

JOURNALS
of the
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
of the
Province of Saskatchewan

From 6th day of February, 1930, to 9th day of April, 1930.

(Both days inclusive)

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

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

SESSION 1930

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY



REGINA:
ROLAND S. GARRETT, King's Printer
1930

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 Thursday, the Sixth day of FEBRUARY, 1930, 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 Thirtieth day of DECEMBER, 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

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

REGINA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1930.

3 o'clock p.m.

This being the first day of the meeting of the Second Session of the Seventh Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, for the dispatch of business, pursuant to a Proclamation of His Honour the Honourable Henry William Newlands, Lieutenant Governor of the Province, and dated the thirtieth day of December, 1929, and the Assembly having met, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber and took his seat upon the Throne.

The Honourable Mr. Merkley, 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 has 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.

The Clerk informed the Assembly that he had received from the Clerk of the Executive Council notifications of the following vacancies, which had occurred in the Representation, viz:—

In the Electoral Division of Saskatoon City by the acceptance of offices of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable James

Thomas Milton Anderson and the Honourable Howard McConnell.

In the Electoral Division of Regina City, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson.

In the Electoral Division of Tisdale, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable Walter Clutterbuck Buckle.

In the Electoral Division of Lumsden, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable James Fraser Bryant.

In the Electoral Division of Moosomin, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable Frederick Dennis Munroe.

In the Electoral Division of Yorkton, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable Alan Carl Stewart.

In the Electoral Division of Moose Jaw City, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable John Alexander Merkley;

and certificates of the following Elections and Returns, viz:

Of the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson and the Honourable Howard McConnell as Members for the Electoral Division of Saskatoon City.

Of the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson as Member for the Electoral Division of Regina City.

Of the Honourable Walter Clutterbuck Buckle as Member for the Electoral Division of Tisdale.

Of the Honourable James Fraser Bryant as Member for the Electoral Division of Lumsden.

Of the Honourable Frederick Dennis Munroe as Member for the Electoral Division of Moosomin.

Of the Honourable Alan Carl Stewart as Member for the Electoral Division of Yorkton.

Of the Honourable John Alexander Merkley as Member for the Electoral Division of Moose Jaw City.

(*Sessional Paper No. 1.*)

The Honourable Mr. Anderson, addressing himself to the Clerk, proposed to the Assembly for its Speaker, Robert Sterritt Leslie, Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of Weyburn, and moved, seconded by the Honourable Mr. Stewart, that he do take the Chair of this Assembly as Speaker.

The question being put by the Clerk, it was

Resolved, *nemine contradicente*, that Robert Sterritt Leslie, Esquire, do take the Chair of this Assembly as Speaker.

The Clerk having declared Robert Sterritt Leslie, Esquire, duly elected, he was conducted by the Honourable Mr. Anderson and the Honourable Mr. Stewart, to the Chair, when he returned his humble acknowledgements to the Assembly for the great honour it had been pleased to confer upon him by choosing him to be the Speaker.

Thereupon he took the Chair and the Mace was laid on the Table.

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

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

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,

The Legislative Assembly has elected me as its 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.

The Honourable Mr. Merkley, Provincial Secretary, then said:—

MR. SPEAKER,

I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to declare to you that 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 MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

It is my privilege and pleasant duty to welcome you to the Second Session of the Seventh Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

Notwithstanding the fact that, owing to adverse climatic conditions in certain sections of our province the aggregate yield of grain during the past year fell short of the record achieved in the previous year, that ever-present spirit of optimism among our people that has played such a conspicuous and noble part in laying with solidity and care the foundation of our great province, still prevails.

The industrial and business depression throughout the Dominion, resulting in unemployment has affected some of our people in the urban centres and the unsatisfactory crop returns in some

of our farming areas have created situations that have called for attention on the part of my Government. In co-operation with the urban and rural municipalities necessary relief measures have been taken, and will continue to be extended, with a view to enabling our people to meet present situations so that they may look forward with renewed hope and strengthened confidence and trust as we enter upon the responsibilities of another year.

You will be pleased to know that my Government has approached the Federal Government with a view to securing the control of our natural resources and there is every reason to expect that in the near future our province will be called upon to administer these resources in the best interests of our people. Undoubtedly industrial development resultant from the manufacture within our province of our raw natural products will provide a solution to the unemployment problem that yearly calls for our consideration. My Government therefore realizes the urgency of securing provincial control of lands, water powers, minerals and timber and equitable and reasonable compensation for the resources that have been alienated, with the least possible delay.

Realizing the advisability and importance of settling our vast untitled areas with a happy, contented and prosperous people, when economic conditions warrant action being taken to this end, my Government has appointed a Commission thoroughly to investigate all phases of immigration and settlement and it is intended that a suitable provincial immigration policy will be evolved, based upon the findings of this Commission.

Better roads and a resulting increased stimulus to business, with improved facilities for the transportation to market of the produce of the farm, are the aims of my Government in formulating the highways policy that will be placed before you.

My Government recognizing the necessity of loans at reasonable interest rates to our farmers will ask you to make provision for a continuance of the farm loans scheme. The activities of the Farm Loans Board have been canvassed and you will be given a detailed statement of these operations, and suggestions as to the future policy of the Board will be presented for your attention and consideration.

It is essential in dealing with the Estates of Infants that all expenses be reduced to a minimum and with a view to introducing this principle, legislation will be presented in relation to the office of Official Guardian.

You will also be asked to consider a consolidation of the Succession Duties Act along with certain amending legislation intended to lighten the burden on those coming within the scope of the Act.

The majority of our future citizens are being trained and educated in the rural schools of the province, and only a small percentage of these boys and girls have up to the present been able to proceed beyond Grade Eight. My Government, considering that over sixty per cent. of our people are engaged in the great industry of agriculture will present to you certain amendments to the School Act, with a view to making more efficient these most important educational institutions—the rural schools. Hundreds of our rural children, anxious to secure secondary education cannot, under existing conditions, satisfy this worthy ambition and my Government hopes that with your assistance and endorsement this problem will soon be solved.

