is to propagate and make effective their particular views. Having drafted their platforms, members go throughout the country to set forth these platforms so that the voters may have some idea as to what they might expect if the leader of that particular party were called upon to form a Government. But there is another objective of the British party system and that objective is to give as much stability to government as possible; that is, to prevent

elections occurring with too great frequency. The objective is to make more stable the government of a province, a dominion or the Empire itself and only by groups acting with united effort and knowledge can that be made possible. Without that united effort, without that banding together, we would be blown hither and thither. Under our British system, the less stable the government the less certainty prevails in all matters pertaining to the welfare of the people, and conversely. But it always comes back to the one point that we, as members, have a responsibility to the whole province. We have also a responsibility as members of the Provincial Legislature to the country to which we belong and to the Empire to which we belong.

Now, I wanted to consider those points in order to develop certain ideas I have in mind and with a full realisation of the importance of the position in which we stand as a Government in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present moment.

From some of the things which have been said it is possible that we are nearing the end of a long period of Liberal rule in Saskatchewan which has extended from 1905 to the present moment — or throughout the twenty-four years since the formation of the province. What I want to say at this early stage in my remarks is that, as a Liberal, having served in this Legislature for fifteen of those twenty-four years, having served for seven of those fifteen years as a Minister of the Crown and having served as Prime Minister for three and a half years; if, by the vote of this Legislature, which no doubt will be cast tonight, I have to take my place on the opposite side of the House as Leader of the Opposition, I shall do so feeling that the Liberal party has given of its best to the people of Saskatchewan throughout the twenty-four years it has formed the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. I shall do so feeling that Saskatchewan has nothing to apologise for because of the record of the Liberal Government during those twenty-four years. I shall do so feeling that, during the fifteen years I have been in the House since the time I sat back on the aisle from where the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*) spoke this afternoon, whether it has been well or otherwise, I have done what I considered to be in the best interests of Saskatchewan. I want to say that if it is my duty as a member to take my place as Leader of the Opposition as the result of the vote which no doubt will come tonight, I shall serve in that position so long as my colleagues consider it advisable, with the same idea in mind.

The Liberal party, as I said, has been in power for twenty four years in this province which means that it has been able to place its views before the people in a manner which won their more or less consistent support. So much so, indeed, that nearly all those who held other views with regard to methods of organisation, policy or personnel considered themselves natural opponents of the Government party. But we are brought face to face with a condition which, as never before, emphasises the importance of the member, and, through the member, the importance of the Legislature, as the only place to which he is elected and in which he can speak and act by virtue of the position he holds.

Having made that fact plain, nothing is to be gained by reviewing at this time the reasons for the present standing in the House. We are here with certain duties to perform and the decision of the House is awaited by the people throughout the length and breadth of the province. They are discussing the situation from their own particular points of view — Conservatives and those who want a Conservative Government, from that point of view; Independents, from their point of view, though how they can call themselves "Independents" and yet become part of a Government (that is, if they are going to become part of the Government) is more than I can understand; and Progressives, from their point of view, although the Progressives are a party which did not intend to form a Government, Mr. Speaker. You will agree with that statement when I remind you that members of the Progressive party contested only 14 of the 63 constituencies in the province and thus, they could not have intended to form a Government nor did the people who voted for them intend to form a Government. All these matters are being discussed in different parts of the province and from these different angles tonight, as the people await the decision of this Legislature.

We are confronted with a condition which some members in the House have hoped for — indeed prayed for, and the question that arises in my mind is, what are they going to do with the power which is now theirs to make and unmake governments? Theories are helpful if they set up an ideal toward which we may strive, but the testing times comes when we are placed in a position where those theories may be applied. The Liberal party in Saskatchewan and the Conservative party in Saskatchewan were on trial before the tribunal of public opinion in the election of June 6, last. As a result, we have on this side 28 members who stand for the principles of Liberalism

and behind the twenty-four year record of Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. We have, on the other side, 24 members elected as a result of the activities of Conservative organisations in twenty-four constituencies of the province. Consequently, the decision of the people of Saskatchewan between the Liberal and Conservative parties as it has been given expression to in the membership of this House is not a definitely conclusive one.

Neither of those parties are on trial, as I see the situation in the House at the present time, largely because there is no common ground on which to compare them. The Liberal party has a long, efficient, economical record of administration to their credit with here and there cropping out, incidents which would indicate that members of the Government or members of the Civil Service were not entirely free from the expected weaknesses of human nature. The Conservative party have a long record of persistent, if not consistent, hammering at the door for admission. Their record bears evidence, and at no time more than in the last campaign, that they, too, have within their ranks those who may be cabinet ministers or members of the Civil Service who are afflicted with the same expected weaknesses of human nature.

But there are in this House two other groups who, for the first time in Saskatchewan, are clothed with the power for which they have hoped. By the results of the election, there are 24 Conservatives on the other side — and that does not constitute a majority of this House; and on this side there are 28 Liberals and they do not form a majority on the floor of the House. In other words, it would take at least nine members in addition to all the Conservative members elected to give them sufficient of a majority to successfully carry on Government in this Province of Saskatchewan. Now, taking the 24 Conservatives with the six Independents, even then there are not sufficient to form a Government because one Conservative has gone to the Speaker's Chair leaving only 23 and those with the six Independents would make 29 against 28 Liberals all holding the views of one organisation, united on one set of ideals and principles and all supporters of a record established in the twenty-four years we have been in power. That brings me to this point: All the Conservatives in the House with all the Independents in the House cannot hope successfully to carry on the business of the province; but, after all, what is an "Independent"? Webster's definition of an Independent person is "one who is not subject to influence or bias." He leaves all suggestion of personal gain or affluence out of mind when he approaches a question and excludes from its consideration any bias which past experience may lead you to expect him to bring to judgment. Well, now, one of those gentlemen stood up and gave expression to some of his views, and I was surprised to read the very severe reprimand which was given in the columns of one of the local papers to a member of this Legislature who got up to speak in this House. There may be good reason why some of the new members should prefer to remain silent at this time, but there are other older members on that side who should exercise the right their position gives them, yet they, too, I notice, sit silent taking their instructions from the common source of Conservative strategy and advice, and none opens his mouth. We have to assume that the revered Leader of the Conservative party carries all the ability on that side and, from the attitude taken by honourable gentlemen opposite, we have to assume that the Leader of the Conservative party not only dominates the thirty-five men sitting on that side but represents their collective ability. Well, I used to sit over here when we had fifty-two members and he would stand up in his place and in those resonant tones, so well known, thunder forth the accusation that we had a group of party newspapers in this province that were subservient to our will, and that all we had on this side was fifty-two rubber stamps. Today we have a situation wherein thirty-four members sit silent behind him, listening to him enunciate views for them, listening to him enunciate doctrines that the Tory party itself scrapped long ago. Never have such doctrines been enunciated before for the consideration of members of this Legislature. Never has there been an example of Toryism so unadulterated since the time of the Stuart period! He has even told you that members of this House are not concerned with the kind of Government we are to have in the future, that they are not concerned with the record of the Government we have had in the past, that they are only concerned with voting the present Government out of power. We held an election on June 6, and the results were spread broadcast all over the country, but after it is all over, lo, and behold! we find that the people of the province had not voted for what they thought at all. The gentlemen opposite shortly after the election met in conference and decided to co-operate. Well, I waited for about a week to see if any intimation of their intentions would be forwarded to myself. We, for our part, did make a pronouncement of our intentions which was put out in the form of a statement in these words:

"The official figures of the voting make it clear that the Government party comprises the largest group in the House, supported by a considerably larger popular vote that was accorded the next highest group, and a somewhat larger popular vote than that received by any two other groups combined.

"The election is not yet completed, nor can it be until all the official counts have been made and all requirements of The Saskatchewan Election Act, especially with respect to recounts, complied with, and the two deferred elections held.

"It became my duty as prime minister to acquaint His Honour the Lieutenant Governor with the situation as it exists. This I have done. Two courses of procedure have been given careful consideration:

- "(1) That His Honour be asked to call upon the leader of the second largest group to form a Government;
- "(2) That His Honour be asked to summon the Legislature at the earliest possible date for the purpose of determining before the public and on the floor of the Legislature the will of elected representatives as to who is in a position to carry on the Government.

"With respect to the leader of a political party not having a clear majority in the Legislature, and not even comprising the largest political group in the Legislature, being called upon to form a Government, the cabinet is of opinion that responsible self-government calls for a decision by the Legislature itself, not by informal group caucuses held behind closed doors, but by all the elected representatives of the people speaking and voting on the floor of the Legislative Assembly.

"I am not aware of any precedent in Great Britain or in Canada for recommending, before Parliament or a Legislature meets, that the leader of a party commanding the second largest group in the House should be called upon to form a Government. There are, however, many precedents for meeting parliament with a minority group when no one group has a majority, and allowing parliament to decide. This happened as recently as 1923 in Great Britain and 1925 at Ottawa.

"No official report has been presented to the Government of the findings of any conference which may have been held among other groups elected to the Legislature, but press reports of a conference held on Tuesday last, as reported by two Conservative members, indicate a discussion of certain conditions of agreement 'in the event of the present Government resigning', which might conceivably be acceptable to all members of the House.

"Among the matters assented to was the contention that the groups should retain their identity. This would still leave a minority group in control of the Government and place the full responsibility upon the cabinet for having created the condition. This responsibility should be assumed by the elected representatives of the people speaking and voting in the Legislature. Electors have no information as to the course of reasoning by which the conclusions might have been arrived at in any conference held in camera. They have a right to know officially as a result of discussions in the Legislature the views of their elected representatives on such important matters, before a cabinet assumes the responsibility for turning over the administration to another minority.

"I have therefore taken the responsibility of advising His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to summon the Legislature at as early a date as possible after the elections are completed, in accordance with The Saskatchewan Election Act. This will be as soon as possible after the 12th of August, when the Cumberland deferred election will be held.

"In reaching this conclusion to meet the Legislature, the Government has no desire even to appear to flout the opinion or the will of the people, but, representing the largest group in the House, supported by a larger popular vote than was accorded any other party, the Government believes it to be its duty in the best interests of the province to adhere to the accepted constitutional procedure of both British and Canadian Parliaments.

"To adopt any other course would be to deny the right of the people to express their views and govern themselves in the manner provided for by the constitution, namely, through their elected representatives and in accordance with well-established parliamentary procedure.

"In the short interval that must elapse until the election is fully completed and the Legislature meets, it is the intention of the Government to refrain from making appointments other than those which the carrying on of the public business made demand."

That statement simply means, Mr. Speaker, that we intended to call the members to the floor of the House and there have a decision made in accordance with duly accepted parliamentary practice.

Now that we are here, in four groups, it seems to me that it is not enough merely to vote the Government out of power. The task which is now before us is to determine, in accordance with well established constitutional practice, how, under conditions entirely new in this province, a Government is to be constituted and to be maintained. It is not enough simply to constitute a Government. We should be given to understand through the expressions of members on the floor of this House, as to how the Government is to be constituted and after its institution how it is to be maintained. Thus only can we ascertain what recommendation should be made to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

It has been contended by some that I and I alone should have decided this question by resigning immediately the election results were made known and thus making way for the placing of the head of the Conservative party in the position of Prime Minister of this province. In answer to that I would say that there is no precedent in the British Empire so far as I know for the largest group refusing to meet the Legislature and to leave the decision in the hands of the Legislature. There certainly is none in Great Britain or in Canada. All constitutional authorities maintain that it is the undoubted right of the Government to meet the Legislature after any election, whether having the largest group or not, but every precedent establishes the fact that it is the duty of the Government to do so if it has the largest group. I am only going to quote you the words of a very eminent British statesman which were to the effect that I would have been slighting the Legislature had I, while Leader of the largest group, presumed to choose the Prime Minister to succeed me by resigning at once and saying to the Lieutenant Governor that he should call upon the Leader of the second largest group.

It has been stated before, that the reason for the Progressive party has been to emphasise the importance of the position of the ordinary member on the floor of the House. They have been telling us since 1924, that party lines have been so closely drawn on the floor of the House that the members on this side were so many "rubber stamps," mere parts of a machine, and that they desired to have men on the floor of the House who would occupy their positions in a different manner and give better service to the people of the province. Well, we have five of them here tonight. What is their position? We on this side with twenty-eight members, with the assistance of these five Progressives, would constitute a majority in this House. The Conservatives and Independents with the same five Progressives would, combined, constitute a majority in the House. I would like to state further that, if we were to take all the representation of Liberals, Independents and Progressives, we would have a majority of fifteen in this House, a majority sufficiently large to give stable government to the people of this province for, at least, another four years. If, on the other hand, the Independents and Progressives united with the twenty-four Conservatives (there are twenty-three now that you have taken the Chair, Mr. Speaker) they would have, combined, a majority of six over the group on this side of the House. But if the group on this side of the House were left to carry on the Government, it already has five ministers elected, five to carry on in the meantime, and only two more need be elected to put the cabinet back in the position in which it was prior to the election of June 6. I do not know how many ministers the opposite side would want to form a Government, but I presume that, if they are to satisfy all the demands that will be made upon them seven or eight members will have to go back for re-election. No matter how many they choose, they will have to be re-elected and if we were to defeat two of the eight in these by-elections, it would be very difficult for any group opposite or the combined groups opposite to carry on the Government even for a day.

We, on this occasion, are confronted with a certain situation which should make us realise that the responsibility rests upon us much more heavily than in the past, as the facts I have cited should indicate. But the responsibility is on us as a Legislature. There are other reasons why, if I, as Prime Minister, had said, immediately after June 6, "We are ready to vacate office in favour of the second largest group," I would have been derelict in my duty and assuming a responsibility that rightly rests upon the Legislature itself. Those reasons are to be found in what has transpired

in other parts of the Empire and in the Dominion of which we form a part. I shall only refer to a few, as the matter has been already reviewed so ably by the Attorney General.