Our public schools are the great training grounds for citizenship and in this vast rich province, with its cosmopolitan population, representative as it is of several scores of races who have come to us from all corners of the earth, we find being carried on from day to day, in our little country school-houses, one of the greatest experiments of democracy, — the building of a nation. Here we find children of varied racial origin, speaking many different languages and subscribing to various creeds, all assembled together to learn the common language of the province and to receive preparation for the duties of Canadian citizenship. My Government, therefore, in view of the necessity of maintaining harmony, peace and concord in these public schools will present to you legislation intended to bring about this desirable condition.

My Government realizes to the fullest extent the great responsibility that rests upon it in the matter of Public Health and suggestions will be placed before you in this connection. You will also be asked to endorse legislation tending to reduce to a minimum the dangers that beset our people in the face of that dread disease, cancer, which carries all too high a death rate, and in this connection you will be asked to approve of legislation embodying a comprehensive cancer programme involving Consultative Diagnostic Clinics.

The problem of our mentally afflicted will receive consideration during the Session and a report will be presented to you containing the result of investigations in connection with conditions in our mental hospitals. The care and training of mental defectives in a separate institution is an urgent need in this province and unless steps be taken in the near future to cope with this situation serious consequences and heavy capital expenditures are certain to follow.

My Government will also place before you recommendations and legislation intended to improve the Civil Service and you will be advised fully regarding changes in the service that have recently been made.

Independent audits have been conducted in connection with the Telephone Department and the Farm Loans Board and you

will be asked for an expression of opinion regarding an independent audit of the accounts of the province covering a period of years.

A provincial policy relating to power will be set before you by my Government. This policy will be based upon the principle of public ownership of this important public utility. A short time ago the new Government power plant at Saskatoon was formally opened and will constitute one of the largest units in the provincial power scheme.

The weed menace which has become most acute in sections of our province has been receiving the most careful thought and consideration of my Government and plans to cope with this situation will be introduced for your consideration.

During the past year an addition was erected to the mental hospital at Weyburn and with a view to segregating as far as possible the mental defectives from the adult insane, the children will be placed in this new wing. A modern up-to-date, fully equipped sanatorium has been opened at Prince Albert and the erection of a school for the deaf will very shortly be commenced on the University property at Saskatoon. A new normal school, also, has been completed at Moose Jaw and is now in operation.

The past year has witnessed a very marked and renewed interest in the dairy and live stock branches of our agricultural industry and exhibitors from Saskatchewan at the large exhibitions have met with their usual success. It is quite significant that the recent dairy and live stock conventions held in the City of Moose Jaw were the most successful in the history of the Associations.

The Workmen's Compensation Board is now in the course of organization and it is expected that the Act will be put into force in its entirety within a very short time.

My Government has given attention to the matter of superannuation for teachers and you will be asked to give consideration to this important question. It is very desirable that those who are training our future citizens should be encouraged to remain for a longer period of time in the teaching profession and a fair and reasonable superannuation scheme will tend to encourage this.

Several other measures intended to improve conditions among our people, socially and economically, will be submitted to you. The Public Accounts for the past fiscal year and the estimates for the fiscal year 1930-31, prepared with due regard to economy and the requirements of the public service, will be presented to you.

I commend the work of the Session to your most earnest attention and pray that Divine Providence will guide and bless you in your deliberations.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor then retired from the Chamber.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Anderson 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.

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

Ordered, That the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor be taken into consideration on Monday next.

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

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.

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

Ordered, That a Select Special Committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this Assembly, provided under Standing Order 45, said Committee to be composed of Messieurs Bryant, Stewart, Benson, Gardiner and Paulson.

Such said Select Standing Committees to be severally empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the Assembly, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath.

The Assembly then adjourned at 3.25 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1930.

The following Petitions were severally presented and laid on the Table:

By Mr. Hanbidge—Of the City of Saskatoon.

By Mr. Hanbidge—Of The Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons.

By Mr. Hanbidge—Of Saskatchewan General Trusts Corporation Limited.

The Hon. Mr. Bryant, from the Select Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this Assembly, reported that it had prepared lists of members accordingly, and the same were read as follows:

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------|----------|-------------|
| Lilly | Bryant | Patterson, |
| Agar | Gardiner | (Milestone) |
| | | Whatley |

Three shall be a quorum.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|-----------|---------------------|
| Taylor | Dunn | Horner |
| Anderson | Eades | Huck |
| Ayre | Finlayson | MacPherson |
| Bennett | Fraser | McIntosh |
| Benson | Garner | Parker, (Touchwood) |
| Bryant | Given | Paulson |
| Buckle | Grant | Stewart |
| Cockburn | Grassick | Spence |
| Davis | Greaves | Warren |

Eight shall be a quorum.

ON PRIVATE BILLS

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|-----------|------------------|
| Eades | McConnell | Parker, (Pelly) |
| Cockburn | McGregor | Smith, |
| Davis | McIntosh | (Moose Jaw City) |
| Dunn | McLean | Smith, |
| Gryde | McLeod | (Swift Current) |
| Garner | Merkley | Spence |

| | | |
|------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Hanbidge | Miller | Stewart |
| Hogan | Morken | Stipe |
| Huck | Munroe | Taylor |
| Hutcheon | Patterson, | Warren |
| Loptson | (Pipestone) | Whatley |
| MacPherson | Parker, (Touchwood) | Whittaker |
| | | Uhrich |

Eight shall be a quorum.

ON RAILWAYS, TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPHS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|---------|-----------|---------------------|
| Whatley | Grant | Morken |
| Benson | Greaves | Munroe |
| Bryant | Hall | Parker, (Touchwood) |
| Clinch | Horner | Paulson |
| Davis | Huston | Patterson, |
| Eades | Hutcheon | (Pipestone) |
| Fraser | Johnson | Spence |
| Given | McConnell | Stewart |
| Gordon | McLean | Stipe |

Six shall be a quorum.

ON MUNICIPAL LAW

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|------------|-----------------|
| Grassick | Hanbidge | Patterson, |
| Agar | Hutcheon | (Milestone) |
| Arthur | Johnson | Parker, (Pelly) |
| Ayre | MacPherson | Paulson |
| Bennett | McConnell | Stewart |
| Cockburn | Lilly | Smith, |
| Davis | McLean | (Swift Current) |
| Eades | McGregor | Strath |
| Garner | Merkley | Warren |
| Hogan | | |

Six shall be a quorum.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND PRINTING.

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|----------|------------------|
| Arthur | Gardiner | Parker, (Pelly) |
| Agar | Garner | Patterson, |
| Anderson | Gordon | (Pipestone) |
| Ayre | Greaves | Smith, |
| Bennett | Hogan | (Moose Jaw City) |
| Benson | Horner | Smith, |
| Bryant | Huston | (Swift Current) |
| Buckle | Hutcheon | Spence |

| | | |
|--------|---------------------|---------|
| Cobban | Lilly | Stewart |
| Davis | MacPherson | Stipe |
| Dunn. | McConnell | Therres |
| Eades | McIntosh | Uhrich |
| Fraser | Parker, (Touchwood) | |

Eight shall be a quorum.

ON LIBRARY.

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|-----------|------------------|
| Leslie | Benson | Miller |
| Anderson | Clinch | Munroe |
| Agar | Cockburn | Smith, |
| Arthur | Finlayson | (Moose Jaw City) |
| Ayre | McGregor | Uhrich |
| Bennett | McLeod | Whittaker |
| | Merkley | |

Four shall be a quorum.

ON EDUCATION.

Messieurs

| | | |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Smith, | Gordon | Merkley |
| (Moose Jaw City) | Grassick | Miller |
| Anderson | Hall | McIntosh |
| Arthur | Hanbidge | Smith, |
| Benson | Horner | (Swift Current) |
| Bryant | Huck | Strath |
| Clinch | Loptson | Taylor |
| Dunn | MacPherson | Uhrich |
| Finlayson | Marion | Warren |
| Gardiner | McConnell | Whittaker |
| Garner | McGregor | Whatley |
| Given | McLeod | |

Eight shall be a quorum.

ON LAW AMENDMENTS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|------------|-----------------|
| Hanbidge | Gryde | Parker, (Pelly) |
| Anderson | Horner | Patterson, |
| Bryant | Johnson | (Milestone) |
| Buckle | Lilly | Patterson, |
| Cobban | MacPherson | (Pipestone) |
| Davis | Marion | Paulson |
| Gardiner | McConnell | Stewart |
| Given | Merkley | Uhrich |
| Grant | Morken | Whatley |
| | Munroe | |

Five shall be a quorum.

ON AGRICULTURE.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| Greaves | Gryde | Munroe |
| Agar | Hall | Patterson, |
| Benson | Hogan | (Milestone) |
| Buckle | Horner | Parker, (Pelly) |
| Clinch | Huston | Paulson |
| Cobban | Hutcheon | Spence |
| Cockburn | Johnson | Stewart |
| Eades | Lilly | Stipe |
| Finlayson | Loptson | Strath |
| Fraser | Marion | Taylor |
| Gardiner | McGregor | Therres |
| Given | McLean | Warren |
| Gordon | McLeod | Whatley |
| Grant | Miller | Whittaker |
| Grassick | Morken | |

Eight shall be a quorum.

By leave of the Assembly,

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

Resolved, That this Assembly doth concur in the report presented this day of the Select Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this Assembly during the present Session.

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, a Member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

Second Annual Report of the Civil Service Superannuation Board for the fiscal year ended April 30, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 2.)

And also,—Annual Report of the Local Government Board for the year ended December 31, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 3.)

The Assembly then adjourned at 3.25 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1930.

The following Petitions were severally presented and laid on the Table:—

By Mr. Grassick—Of Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.

By Mr. Huck—Of Sister M. Mercedes and two others.

By Mr. Davis—Of The London and Western Trusts Company, Limited, and The Standard Trusts Company.

By Mr. Smith (Moose Jaw City)—Of the City of Moose Jaw.

By Mr. Grassick — of the Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

According to Order, the Clerk having favourably reported on same, pursuant to Standing Order 50 (7), the following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the City of Saskatoon, praying for an Act to confirm a certain By-law of the City of Saskatoon and a certain Agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and the City of Saskatoon of the other part, and for other purposes.

Of the Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

Of Saskatchewan General Trusts Corporation, Limited, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

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

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended April 30, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 4.)

The Order of the Day being read for taking into consideration the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the Session, it was

Moved by Mr. Eades, seconded by Mr. Taylor,

That an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, as follows:—

TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE H. W. NEWLANDS,
Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,—

We, His Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present Session.

A debate arising, said debate was, on motion of Hon. Mr. Anderson, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1930.

The following Petitions were severally presented and laid on the Table:—

By Mr. Grassick—Of Neil Joseph Taylor and two others.

By Mr. Smith (Moose Jaw City)—Of the City of Moose Jaw.

According to Order, the Clerk having favourably reported on same, pursuant to Standing Order 50 (7), the following Petitions were read and received:—

Of Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

Of Sister M. Mercedes and two others, praying for an Act to incorporate The Sisters of the Order of St. Dominic.

Of The London and Western Trusts Company, Limited, and the Standard Trusts Company, praying for an Act substituting The London and Western Trusts Company, Limited, for The Standard Trusts Company.

Of the City of Moose Jaw, praying for an Act respecting certain Bylaws and Debentures of the City of Moose Jaw.

Of the Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 1.—An Act to amend The School Act. (No. 1.)

Hon. Mr. Anderson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 2.—An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 3.—An Act to amend The Jury Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 4.—An Act to provide for the Registration of Corporation Securities.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 5.—An Act to amend The Marriage Act, 1924.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 6.—An Act to amend The Partnership Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 7.—An Act to amend The Homesteads Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 8—An Act to amend The Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 9—An Act to amend The Executions Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

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

Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ended April 30, 1929. (*Sessional Paper No. 5.*)

And also—Auditor's Report and Financial Statements respect- the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board, dated December 31, 1929. (*Sessional Paper No. 6.*)

The Hon. Mr. Merkley, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

President's Report of the University of Saskatchewan, includ- ing Financial Statements, for the year ended June 30, 1929. (*Sessional Paper No. 7.*)

The Hon. Mr. Bryant, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly, by command of His Honour the Lieuten- ant Governor:—

Annual Report of the Department of Telephones for the year ended April 30, 1929. (*Sessional Paper No. 8.*)

Mr. Speaker laid before the Assembly the Annual Report of the Legislative Librarian, which is as follows:—

Regina, 10th February, 1930.