In England, where they have had more than two parties continuously since 1874, they have had sixteen elections. In ten of them either the Opposition or the Government has been returned with a clear majority over all and so there has been no doubt as to what should take place. The party having the clear majority has formed the Government without meeting Parliament. In six cases, however, no group has had a clear majority, and in five of them the Government has met the members on the floor of the House for a decision.

In 1885, the result gave the Conservatives 249 seats, the Irish Nationalists 86, and the Liberals 335. Salisbury, leader of the Government of that day, met the House and was defeated.

In 1892, the result gave Conservatives, 268; Liberal Unionists, 47; Liberals, 273, and Irish Nationalists, 81. Salisbury, again in power, again met the House and was defeated.

In 1910, the result was: Conservatives, 273; Labour, 40; Liberals, 275; Irish Nationalists, 82. Asquith, the then Prime Minister, met the House and was sustained.

In the same year, 1910, there was another election (you will note that, over there, they are not much concerned if elections come frequently) and the result was: Conservatives, 272; Liberals, 272; Labour, 42, and Irish Nationalists, 84. Mr. Asquith again met the House and again was sustained.

In 1923, the result was: Conservatives, 258; Labourites, 191; Liberals, 157, and nine others. Mr. Baldwin, as Prime Minister, met the House and was defeated on the Address. It is interesting to note that in a few months Mr. Baldwin was returned at the head of the poll. Apparently the people thought that the largest group should rule.

In 1929, Mr. Baldwin was again in a minority but headed the second largest group and resigned without meeting the House.

I wish to pass just a few comments on that. Statements have appeared in the press suggesting that we should have shown "British sportsmanship" and resigned immediately after the results of the election were known. All I wish to say is that I am not ashamed to be in the company of such British statesmen as Salisbury, Asquith and Baldwin on this one decision, at least.

We have had frequent visits from distinguished men from the Mother Land in the last few weeks, and it would have been better for us in this Dominion, had we had as frequent visits during the last forty years from these distinguished statesmen as we have had in the past year or two. All of us have derived some benefit from the visits of these men. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition benefitted from the visit of no less a renowned statesman than Winston Churchill a short while ago. I want to tell him that I benefitted from the conversation I had with Mr. Churchill because of the insight I received into British parliamentary practice and procedure. I want to state this that I believe the reason why there has been very little comment from members of the Opposition or from the opposition press in the past few weeks in criticism of the action of the Government in meeting the Legislature has been because of the expressions of opinion given both publicly and in private by British statesmen, such as Mr. Churchill recently, who have brought to this country their long experience of statesmanship in Great Britain. I venture to state that not a statesman in Britain would question the right of any party having the largest group in the Legislature to meet the Legislature and have a decision on the floor of the House. That course of action should be approved by the Conservative party more than any other in Canada; and if I thought I could influence the Conservative party I would read to them the opinion of Hon. Mr. Meighen, the former leader of the party. I was twitted with regard to some of my criticisms of Mr. Meighen on other occasions, but I have not criticised him any more severely on matters such as the tariff, or freight rates, than have my friends of the Progressive party. We have criticised him in season and out of season on matters such as those, but, when it comes to a matter of procedure that is an entirely different thing. There he is recognised as an authority and should be quoted, Mr. Speaker, and he said this, as reported in Hansard of January 8, 1926, page 16:

"That a Government whose candidates were successful in only 101 seats out of 245 should seek to continue in office is, of course, without precedent in our Dominion. Were they, however, in the position that, taking part in the election in question, there was no other party which had been returned with a larger number of supporters than themselves, then undoubtedly they would have been justified in assuming that they had the same right to expect the allegiance or at least the independent support of those who ran in other capacities, such as Progressives or as Independents, as would another party which had a minority in comparison with themselves, and if they did get that support they would be justified in assuming that they would be able to carry on the administration of the country

"However, leaving aside the remarks of the Prime Minister to that effect, there would have been justification for the present course of the Government, even had they come back in a minority, did there exist no stronger party elected to the House, with a right equal to theirs to present to parliament the programme of that party and to ask for the support of all elected on other tickets, if that programme appealed to them."

Last of all, Mr. Speaker, in attempting to prove to this House my contention that here and now on the floor of the House is the proper time and place to decide issues like this, may I quote one of the strongest contentions put before the people of this province by the Progressives in their platforms which reiterate, time and again, that no Government should resign except when defeated on a "want of confidence" motion. This, I understand, is one of the conditions submitted by them to the Conservative caucus. In this contention, they have been stating what has been a maxim under the British parliamentary system before — that a vote on anything but want of confidence did not constitute a defeat of the Government. In 1868, the Government at the centre of the British Empire did not consider a vote against a measure introduced by it as a defeat of the Government. They held that the enactment of laws was the duty of the Legislature and that to administer the laws was the duty of a committee of the Commons known as the Cabinet or Government. The first Prime Minister of Great Britain to take the other attitude was Disraeli when he held an election over the heads of the members if they did not pass a certain measure. But previous to that it was held that the matter of legislation was the duty or function of members of the Legislature or the members of the House of Commons, as the case might be. Under the old procedure members would not be subjected to an appeal of that kind and would thus be saved the necessity of putting legislation on the Statute Books to avoid an election. A return to that procedure has been advocated by certain people in the Old Land and it has been advocated by my Progressive friends who thought there was something autocratic in the manner in which legislation was put through in this House. There were at the time from 50 to 53 members sitting on this side of the House and my Progressive friends who sat in the House conceived the idea from that fact that the Government of Saskatchewan was autocratic in bringing down most of the legislation and in getting it passed through the House. I would remind those who have taken that view of this fact: Under the conditions that prevailed and during all the time we have been in this Legislature, the party on the Government benches has been meeting in caucus for the discussion of the legislation which was to be brought down. In caucus the individual members expressed their opinions, and the legislation was discussed from every viewpoint. Consequently, when it came to the floor of the House the legislation embodied the consensus of opinion of all those occupying seats on this side. All the difficulties had been smoothed out before the measure was brought before the House and had the support of the majority and thus it was assured a safe passage through the House. Today, however, we have a different set of conditions in the House but, no matter whether Conservatives or Liberals be called upon to form a Government when the vote is finally taken on this resolution, the same conditions will prevail, and decisions still will be reached in caucus. It would appear, too, that the Progressives already have got rid of their objection to caucus. In proof of that fact, I need only review some of the statements made in a document that will go down in the history of Saskatchewan as the only one of its kind ever presented to a representative of the King in any part of the British Empire. In this document there is a statement signed by members of the Conservative party and an identical statement over the signatures of ten men who, at the time, were looked upon as Progressive and Independent members-elect and thus as grouped apart from the Conservative or Liberal parties. The statement reads:

"Whereas the Progressive and Independent Members-elect were elected in the recent Provincial election as opponents of the present Gardiner Government;

"And whereas, in our opinion, the electors of Saskatchewan have voiced decisively their condemnation of the present Gardiner administration;

"We, the Progressive and Independent Members-elect of the Provincial Legislature, call upon Premier Gardiner and his Government to resign immediately."

Then follows the signatures of the ten men looked upon as Progressives and Independents.