To the Honourable,

The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

Sir:—

I have the honour to submit to you the Annual Report of the Legislative Library.

In the year 1929 a total of 793 volumes has been added to the Library. The Encyclopaedia Britannica (Fourteenth Edition), which includes twenty-four volumes, has also been purchased at a cost of \$119.50.

Notable among the additions to the law section of the Library were the following:—

Queensland Reports 1860-1925, 41 vols., \$1100.00.

South Australian Reports 1865-1924, 50 vols., \$1100.00.

West Australia 1898-1925, 28 vols., \$335.00.

The Reading Room is supplied with a variety of magazines and periodicals, for which a subscription list of some eighty-nine magazines is maintained. Representative newspapers throughout Canada are daily placed on the racks, and all the Provincial newspapers are also subscribed to.

As this is a Parliamentary Library, even a greater effort will be made in the future to maintain its reputation along these lines. The co-operation of the Members is also asked in the recommendation of books which they consider should be on our shelves.

It is regretted that no report can be made of any notable additions to the Provincial Archives which are in the care of this Library, but until this Department is properly developed, no progress can be made in securing the valuable material which should be collected and preserved by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Respectfully submitted,

J. R. BOTHWELL,
Acting Librarian.

(*Sessional Paper No. 9.*)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Uhrich, adjourned.

The following Addresses were voted to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, and Orders of the Assembly issued to the proper officers:—

By Mr. Gardiner:—Address to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor for copies of all Orders in Council passed since September 8, 1929.

By Hon. Mr. Anderson:—Address to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor for copies of all Orders in Council passed from June 6 to September 9, 1929.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10.05 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1930.

According to Order, the Clerk having favourably reported on same, pursuant to Standing Order 50 (7), the following Petitions were read and received:—

Of Neil Joseph Taylor and two others, praying for an Act to incorporate Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited.

Of the City of Moose Jaw, praying for an Act to confirm certain bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and an Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Icwaw Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted; and the respective Ministers introducing the Bills having in each case 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 following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 10—An Act to amend The School Grants Act, 1920.
Hon. Mr. Anderson, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 12—An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Friday next.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 11—An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.
Hon. Mr. Anderson, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 13—An Act to amend The Corporations Taxation Act.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Friday next.

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

Fourteenth Annual Report of the Insurance Branch of the Province of Saskatchewan for the year ended December 31, 1928.
(*Sessional Paper No. 10.*)

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

Annual Report of the Department of Public Health and the Vital Statistics Report of the Province of Saskatchewan for the calendar year 1928.
(*Sessional Paper No. 11.*)

Also—Annual Report of the Bureau of Child Protection, including the Old Age Pensions Branch, for the year ended April 30, 1929. (Sessional Paper No. 12.)

And also—Annual Report of Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League for the year 1928. (Sessional Paper No. 13)

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

Annual Report of the Department of Highways for the fiscal year ended April 30, 1929. (Sessional Paper No. 14.)

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkle:—

- (1) Is one P. J. Ives in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, in what capacity?

Answer: Game Guardian.

- (3) What salary is being paid to him, and what allowance does he get by way of salary?

Answer: \$1500.00 per year salary, and \$900.00 per year sustenance and travelling expenses.

- (4) Who set the competitive examination upon which this man wrote for the position he occupies?

Answer: Competitive examinations have never been in force in Saskatchewan, but this matter is under consideration by the Government.

- (5) Where did he write such examination?

Answer: See Answer to Question 4.

- (6) What other candidates for the position submitted themselves for examination?

Answer: See Answer to Question 4.

- (7) Who were the examiners?

Answer: See Answer to Question 4.

- (8) In what newspapers and in what issues thereof did advertisements appear notifying the public of the vacancy in the public service now filled by this man, and calling for applications for the position?

Answer: See Answer to Question 4.

- (9) Who recommended this man to the Minister in charge of the Bureau in which he is employed?

Answer: The Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries, in whose Department P. J. Ives is employed, assumes responsibility for the appointment.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Munroe:—

- (1) Is one Ewing and is one Rogers in the employ of the Government, and if so, in what capacity?

Answer: Yes. They are employed as Inspectors of Old Age Pensions and Mothers' Allowances.

- (2) What salary is being paid them?

Answer: One hundred and fifty dollars per month.

- (3) What allowance for expenses is being given?

Answer: They are being granted the usual expenses for travelling, hotel and livery, such as are allowed other Inspectors in the same Department.

- (4) What are their respective duties?

Answer: Their duties consist in checking up pensions which have been granted in the past without inspections having been made; also in investigating mothers' allowances to see that the amounts granted were to deserving cases, and that the funds are being used in accordance with the provisions of The Child Welfare Act.

- (5) Where have they spent each day since their appointment was made?

Answer: Mr. Ewing was engaged on the temporary staff on December 23, 1929. He has been in the Prince Albert and Rosthern Constituencies, and is still working there, making Prince Albert his headquarters at present.

Mr. Rogers was taken on the temporary staff on December 23, 1929. He was engaged in the Prince Albert and Rosthern Constituencies up to January 24, 1930, since which time he worked in various districts.

- (6) By whom were these men recommended for the positions they hold?

Answer: By the Minister in charge of the Bureau of Child Protection.

- (7) Under what Department of the Government are they employed?

Answer: The Old Age Pensions and Mothers' Allowances Branch of the Bureau of Child Protection.

The following Address was voted to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, and Order of the Assembly issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Patterson (Pipestone):—Address to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor for copies of all correspondence passing between the Provincial and Federal Governments relating to the admission to Canada of Lutherans and Mennonites from Russia.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Bryant adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1930.

Mr. Lilly, from the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented the first report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Lilly as its Chairman.

Your Committee has duly examined the following Petitions and finds that the provisions of Standing Order 76 have been sufficiently complied with in each case:

Of the City of Saskatoon, praying for an Act to confirm a certain Bylaw of the City of Saskatoon and a certain agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and the City of Saskatoon of the other part, and for other purposes.

Of Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

Of Sister M. Mercedes and two others, praying for an Act to incorporate The Sisters of the Order of St. Dominic.

Of the London and Western Trusts Company, Limited, and the Standard Trusts Company, praying for an Act substituting The London and Western Trusts Company, Limited, for The Standard Trusts Company.

Of the Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

Of Saskatchewan General Trusts Corporation, Limited praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

Of the City of Moose Jaw, praying for an Act respecting certain Bylaws and Debentures of the City of Moose Jaw.

Of the City of Moose Jaw, praying for an Act to confirm certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and an Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

Of Neil Joseph Taylor and two others, praying for an Act to incorporate Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited.

Of the Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, praying for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation.

The Clerk laid on the Table the following Private Bills:—

Bill No. 01—An Act to confirm a certain Bylaw of the City of Saskatoon and a certain Agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and the City of Saskatoon of the other part and for other purposes.

Bill No. 02—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited

Bill No. 03—An Act to incorporate The Sisters of the Order of St. Dominic.

Bill No. 04—An Act respecting the London and Western Trusts Company Limited and the Standard Trusts Company.

Bill No. 05—An Act to amend An Act incorporating The Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons.

Bill No. 06—An Act to amend Chapter 46 of the Statutes of 1910-11, as amended.

Bill No. 07—An Act dealing with certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw.

Bill No. 08—An Act to confirm certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and a certain Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

Bill No. 09—An Act to incorporate The Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited.

Bill No. 010—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

The said Bills were read the first time and ordered for second reading on Monday next, pursuant to Standing Order 80.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 14—An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson Second reading Monday next.

Bill No. 15—An Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act, 1929.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Monday next.

Bill No. 16—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Northern Saskatchewan Co-operative Stock Yards, Limited.

Hon. Mr. Buckle, Second Reading Monday next.

The Hon. Mr. MacPherson, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

A detailed Statement of all Remissions made under The Penalties and Forfeitures Act, for the period ended February 10, 1930.
(*Sessional Paper No. 15*)

And also,—Record of Convictions under The Liquor Act, 1925, for the period from December 11, 1928, to February 10, 1930.
(*Sessional Paper No. 16*)

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

Annual Report of the Provincial Secretary, including the Report of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, for the year ended April 30, 1929.
(*Sessional Paper No. 17*)

Also,—Statement of Licenses and Permits issued under The Public Vehicles Act, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1929.
(*Sessional Paper No. 18*)

And also,—Annual Report and Financial Statements of The Saskatchewan Power Commission, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1929.
(*Sessional Paper No. 19*)

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Prior to the eighth day of September, 1929, by whom was the Saskatchewan Gazette printed?

Answer: Prior to the eighth day of September, 1929, the Saskatchewan Gazette was printed by the Leader Publishing Company, Limited, of Regina; the contract being awarded to that Company without tender of any kind.

- (2) By whom is it now printed?

Answer: The Saskatchewan Gazette is now printed by the McInnis Brothers, Limited, of Regina.

- (3) If a change in printers has been made, when was such a change made?

Answer: The change in printers was made on September 21, 1929.

- (4) In what newspapers in Saskatchewan, and in what issues thereof did advertisements calling for tenders for this work appear?

Answer: None, as it was necessary to have the Gazette printed in the city of Regina.

- (5) Who tendered on this work and what were the amounts of the various tenders?

Answer: At the time of the change no tenders were called for the remaining issues of the Gazette for 1929. Tenders were, however, called for the year 1930, and letters asking that tenders be submitted were sent to the following firms:

Caxton Press, Limited, Regina;
 Central Press, Limited, Regina;
 Commercial Printers, Limited, Regina;
 McInnis Brothers, Limited, Regina;
 McInnis Press, Limited, Regina;
 Western Printers' Association, Ltd., of Regina;

Tenders were received from the following firms

McInnis Brothers, Limited: based on 3,000 copies:
 Flat rate \$7.75 per page
 Standing matter no charge
 Additional 50 copies 13¼ per page

Commercial Printers, Limited:
 8-point straight \$7.00 per page
 Tax sale lists \$8.50 per page
 Standing matter 80 per 1M ems
 Additional 50 copies05 per page

The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. McIntosh asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Is William Gibbon in the employ of the Government?

Answer: There is no Willam Gibbon in the employ of the Government; there is, however, a William J. Gibbins employed by the Government.

- (2) In what Department is he employed and in what capacity?

Answer: Mr. Gibbins is temporarily employed in the Department of Municipal Affairs as an inspector in connection with advances of relief and seed grain in the Local Improvement Districts in the southern portion of the Province.

- (3) When was he appointed?

Answer: He was appointed on October 1, 1929.

- (4) What salary is he receiving?

Answer: One hundred and fifty dollars per month.

- (5) What are his qualifications?

Answer: He is a farmer of several years' experience, has good administrative ability, is highly respected in his district and has an intimate knowledge of the conditions and needs of the district in which he is working.

- (6) Is this the W. Gibbon who was a Conservative candidate in the constituency of Willow Bunch on June 6, 1929.

Answer: Yes.

- (7) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

Mr. Parker (Touchwood) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Who is the Commissioner of Publications?

Answer: Thomas Allan McInnis.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: January 6, 1930.

- (3) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: \$4,000.00 per annum.

- (4) What are his Qualifications?

Answer: Thirty years' experience in newspaper work, covering all branches and including the writing of special and publicity articles for Canadian and American newspapers and magazines.

Mr. Dunn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Was Mr. Russell Ostensky of Fenwood recommended for the appointment of Commissioner for Oaths?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) By whom was he recommended?

Answer: Mr. C. M. Dunn.

- (3) Did he receive the appointment?

Answer: No.

- (4) If not, why not?

Answer: It was not considered advisable at that time to make the appointment.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) What is the name of the Police Magistrate at Moose Jaw?

Answer: F. W. Torney, K.C.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: The 24th of January, 1930.

Mr. Strath asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) What information did the Government receive from Mr. William Balfour's trip to Eastern Canada to investigate the possibilities of the Horse Market in these Provinces for Saskatchewan horses?

Answer: Mr. Balfour was sent east by the Department of Agriculture as a result of a request from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Live Stock Producers Limited for assistance in marketing surplus horses. While in Ontario Mr. Balfour interviewed many horse dealers and received orders for a number of carloads for use in lumbering. The information obtained by Mr. Balfour and the orders for horses were transmitted to the Saskatchewan Live Stock Producers, Limited, Moose Jaw.