Now, in regard to the first statement that they were elected as opponents of the Government, I can quite understand why they have arrived at that conclusion. Partly, it is because of the reason to which I have already referred, that there were 53 members elected on this side and because the legislation representing the consensus of opinion of these 53 invariably carried against the small group opposite, they conceived the idea that it was "railroaded" through the House by the Government. I can see justification for that attitude, also, from another point of view. The Government of this province having been so strongly entrenched that it had been able to retain power in this province from 1905 down to 1929, all those who attempted to secure seats in this Legislature as representing any other group have come to look upon themselves as opponents of the Government, because they invariably were opposed by Government candidates. I can quite understand how that attitude of mind has arisen. But, I contend, the only reasons I can conceive of that would drive the members on the Opposition side of the House together on those conclusions, are political reasons. I am not criticising them for their political reasons. Not at all! But let me say again, I can quite understand why there should be that opinion in the minds of those who have been elected on the opposite side; but, as I stated at the beginning, when we come onto the floor of the House we assume that, as members, we are representative of the entire province and not here simply as delegates representing some particular organisation or any one particular constituency.

Let me read another part of this document. I am not going to read it all, only the parts which are pertinent; but I sometimes wonder whether this document had been read very carefully by some of those who signed it. For instance, I understand that this was prepared and signed on July 3, and it contains this paragraph:

"That sworn copies of said documents have been duly dispatched by registered mail to Premier Gardiner who is fully advised of the situation."

This statement is made on July 3, although the document advising me was mailed on the Fourth of July (the election having taken place on June 6) and that the document was not received by me until July 6.

In the meantime, however, the documents were spread broadcast over the Province of Saskatchewan. Then we come to the next paragraph:

"That following the signing of the said documents, Independents and Progressive members-elect were invited to co-operate with the Conservatives in forming a new administration and agreed to do so."

What I want to ask my friends of the Progressive and Independent groups is this: Did you at the time agree to co-operate with the Conservatives in forming a new administration? Is any member of either group prepared to reply to that question? I am quite prepared to sit down and let him do so.

Mr. Stipe: It won't be long now!

Premier Gardiner: The honourable gentleman has been in the Legislature for some time and we have come to expect a certain type of remark from him; but if he gets the cabinet position he is looking for and if he takes his position in the front row over here, it won't be long before he will learn that he will have to be much more careful in the remarks he makes than he has been in the last four years. I would remind him that we will have something to say on what takes place on this side of the House when we go over there — if we go over there!

Listen to the words:

" . . . were invited to co-operate with the Conservatives and agreed to do so." Who invited them? I presume it must have been the Leader of the Conservative party

Mr. Anderson: Will the honourable Premier tell us what steps he took to invite the Progressives to join him?

Premier Gardiner: I will satisfy him of that — and the advice I give is good advice. I followed the honourable and open course of ringing up the president of the Progressive Association by telephone. I did not call up the members-elect of the group, I called the president but did not get him the first day because he had not returned from his constituency, where he had been defeated not by a Liberal but by a Conservative. Then I called at the office of the secretary of the Association by appointment and I did not make any offer in conversation with him. I said this: There is a different situation in the Legislature from that which prevailed during the past 24 years, in which no group has a clear majority over all the other groups, and we are willing to discuss with you any proposition that the Progressive group may have to put up to the Government of this province. I did not go to the individual members-elect, nor did I go to the Leader of the Conservative party because I could hardly expect support from that source.

Mr. Anderson: Has the honourable Premier any knowledge of any of his agents approaching any member of the Progressive or Independent groups and offering him cabinet position?

Premier Gardiner: I do not know of any agents that could have approached any person and offered him a position in the cabinet. When I have any cabinet positions to fill, I offer them personally and not through any agents. I would like to say, further, that there is not a member of the Independent group with whom I have more than a passing acquaintance even now, and I do not think there is one of them with whom I have exchanged more than a word or two. There is one other member in the House to whom more than any other, possibly, judging from press comments, the honourable member is referring. That is the member for Yorkton constituency (*Mr. Stewart*). Now, I may say that I do not know that I ever have been even formally introduced to him, although I might have met him at Yorkton on one of my visits there, but I do know I have had no conversation with him. Let me repeat again, that I have no agents and when I have had cabinet positions to offer, I offered them myself after consultation with my colleagues

Having made those statements, let me go on to read from the document I have already quoted:

“That at a meeting of Conservative, Independent and Progressive Members-elect, J. T. M. Anderson was elected as Leader of the co-operating groups.”

That is, not of a Government but of a group from which there might be formed a Government.

Well, Sir, I would inform the honourable gentleman that what they are proposing to form is not a “co-operative” Government. It seems to me that, under the conditions prevailing in this House, there are four courses open. One of those is to form a “coalition” among three groups or between two of the groups if the Liberal party is one of the two, because a coalition of any two groups on the opposite side of this House is not enough, without the support of the other group. There is, however, the possibility, Mr. Speaker, that a coalition between the largest group (sitting on this side) and one of the groups sitting on the other side would be sufficient to form a Government, but I am not very optimistic of that, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has transpired since this session opened. Then there is the second possibility,—a coalition between the second largest group and the two other groups on the opposite side, for, as I have pointed out, the Conservatives cannot form a Government with the aid of one group alone. It must be a coalition of all three groups. When formed, such a Government would have a majority of seven if it is able to re-elect all its Cabinet Ministers whatever their number might be, and there would be very little room for “independence” left if a Government with a majority so narrow were to be maintained in power. But such a coalition must be not only for the purpose of bringing a Government into existence, but also for arriving at policies upon which the Government will act once it has been formed.

I put this question to the Opposition: What information have the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, as to the policies that are going to be laid down by this new Government if it comes into being by the bringing together, through coalition, of the three groups on the opposite side? With that in mind, I ask this further question: What information have I, as Premier and the chief adviser of the Lieu-

tenant Governor, to go to him tomorrow and say that I can conscientiously advise him to call upon the Leader of the Conservative party to form a Government without knowing that I can rely on him having the support of the other two groups not only in putting this Government out but also in carrying on the new Government at least for a reasonable time.

Acting under the dictation of the Dictator of the Conservative party — the editor and proprietor of a certain Regina newspaper, who blazes in his headlines in red type across today's paper the statement "Silence is golden," are we to go to the Lieutenant Governor (if go we must) without any information in connection with the situation that now exists?

The formation of a Co-operative Government was a possibility after June 6, but only for a short while. What is a "co-operative" or "group" government? It has only been once clearly defined, so far as I am aware, and that was by Mr. J. J. Morrison, secretary of the United Farmers of Ontario, somewhere about 1920. He put it in this way: He said that a Co-operative Government should be formed by the leader of the largest group in the Legislature — but I am not asking that I be invited to act as leader, Mr. Speaker. This leader would choose his cabinet from all the groups in the House in proportion to the number of members each had — and he (*Mr. Morrison*) enumerated what that would be under the Drury Regime in Ontario. In this way, opposition would be removed and there would be brought to the councils of the state the ablest men available of all lines of thought. The Government thus formed could carry on the affairs of the province in very much the same manner that a city council carries on the affairs of a city.