- (2) What was the cost of the venture?

Answer: \$666.62

- (3) Is Mr. Balfour at present in the employ of the Government?

Answer: No.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Whatley, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY FEBRUARY 14, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:

Bill No. 17—An Act to amend The Horticultural Societies Act, 1928.

Hon. Mr. Buckle, Second reading Tuesday next.

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

Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ended December 31, 1928. *(Sessional Paper No. 20)*

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Who were the Inspectors employed by the Government in connection with the investigation of the Farm Loan Board?

Answer: T. A. Anderson, Regina; J. H. Currie, Saskatoon; C. B. Daniels, Moose Jaw

- (2) When were they employed?

Answer: During the period from 25th October, 1929, to 27th November 1929.

- (3) How long did they work? What were they paid? What were their expenses?

Answer:

T. A. Anderson, 20 days, \$10.00 per day and expenses \$192.39
J. H. Currie, 24 days \$10.00 per day and expenses \$444.35
C. B. Daniels, 24 days \$10.00 per day and expenses \$316.95

- (4) Did any of such Inspectors take part in the last Provincial Campaign on behalf of the present Government?

Answer: The present Government was not in existence at the time of the last election.

- (5) Did any of such men during the campaign discuss the Farm Loan Board from the public platform?

Answer: The Department has no record of this matter.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Sheriff of the Judicial District of Saskatoon?

Answer: Basil P. Boyce.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: 21st December 1929.

- (3) Who recommended him for this appointment to the Attorney General?

Answer:

Basil P. Boyce made personal application to the Attorney General on October 1st, 1929 for a position in his Department, the said Basil P. Boyce stating that he had been admitted to the Saskatchewan Bar in 1919 and had continuously practised law in the City of Saskatoon since May 1920. He also stated that he was a returned soldier having gone overseas in 1914 returning home in the early part of 1919, the last nine months of the War he was held a prisoner being captured in the Flying Corps prior to March 1918. His reason for wishing to seek new employment was that Court work was affecting his nervous system which in turn affected his general health.

Enquiry was made of various parties including the representative for the City of Saskatoon in the Legislature, and the Attorney General, in whose Department he is now employed assumes responsibility for the appointment.

- (4) Who is the Deputy Sheriff at Saskatoon?

Answer: E. J. Shaver.

- (5) How long has he been in the employ of the Province?

Answer: Since 1st November 1907.

- (6) Is the Government satisfied with his services?

Answer: Yes.

- (7) Why was he not promoted to the position of Sheriff?

Answer: Because Basil P. Boyce was appointed.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:

- (1) Who printed the January 1930 edition of the Regina City Telephone Directory?

Answer: The McInnis Brothers, Limited, of Regina, printed the Regina City Telephone Directory.

- (2) What was paid for this work?

Answer: The sum of \$4,187.55 was paid for this work, consisting of 14,000 copies of the Directory. The price charged by the Regina Leader Publishing Company for 13,875 copies of the preceding Directory, being thirty-six pages less in size was \$4,584.02.

- (3) Were public tenders called for this work?

Answer: On the recommendation of the King's Printer, owing to the emergency of the work, public tenders were not called for. Tenders will be called for in the following issues.

- (4) In what newspapers and what editions thereof did advertisements appear calling for such tenders?

Answer: See answer to question 3.

- (5) What tenders were received and who were the tenderers?

Answer: See answer to question 3.

- (6) What was the amount of such tenders?

Answer: See answer to question 3.

- (7) Were tenders called more than once for this work, and if so, why?

Answer: See answer to question 3.

Mr Benson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson.

- (1) Is Jim Cameron in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Absolutely not.

Mr. Finlayson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Who is the Beer Vendor at Bracken?

Answer: Joseph Weitzel.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: January 8, 1930.

- (3) Is he a Returned Soldier?

Answer: No.

- (4) By whom was this man recommended?

Answer: By the Liquor Board.

FEBRUARY 14, 1930

37

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Patterson (Pipestone) adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11.15 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 18—An Act to amend The Brand Act.

Hon. Mr. Buckle, Second reading Wednesday next.

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return to an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, dated February 12, 1930, for:—

Copies of all correspondence passing between the Provincial and Federal Governments relating to the admission to Canada of Lutherans and Menmonites from Russia.

(Sessional Paper No. 21)

The Hon. Mr. McConnell, a member of the Executive council, laid before the Assembly:—

Fourth Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Liquor Board for the year ended March 31, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 22)

Also,—Annual Report of the Administration of The Deferred Charges Act for the fiscal year ended April 30, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 23)

Also,—Statement of Temporary Loans, issued pursuant to Section 13 of The Treasury Department Act.

(Sessional paper No. 24)

And also,—Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board for the year ended December 31, 1928.

(Sessional Paper No. 26)

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

First Annual Report of the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries, for the year ended April 30, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 25)

Mr. McLeod asked the Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

Of the Million and one-half dollars appropriated for the use of the Farm Loan Board for the year 1929,

- (1) How much was actually loaned to the farmers of this Province for the year 1929?

Answer: From May 1, 1929 to December 31, 1929.
\$1,270,638.22.

- (2) For what purpose giving details, was the balance of this appropriation spent by the Board?

Answer:

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|------------|
| Hail Insurance | \$ | 9,764.05 |
| Seed Grain Advances | \$ | 4,872.29 |
| Taxes Advanced | \$ | 29,593.35 |
| Foreclosed Loans & Advances | \$ | 75,880.51 |
| Real Estate Sales Advances | \$ | 4,374.87 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | \$ | 124,485.07 |
| Unused at December 31, 1929 | | 104,866.71 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | \$ | 229,351.78 |

- (3) How much money was lent to the farmers by the Board from May the first, 1929 to June the sixth, 1929?

Answer: \$143,710.00

- (4) How much money was loaned by the Board from June the sixth, 1929 to September the ninth, 1929?

Answer: \$547, 665.00

Mr. Patterson (Milestone) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Who is the Solicitor for the Farm Loan Board?

Answer: James W. Blyth, Regina.