Well, that definition of co-operative Government leads to the conclusion that there was no proposal to form a Co-operative Government here. The only proposal was that the three groups should co-operate in forming a Government, or rather, co-operate, in the first instance, in voting the present Government out of office and thus placing the 28 members on this side of the House in opposition to the 35 on that side. There can be no Co-operative Government while one side takes that attitude toward the other, and in signing the very declaration that I have quoted, honourable gentlemen opposite made impossible the formation of a Co-operative Government in this province.

What I would like to ask my honourable friends of the Progressive and Independent groups is this: Are they prepared to come over to this side of the House? Are they going to cross the floor of the House if they are called upon to assist in forming a Government tonight? Is the Independent group coming over in a body? Is the Progressive group coming over? Or are they going to sit on that side of the House and still keep up an appearance of political independence? Again, Sir, if any member of either group is prepared to make a statement, I am prepared to sit down and await that statement.

(*Brief interval.*)

Well, we won't be long now!

By what method did the Opposition make it impossible to form a Co-operative Government in this province? They made impossible the formation of such a government by inviting into conference not all the parties, but just a sufficient number of the groups to make possible the turning out of those on this side of the House and the formation of a Government from the groups opposite. And what kind of Government will it be?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had a little experience since that time which set any doubts I had at rest. It was in Ile a la Crosse when the deferred election was on. The Leader of the Opposition was there, too. He came to a meeting which the Honourable Minister of Public Health (*Hon. Dr. Uhrich*) and myself were addressing. He was invited to the platform and invited also to take part in the discussion. I admit he was in an unhappy position being placed on record before an audience who were to vote the following day and although it has been said in the *Regina Star* that they were not really competent to judge of the situation in the province, there were between 300 and 400 people present at the meeting. We were discussing the general situation and, when the honourable gentleman got up, he was advocating the election of a man who had been a Liberal up to June last, but who had been nominated as a Conservative, run as a Conservative and who was supported by at least one member of one of the other groups in the House. During the day-time, I could look from the hall down the Main street of the village and at the other end of the street I could see a sign

"Conservative Committee Room." While he was speaking he was telling the people of the Co-operative Government he was going to form and he also told them what he, as Leader of that Co-operative Government, would do for them — he apparently thought himself the adviser of the Lieutenant Governor at that time as he did when he, at a later date, went along Dewdney avenue to Government House to present the famous petition to His Honour, an incident which has no precedent in British constitutional history since the time of Watt Tyler, in England, went straight to the King over the heads of his constitutional advisers. Do you know what he stated on the occasion of our meeting at Meadow Lake? You will hardly believe it. He appealed for support for his candidate because of the patronage he might be able to get as a supporter of the Government-to-be and he thought he was justified in making that kind of appeal to the people of Ile a la Crosse.

The course we took was entirely different. In discussing the situation, the statement I made in the course of my remarks was this: That never in the history of Saskatchewan had we had to rely on the constituency of Ile a la Crosse to put the Liberals in power. At each of the deferred elections, we had had a majority in the House and so far Ile a la Crosse had always elected a Government member. I said to them on this occasion: "I cannot come to you guaranteeing that I am going to be head of a Government or even in the Government, but I come to you standing for the same principles I stood for on June 6." And I pointed to the Leader of the Opposition, and told them that up to June 6 he was Leader of the Conservative party. On June 11, he was still Leader of the Conservative party, and then he is presumed to have resigned from the Conservative party (but not at a convention of the party) and to have assumed leadership of thirty-five men — again not at a convention, but at a meeting in the Saskatchewan Hotel where these men met, not as members of the Legislature, (they had not even been sworn in) but as individuals. They met and decided to co-operate for the purpose of making Dr. Anderson Premier of Saskatchewan and thereby all Conservative principles advocated prior to June 6 went by the board as well as the policies they had been advocating in the other groups. My friends of the Progressive and Independent groups need not think that their responsibility ends with voting the Leader of the Conservative group into office and that as separate groups in this House they would still be adhering to the principles by which they have stood and upon which they were elected. They have a further responsibility — the responsibility of maintaining the Government in office once they have voted this Government out. It is not quite the same thing when you come to make members of these groups, members of a Government! In spite of what may have taken place outside the House, they are called upon inside the House to choose between the Leaders of the Liberal and Conservative parties to head a "Coalition Government" dominated either by Liberals or Conservatives.

There is one remaining method whereby a Government can be assured in this province. As I have said, the Co-operative idea has been made impossible by my friends opposite; but there is a further possibility and that the only one upon which I can make an appeal with the best grace and with least offence. My plea is that each member present himself on the floor of the House exactly as he represented himself to be in the constituency from which he came. If a Co-operator, let him be a Co-operator. If an Independent, let him remain an Independent — but he cannot be an Independent if he is pledged to put out the Liberal Government supported as it is by 28 members in the House and by 151,000 votes in the province. If he was elected as a Progressive, let him remain a Progressive, holding for the first time the balance of power in the House. If the Independent acts as an Independent and the Progressive holds the balance of power, they can say to both Liberals and Conservatives alike "Maintain your present positions until the regular session of the House; then produce your policies upon the floor of the Legislature in the form of legislation or by way of resolutions and we shall decide upon the merits of the policies so set forth who should carry on the Government."

It is true that in signed statements, even before the Legislature met, members of the Progressive and Independent groups have given an opinion against the Government and they have stated that they are prepared to give a decision that another Government should be formed under the present Leader of the Opposition, without the people of this province knowing what the policies of the Government that is to be formed are going to be when it does take office. The only plea that I wish to make is that we maintain the *status quo* in this House and that we maintain it until the regular session meets and then, in accordance with the legislation introduced and upon the merits of that legislation, let a decision be reached. Let me couple with that plea that when the regular session does come along that we be confronted not

only with the policies of the Government side but also those which the Conservatives have been advocating or are prepared to institute. Having these all before us, we could then decide as between them, basing our decision on the form of legislation or the form of resolutions, as the case might be, and so come to a decision as to the Government that will carry on for the next three or four years in the interests of Saskatchewan.

There are certain matters of policy which have been already discussed upon the floor of the House which are in process of development. I am not going to discuss them now, but, simply by referring to them show that any decision reached here tonight is going to affect them in the future. We decided last session in favour of Government ownership of power. It was agreed to almost unanimously, if not unanimously. My friends the Progressives are much interested in this matter and should be interested to know what effect the vote tonight is going to have upon that policy. Are they prepared to vote for this resolution without any pronouncement from the new Government or without any definite pronouncement from the Leader of the Opposition with regard to a policy on power? Are they going to have it dealt with differently from what they have advocated in their own constituencies and at their own conventions, or are they going to stand by their principles in this matter? I want to give this warning: Power development in this province is in that position wherein conditions can be created very easily which can make it absolutely impossible, in the future of this province, as it has been made in other provinces and countries, for the public to have ownership and control of the power utility. That is an important issue. It is bigger than the individual. This province can well afford to be without any individual member of this House or any Prime minister for that matter rather than that a question of this kind should be dealt with in such a way as to take for all time out of the hands and control of the people of this province a utility like that of power.