- (2) During the year 1929, did he take care of all legal work of the Board? if not, what other Solicitors were employed by the Board: give the firm names and addresses?

Answer: The following firms were employed by the Board:

Cross, Jonah, Hugg & Forbes, 405 Mc Callum-Hill Bldg., Regina.

Tingley & Malone, 715 Mc Callum-Hill Bldg., Regina.

McNiven, Fraser & Fyffe, 30-32 Western Trust Bldg., Regina.

B. D. Hogarth, 1762 Scarth Street, Regina.

- (3) How much legal fees were paid to each of these firms for the work done?

Answer:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| Cross, Jonah, Hugg & Forbes | \$546.75 |
| Tingley & Malone | 436.50 |
| Mc Niven, Fraser & Fyffe | 529.00 |
| B. D. Hogarth | 519.00 |

- (4) Why was it necessary to employ these additional firms of Solicitors?

Answer: The office of the Board's Solicitor being congested he asked for relief, and the Board decided to relieve him of 160 accepted applications, 40 of which were given to each of the firms named in Question 2.

Mr. Cobban, asked the Government the following Question which was answered by Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) During the year 1929, were any loans in excess of Five Thousand Dollars given to the farmers of Saskatchewan? If so, give details of these loans with respect to the amounts and the numbers of the loans?

Answer: During the year 1929 64 loans were given to the farmers of Saskatchewan, in excess of \$5,000.00, numbers and amounts of loans as follows:

| Loan No. | Amount | Loan No. | Amount |
|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| 4490 | \$10,000.00 | 4746 | \$12,000.00 |
| 4505 | 6,000.00 | 4751 | 7,500.00 |
| 4513 | 6,000.00 | 4765 | 6,500.00 |
| 4516 | 7,000.00 | 4768 | 16,000.00 |
| 4533 | 10,000.00 | 4771 | 5,500.00 |
| 4534 | 10,000.00 | 4776 | 8,000.00 |
| 4535 | 7,000.00 | 4780 | 7,000.00 |
| 4542 | 6,000.00 | 4789 | 8,500.00 |
| 4552 | 5,100.00 | 4821 | 6,000.00 |
| 4561 | 7,500.00 | 4822 | 8,000.00 |
| 4573 | 6,500.00 | 4841 | 6,400.00 |
| 4590 | 6,000.00 | 4845 | 6,000.00 |
| 4607 | 7,000.00 | 4859 | 6,500.00 |
| 4608 | 8,000.00 | 4865 | 8,500.00 |
| 4616 | 10,000.00 | 4870 | 7,000.00 |
| 4619 | 7,000.00 | 4881 | 6,000.00 |
| 4626 | 6,000.00 | 4889 | 8,000.00 |
| 4628 | 7,000.00 | 4894 | 6,400.00 |
| 4629 | 6,000.00 | 4921 | 10,000.00 |
| 4630 | 6,000.00 | 4924 | 6,000.00 |
| 4636 | 8,000.00 | 4935 | 7,000.00 |
| 4639 | 10,000.00 | 4941 | 7,000.00 |
| 4641 | 5,400.00 | 4974 | 5,500.00 |

| Loan No. | Amount | Loan No. | Amount |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 4647 | 9,000.00 | 5001 | 7,000.00 |
| 4659 | 6,300.00 | 5019 | 6,500.00 |
| 4665 | 7,000.00 | 5022 | 6,000.00 |
| 4673 | 6,000.00 | 5045 | 7,000.00 |
| 4675 | 7,000.00 | 5060 | 6,800.00 |
| 4691 | 5,500.00 | 5066 | 6,000.00 |
| 4698 | 7,000.00 | 5067 | 6,000.00 |
| 4736 | 8,000.00 | 5079 | 6,000.00 |
| 4738 | 5,500.00 | 5107 | 7,500.00 |

\$462,900.00

Mr. Therres asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Did the Government or Department of Highways place snow fences along the Provincial Highway No. 1. between Moose Jaw and Regina?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what was the cost of construction of these fences and what part thereof represents material and what part labour?

Answer:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Purchase Cost of Snow Fence complete | \$2,253.40 |
| Labor Cost | 284.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| Total Cost | \$2,537.40 |

- (3) Where was the material purchased and was it purchased by public tender?

Answer: Snow fencing was purchased from the Canada Ingot Iron Company, Limited, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Time did not permit of advertising call for tenders. Inquiries were made as to prices and time of delivery.

- (4) Has the Government purchased any road machinery for use in the removal of snow from such highway?

Answer: Yes.

- (5) If so, where and from whom was this machinery purchased, and was it purchased by public tender?

Answer: One "Snow King" Rotary plow purchased from Canada Tractor and Equipment Company, Regina. One La Plante-Choate "V" Truck plow, purchased from Albert Olson Company, Limited, Regina.

One La Plante-Choate "V" Tractor plow, purchased from Albert Olson Company, Limited, Regina.

This equipment was not purchased by public tender, as the local authorized agent for this equipment would be the only party who would be in a position to submit a tender.

- (6) What was the total amount expended in keeping this piece of highway open from November 1st, 1929 to February 10th, 1930?

Answer:

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Labor, gas oil and repairs | \$4,113.51 |
| Estimated amount of labor gas and oil accounts not submitted | 800.00 |
| Depreciation on snow fencing and equipment estimated at | 1,506.55 |
| Total | <u>\$6,420.06</u> |

Mr. Dunn asked the Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) Is one Fred Pankoski in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) What is the nature of his employment and in what Department is he employed?

Answer: Game Guardian, Game Branch of the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries.

- (3) What Minister recommended his appointment?

Answer: The Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries.

- (4) By whom was he recommended to the Minister?

Answer: No recommendation to the Minister respecting the appointments of Civil Servants is required under the provisions of The Civil Service Act.

- (5) At what date did he begin work and what is his salary?

Answer: November 19th, 1929, at a salary of \$1500.00 per year.

- (6) What amount has been allowed him for expenses up to the 13th day of February 1930?

Answer: Actual sustenance and travelling expenses totalling \$276.95 up to February 8th, 1930, the date of the last expense account submitted.

- (7) Where was his place of residence before being employed by the Government?

Answer: Yorkton, Saskatchewan.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Were tenders received by the Government for the hauling of coal to the Normal School and Court House at Moose Jaw?