Then there is another question. We were in the midst of negotiations with the Federal Government on the Natural Resources question when the election took place. Even tonight, I am not going to say to what stage these negotiations had been brought; but Manitoba's negotiations had reached a certain stage, and there were certain conditions in Alberta which necessitated that there should be further conversations with Alberta before the negotiations between this Government and the Federal Government could be consummated. In the meantime, certain findings had been made by the Commission appointed in connection with Manitoba's negotiations. I need not mention them, we are all familiar with the terms of the agreement reached, and we are familiar with the terms of the proposed agreement with Alberta but we are not familiar with the terms of any agreement the Conservative party in this province is prepared to enter into. We are not familiar with the terms of any agreement the new Government may be prepared to enter into. These may be such that no Government at Ottawa could possibly agree to, and the resulting negotiations might dangle along indefinitely

Mr. Anderson: But not for twenty-four years.

Premier Gardiner: It is not twenty-four years since the Government of this province entered into negotiations with the Federal Government and the very first time there was any indication on the part of the Federal Government of a willingness to negotiate with us toward a settlement was when there was a Liberal Government in power at Ottawa, and it had only been in power for a short time when considerable progress was made. From 1910 to 1921, there was a Conservative Government in power at Ottawa and in all that time the suggestions made and the overtures made were fruitless because of the attitude of the eastern provinces. Then, when the Liberal Government came back, negotiations were still blocked until 1927, when the eastern provinces finally agreed to the negotiations looking toward a settlement. These negotiations have been going on and are nearing a successful and satisfactory conclusion. When my friends the Progressives say we have been dilatory in this matter, let me tell them that there are Progressive Governments in the provinces to the east and west of us, and they have not yet settled finally the question of their resources. I say to my Progressive friends—What I ask of you is this: Are you prepared to vote one Government out and another Government in without a pronouncement being made on this question? That pronouncement should be made before you cast your vote on the floor of the House.

We are in the midst of negotiations regarding freight rates on the Hudson Bay Railway, and problems resulting from crop conditions are in process of being solved. Is there no interest in these important matters?

I only enunciate these matters to indicate to you that it is much more feasible and desirable that Progressives and Independents should decide an issue of this kind in the interests of the Province of Saskatchewan rather than on a matter of mere leadership or of party.

I shall conclude with these remarks: Under ordinary circumstances the present Government would have continued in office until the regular session and then presented our policies, but with these four important questions on the point of solution and the uncertainty created by reports made to the province through a part of the press rendering action difficult, we have advised His Honour to call the House in special session. A decision reached now can only be a decision between the Liberal and Conservative parties in this House. It is your right to make it and our duty to follow the course which your decision indicates, both assuming full responsibility for the part played—but the decision will not be reached by Liberals or Conservatives but by Independents and Progressives, who because of their strength in this House are in a position to choose. As things stand, the members of the Progressive party sitting as they do with the balance of power in their hands, hold the key to the situation. But once they have exercised their balance of power and they cast their vote against the Government, they put us in a position where we must do one of two things: either recommend the formation of a new Government or a dissolution to ask for a definite decision from the people of the province. If we choose the latter course, the decision will be in the hands of the people themselves; but if we choose the former, their vote will imply confidence in the Conservative party, because the Government formed would have twenty-three supporters from the Conservative party on the floor of the House and would require the support of the other two groups to keep it in power sufficiently long to demonstrate to the people of this province what their policies are. When that decision is reached, is there anything between the twenty-four elected as Conservatives and a few of the Independents who ran as Independents? Are they going to contend that the policies of the new Government are different from the policies advocated by the Conservative group, and are not expressive of the principles of the Conservative party? A new Government in this province, (if there is one) as a result of the conditions existing in this House will essentially be a Conservative Government because, as I have said, having twenty-four elected members there is no one else whom the Government can advise His Honour to call upon excepting the Leader of the Conservative group.

If the present Government is, by their vote, continued in power, it will be a Liberal Government, but that vote would not necessarily imply confidence in the present Government but merely would indicate a desire to maintain the *status quo* until the regular session of the Legislature when we would bring down our programme and be judged upon its merits.

It is just possible that the solution may be found in what has transpired in the Dominion House of Commons. Let me remind my Progressive friends that, in the Federal House, a Government favourable to a low tariff, to low western freight rates and to western co-operative methods of marketing is maintained at the present time only because of the understanding reached between Liberals and western Progressives either in the elections or on the floor of the House. It is well to remember, too, that in a sister province to the east of us it became necessary for Liberals and Progressives to bury past animosities and bitter political strife in order to sustain a Progressive Government in the face of an attack which might have resulted in the setting up of a Conservative Government. The condition that has prevailed in the Federal House from 1922 down to the present, and which has prevailed in Manitoba during the last year, is a condition that well might prevail in this House.

If the vote tonight is cast against the Government, it removes all power held by the Progressives, in excess of that held by any other five members of the House, from them, and leaves them five lonely members of the Conservative party. I think that must be apparent to all of us. When we met here last session, there were only four Conservatives but now, as a result of the election their numbers have been multiplied six-fold. In saying that, let me congratulate the Leader of the Conservative party upon the energy he has displayed and the success he has had in advancing the cause of Conservatism throughout the province. I want to warn him, however, that there is a certain part of his campaign that will follow him throughout his political career and I only hope that, if he is called upon to lead a Government, if he desires to serve the best interests of the province, he will endeavour to remove from the breasts of the people of Saskatchewan many of the misunderstandings that remain from the representations made during his campaign.

If the vote tonight is cast against the Government, it will place the Conservatives in a position, as the largest group forming the new Government, to say to the other

two groups: "If you are not satisfied with the type of legislation we are bringing down, the only thing for us to do is to go back to the country." They place Disraeli's club of an election in the hands of the Leader of the Conservative group to wield it over the heads of members of the other two groups if they place the Conservative party in power without an election. To vote against the Government, let me repeat, without any expressed reservation, implies a vote of confidence in the Conservative party.

I believe that the vote, when and if it is recorded, will have a far-reaching effect upon political developments in the immediate future, not only in Saskatchewan but throughout Canada. Political decisions in Canada within the next few years will establish for a generation at least the attitude of mind of every living Canadian toward economic solidarity, social relationship, corporation influence and national unity. Co-operative endeavor, public ownership of public utilities such as power, a spirit of unity, cannot exist in a community which can be broken asunder by a subsidised press scattered free-of-charge over a whole province — as was the case in Saskatchewan prior to the last election. If Liberalism has sustained a reverse in Saskatchewan in order to warn Canada against the lengths to which greed will lead, then she has not fought in vain. If Conservatism comes into power then I trust the leaders will realise that their greatest task is to break down the feelings of mistrust which the campaign waged on their behalf has left rankling in the breasts of our people. I trust that members of the Progressive and Independent groups will consider the effect of their decision from a national viewpoint as well as the provincial, before reaching a final conclusion in this important matter.

If we leave office, as it would appear we may, we leave it with a clean record. One of my friends laughs at the remark that we leave with a clean record. I would refer him to the independent audit which has been placed upon the table. I would refer him to the records of administration in every department of Government. In referring him to those records I am certain that, when he has examined them fully he will be prepared to admit the record is clean. I believe that all members opposite, as gentlemen, having examined that record, will agree with the sentiments I voice that there have been men within the Liberal party from 1905 down to the present time who have given of their very best to the service of the province, that certain of them have given much of their time, devoted much of their abilities, and sacrificed much of their health, too, to the preparation of all the legislation on the statute books and in the organisation of all those services incorporated in the different departments of Government. If they have exhibited human frailties (as no doubt they have) they are the same human frailties as are represented in the character of men who sit on the opposite side and which they will bring with them when they occupy seats over here. And when they have done what they said they would do — when they have eliminated from the Civil Service all the objectionable Liberals they find in it and have appointed their own friends to the positions made vacant, they will find in the character of those men the same human frailties as we have found and that are to be found in men everywhere. We are none of us perfect. I hope and trust, however, that, when honourable gentlemen opposite come over here and go into departments of Government (as they may), they will recognise the fact that, when they have been in power for twenty-four years (if they ever are) there will be records in the departments of some of the frailties to be found in human nature, just as they may be found in the books of any organisation, and as they may be found in departments now. I may say that we, as Liberals, have been criticised for joining with Conservatives in Ontario in condemning the Farmers' Party because of the actions of one individual in the past So I appeal to you, as men, that you will acknowledge that human frailties are not the attributes of party and make allowances for some things done by individuals in the past. One of the hardest things I have had to do since I became Premier was to consent to the punishment of one or two personal friends whom I found going wrong in the service of the province.

It does not matter very much what party forms a Government in this province, whether it be all Conservative, even if it be all Progressive — let me tell them this: That sort of thing will still be done; there still will be human frailties to contend with, but I trust that they will recognise the frailties of human nature and will exercise human kindness in dealing with them at the same time as realising that justice must be done.

May I also say that, if you cross to this side of the House and we to that, there still will be newspapers in this province or outside it, that will be uncharitable in their criticisms of members of the new Government as there have been in regard to the old. A public man in the province of Saskatchewan or in the Dominion of Canada takes his reputation — not his character for that is his own to control — in his hands

when he enters public life. He may have the same character when he leaves it, but it is certain that he will not have the same reputation. Misconceptions, misrepresentations will still go on. When my friends have been over here for some time, and find their actions called in question, I venture to state that it will be demonstrated to them that in their predecessors, as in their successors, there is the same degree of honesty, the same degree of integrity, the same motive of service as they believe to be in themselves. I think they will come to realise that certain things which they have criticised most severely and harshly, were done with the best intentions and in what was judged to be the best interests of the province as a whole.

May I say that we, as a Government, have no apologies to make for the acts of legislation or administration covering the past twenty-four years. We have certainly no apologies to make for the acts of this Government during the past three years and six months. They will bear all investigation that a new administration cares to bring to bear upon them.

We, as a Government, are prepared to abide by the vote of the members; but the decision with respect to who shall conduct the affairs of this House and the affairs of this province rests with my friends of the two groups opposite. That responsibility I do not intend to place on my friends (the Conservatives) sitting in that corner of the House. I say to them, deal with this question as you deem best; if we have to give up the reins of power, if it be your will that we should take our position over there and that you take yours over here, we shall attempt to serve the province in a constructive manner on the Opposition benches as we have while forming the Government. If it be your will that I take my place over there, as Leader of the Opposition, I shall take that place prepared at all times to render every service to the province which that position permits. I am not here merely for the purpose of drawing a salary as Minister, and if it be that I have to take my position as Leader of the Opposition I shall endeavour to serve in that position as I have as a member and as Leader of the Government.

We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, as a Government, to hand over our trust to any other Government. We shall do so prepared to fight our way back to the Treasury Benches on the Liberal principles we have stood for, we hope for another twenty-four years in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. E. S. WHATLEY, M.L.A.

(*Kindersley*)

(*On behalf of Progressive Members*)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1929.

Mr. Speaker,—In speaking to the amendment on behalf of myself and my colleagues, I intend to be brief.

We can interpret the vote of the people on June 6 in no other way than as a vote of want of confidence in the present Government. Having lost 35 candidates out of a field of 63 in the general election, it is obvious that the Government is defeated. It is evident that the people have lost confidence in the administration of this Government and, in our opinion, its resignation is long overdue. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Our duty is clear. In order that His Majesty's Government may be carried on we have no alternative under the existing party system but to support a new government. This we are prepared to do and to continue to support such new government so long as its legislation and administration is in the interests of the people of the province, and maintained on a strictly non-partisan basis.

MR. A. C. STEWART, LL.B. M.L.A.

(Yorkton)

(On behalf of Independent Members)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1929.

Mr. Speaker,—May I join with those who have already spoken in the felicitations on your promotion to the high office in this Assembly to which you have been appointed. I also wish to felicitate the members opposite who have participated in this debate, for the friendly advice they have given more particularly to the Progressive and Independent members. We appreciate the advice they have been pleased to give, but we do not need it and do not intend to accept it. I do not know what prerogative they have for this; but I would like to offer some to the two former Conservatives who are sitting over there that they come across the floor of the House and prove themselves practical co-operators by placing themselves in a position to offer advice to the new Co-operative Government that is taking over.

We have been listening to a certain extent, today and yesterday, to reasons why the Progressives and Independents should have confidence in this Government, and in this so-called "muzzled debate" which has already lasted twelve hours, we have been advised and warned to watch carefully where we are going. We want to get the debate finished without further delay and, speaking on behalf of the Independent members here, I say we know where we are going, and we have no confidence in the present Government.

The honourable the Attorney General (*Hon. Mr. Davis*) has been exceptionally free with his advice but, in the course of his very lengthy oration on a motion which, as I understand it, is an over-riding motion, he touched on everything but the subject-matter of the amendment, in my humble opinion. In addition to that, much of the matters he touched upon already had been decided by the electorate, and he was, therefore, out of order in introducing the mass of irrelevant matter he did. In my opinion, the whole membership of the House would have been better pleased had he dwelt on one thing only and told the people of this province the reasons why he had not prosecuted Harry Bronfman rather than make them listen to a long and wearisome address on constitutional procedure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You won't prosecute him either.

Mr. Stewart: Yes, we will, if you have not delayed too long.

In order not to prolong the debate further, I do not intend to answer the many gibes and taunts thrown at us across the floor of the House nor is it necessary for me fully to explain a number of points that seem to be worrying honourable gentlemen over there. We have been delayed twelve hours as it is and, in order that there may be no more quibbling or mincing of words, I wish to read into the records of this House, the actual petition which was handed to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. This petition sets out very clearly the position of the group which I represent and for which I speak and, while members of the groups on this side have listened to gibes and taunts on their leader and on what they call his unprecedented and unconstitutional "trip down Dewdney avenue," and I would tell them that unusual circumstances require unusual measures. Now I would read into Hansard . . .

Mr. Speaker: May I say that there is no official Hansard. You may, however, table the document as a Sessional Paper.

Mr. Stewart: I desire then, Mr. Speaker, to lay this petition on the table. (see Sessional Paper, No. 5)*

While honourable gentlemen opposite have ridiculed what was in reality an attempt to get what the people of this province wish to secure, and while the Attorney General

seems to get a certain amount of enjoyment out of detailing the trip of our revered leader, let me assure him that it will not be half the enjoyment we and the people of this province will derive in seeing the end of their thralldom to the "Gardiner Machine" as result of the trip of the Honourable J. G. Gardiner when he returns from his visit to the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the Independent members, we shall support the amendment.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 5

To the Honourable Henry W. Newlands,
Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan.

THE PETITION of the undersigned, Members-elect of the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, at the election held on the Sixth day of June, A.D. 1929, humbly sheweth:

1. THAT on Tuesday, the Eleventh day of June, A.D. 1929, all the Conservative Members-elect of the Saskatchewan Legislature met together in the Saskatchewan Hotel in the City of Regina, and signed the following document demanding the resignation of the Government of the Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Premier of Saskatchewan, said document being in the following words and signed as herein indicated:

"WHEREAS the Conservative Members-elect were elected in the recent Provincial election as opponents of the present Gardiner Government:

AND WHEREAS, in our opinion, the electors of Saskatchewan have voiced decisively their condemnation of the present Gardiner administration;

WE, the Conservative Members-elect of the Saskatchewan Legislature, call upon Premier Gardiner and his Government to resign immediately.

(Signed) J. T. M. Anderson, Saskatoon City.

Jas. F. Bryant, Lumsden.
H. K. Warren, Bengough.
S. Whittaker, Moose Jaw County.
R. H. Smith, Moose Jaw City.
F. D. Munro, Moosomin.
Wm. J. Greaves, Melfort.
J. E. Gryde, Cypress.
J. A. Merkley, Moose Jaw City.
W. W. Smith, Swift Current.
A. J. McLeod, Wilkie.
D. S. Hutcheon, Arm River.
H. A. Lilly, Thunder Creek.
R. P. Eades, Morse.
James Cobban, Elrose.
Jas. Grassick, Regina.
W. W. Miller, Biggar.
W. G. Bennett, Wolseley.
W. O. Fraser, Souris.
Nat Given, Rosetown.
Howard McConnell, Saskatoon City.
W. C. Buckle, Tisdale.
M. A. MacPherson, Regina City.
R. L. Hanbidge, Kerrobert."

2. THAT on Tuesday, the eleventh day of June, A.D. 1929, the following Independent and Progressive Members-elect of the Saskatchewan Legislature met together in

the Saskatchewan Hotel and signed the following document demanding the resignation of the Government of the Honourable James G. Gardiner, Premier of Saskatchewan, said document being in the following words and signed as herein indicated:

"WHEREAS the Progressive and Independent Members-elect were elected in the recent Provincial election, as opponents of the present Gardiner Government;

AND WHEREAS in our opinion the electors of Saskatchewan have voiced decisively their condemnation of the present Gardiner administration;

WE, the Progressive and Independent Members-elect of the Provincial Legislature, call upon Premier Gardiner and his Government to resign immediately.

(Signed) A. C. Stewart, Yorkton.
 S. N. Horner, Francis.
 S. W. Arthur, Cannington.
 E. S. Whatley, Kindersley.
 R. S. Leslie, Weyburn.
 S. W. Huston, The Battlefords.
 J. V. Patterson, Milestone.
 R. Stipe, Hanley.
 J. R. Taylor, Wadena.
 J. Benson, Last Mountain."

3. THAT sworn copies of said documents have been duly dispatched by registered mail to Premier Gardiner who is fully advised of the situation.

4. THAT, following the signing of the said documents, Independent and Progressive Members-elect were invited to co-operate with the Conservatives in forming a new Administration and agreed to do so. That, at a meeting of the Conservative, Independent and Progressive Members-elect, J. T. M. Anderson was elected as leader of the co-operating groups on a motion moved by R. Stipe M.D. and seconded by Mr. W. C. Buckle.

5. THAT Premier Gardiner has refused to resign and has announced his intention to summon the Legislature at an early date because "The Cabinet is of the opinion that responsible self-government calls for a decision by the Legislature itself not by informal group caucuses held behind closed doors, but by all the elected representatives of the people speaking and voting on the floor of the Legislative Assembly."

6. THAT twenty-six members were elected as supporters of The Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, and thirty-five members in opposition to the Liberal Administration, and that, even if the Government was successful in winning the two deferred elections, the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan has been hopelessly defeated at the polls and does not possess the confidence of the electors of Saskatchewan or of the elected members of the Legislature.

7. THAT the said Government is carrying on as if it had not been defeated and we strenuously object to the present Liberal Administration continuing to carry on when the said Administration has not the confidence of the electorate.

8. THAT to call a special session of the Legislature in order to have your petitioners repeat in the Legislature what they have already stated over their signatures is entirely unnecessary and at the same time is an expensive procedure, because if the said session of the Legislature is called it is the intention of your petitioners to express at the earliest possible moment, by a vote in the House, their lack of confidence in the Liberal Administration, and, following the defeat of the Liberal Administration, there will be considerable delay occasioned by the formation of a new ministry, the election of the ministers, and by the fact that it will be necessary for the new ministers to become acquainted with their departments and to prepare the programme of legislation for submission to the Legislature.

9. THAT it is a well-established convention that when a Government after an election, if left with a minority of supporters, and there is an alternative Government with a definite majority in sight and with a chosen leader, it is the duty of the Government to resign and facilitate the coming in of the new Government at the earliest possible date in order that the business of the country may not suffer. The procedure proposed by Premier Gardiner and the unnecessary delay occasioned thereby is creating

uncertainty, is unsettling business, impeding progress and is not in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

WHEREFORE your Petitioners pray that, since Premier Gardiner does not possess the confidence of the Legislature, Your Honour dismiss your present advisers at the earliest possible moment and call upon Mr. J. T. M. Anderson to form a new Government.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF we have set our hands this Third day of July, A.D. 1929;

(Signed) J. T. M. Anderson, Saskatoon City; Jas. F. Bryant, Lumsden; Wat. C. Buckle, Tisdale; Howard McConnell, Saskatoon City; F. D. Munroe, M.D., Moosomin; J. A. Merkley, Moose Jaw City; R. L. Hanbidge, Kerrobert; A. J. McLeod, Wilkie; R. H. Smith, Moose Jaw City; D. Selby Hutcheon, Arm River; W. W. Miller, Biggar; J. E. Gryde, Cypress; H. K. Warren, Bengough; Jas. Grassick, Regina City; H. A. Lilly, Thunder Creek; R. P. Eades, Morse; Nat Given, Delisle; S. Whittaker, Moose Jaw County; J. V. Patterson, Milestone; S. W. Huston, The Battlefords; J. R. Taylor, Wadena; James Cobban, Elrose; William W. Smith, Swift Current; A. C. Stewart, Yorkton; George J. McLean, Cut Knife; R. Jas. Greaves, Melfort; M. A. MacPherson, Regina City; W. G. Bennett, Wolseley; S. N. Horner, Francis; R. S. Leslie, Weyburn; W. O. Fraser, Souris; S. W. Arthur, Cannington; R. Stipe, Hanley; J. Benson, Last Mountain; E. S. Whatley, Kindersley.