Answer: No. Because contract is under Five Hundred Dollars.

- (2) If so, who tendered and what was the amount of such tenders?

Answer: See answer to question 1.

- (3) Who is doing this work and what is the amount being paid per ton for doing the work?

Answer: Bert Jackman, .75c per ton.

Mr. Horner asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) How many civil servants were employed in the Provincial Constituency of Prince Albert on September 9th?

Answer: 59

- (2) How many of these have been dismissed?

Answer: 4 dismissed.

How many resigned?

Answer: 1 resigned

- (3) How many of these were returned soldiers?

Answer: 17

- (4) How many returned soldiers were dismissed?

Answer: 1

- (5) How many returned soldiers were employed since September 9th?

Answer: 2

Mr. Parker (Touchwood) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is one Snort Williamson in the employ of the Government?

Answer: No.

FEBRUARY 17, 1930

Mr. Loftson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr Munroe:—

- (1) How many Inspectors were employed in the Bureau of Child Protection on September 8, 1929?

Answer: Ten.

- (2) How many Inspectors are employed in the Bureau of Child Protection at the present time permanently or otherwise?

Answer: There are ten permanent and eleven temporary Inspectors.

- (3) What are their names?

Answer: The names of the permanent Inspectors are:

H. J. Nosworthy
 J. C. Robinson
 J. A. Phillion
 Mrs. I. D. Jones
 W. C. Sutherland
 J. W. Stewart
 S. J. Adlam
 J. A. Hamilton
 Miss H. Hall
 Miss M. T. MacDonald
 H. A. Keown
 A. E. Ewing
 B. H. Gray
 Percy Dallin
 R. W. Morrow
 R. Bocz
 W. Waselenchuk
 A. G. R. Bomford
 C. Buckle
 W. H. Rogers
 W. J. Scott

- (4) What are their salaries and expenses, if any?

Answer: The salaries of the permanent Inspectors are as follows:

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| H. J. Nosworthy | \$2200.00 | per annum |
| J. C. Robinson | 2000.00 | per annum |
| J. A. Phillion | 2000.00 | per annum |
| Mrs. I. D. Jones | 1700.00 | per annum |
| W. C. Sutherland | 2000.00 | per annum |
| J. A. Hamilton | 2000.00 | per annum |
| S. J. Adlam | 1900.00 | per annum |
| J. W. Stewart | 2000.00 | per annum |
| Miss H. Hall | 1700.00 | per annum |
| Miss M. T. MacDonald | 1500.00 | per annum |

The temporary Inspectors are employed in making a survey in connection with old age pensions which have not been previously inspected; in making re-inspections; in interviewing applicants for mothers' allowances; in ascertaining that such allowances are being used for the purpose required by the Child Welfare Act. Their salaries are \$150.00 per month each, excepting in the case of Mr. H. A. Keown, whose salary is \$175.00 per month, and they are allowed actual expenses when travelling.

Mr. Loptson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant.

- (1) Is one William Allen, formerly of Disley, employed by the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what is the nature of his employment?

Answer: Temporary Guard.

- (3) What salary is he receiving?

Answer: \$85.00 per month.

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) Has the Government purchased seed oats for distribution or sale to the farmers of this Province in the spring of 1930?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Were the oats so purchased properly cleaned prior to purchase or have they been cleaned since purchase?

Answer: Some were bought cleaned and some to be cleaned.

- (3) What percentage of wild oats and other noxious weeds do these oats contain?

Answer: These oats were bought subject to approval by Dominion Government Seed Inspectors, and will be cleaned and sold on the basis of seed grades set by the Dominion Seeds Act. Most of them will now grade or can be cleaned to grade No. 1 seed.

- (4) Will a guarantee as to germination be given with such oats, if so, what guarantee?

Answer: The germination tests show many carloads to have a test of over 97 per cent and germination tests of the lot will well exceed requirements for No. 1 Seed Oats.

- (5) Are such oats guaranteed as to strain?

Answer: No, but these oats have been grown in Western Canada, where the Banner and Victory varieties are most commonly used.

- (6) At what price per bushel will these oats be sold to the farmers of the Province in carload lots and at what price in less than carload lots?

Answer: Ninety-five cents (95) for No. 1 seed delivered to customer's station in carlots in bulk, 5c extra per bushel if sacked; and 95c for less than carload lots, sacks included, ex warehouse at Saskatoon or Moose Jaw. Should any of these oats grade No. 2 seed, the price will be 5c less per bushel.

- (7) What has been the average cost of these oats to the Province including all costs of purchase, storage, distribution, etc?

Answer: As some of these oats have yet to be cleaned, costs of storage and shrinkage in cleaning can only be estimated at this time, but the price quoted for sale is expected to reimburse the Government without making a profit.

- (8) Who was employed to purchase these oats?

Answer: R. M. Johnson.

- (9) How long was such person or persons employed on this work?

Answer: Sixty-five days. The purchases were made between October 5th and November 21st.

- (10) What salary was paid to such person or persons?

Answer: Mr. Johnson was paid at the rate of four hundred and fifty-five dollars per month.

- (11) How much were such person or persons allowed by way of expenses?

Answer: \$7.50 per day and reimbursement of railway fares.

- (12) Is it the intention to sell the oats at a price sufficiently high to cover all costs of the Government?

Answer: Yes, excepting 25% of inward freight to storage points, an equivalent being borne by the railways.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Is one Victor May of Saskatoon employed by the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what is the nature of his employment and in what Department is he employed?

Answer: Mr May is in charge of the Clipping and information Service which is being developed in accordance with the recommendation submitted last year by the Commissioner of Publications, that: "The creation of a clipping and Information Service, either in connection with the Legislative Library or the Bureau of Publications, with a capable person in charge whose sole duty would be clipping, indexing and filing essential information, data and material of all kinds, and upon which all Departments or Branches of the Government service could call for information desired, would overcome the weaknesses of present methods."

This service is now being developed by the Bureau of Publications. Mr. May is, therefore, employed in that Department.

- (3) What salary is being paid to him?

Answer: \$1,800 per annum.

- (4) What special qualifications has he for the work he is doing?

Answer: Mr May is fully qualified by education and adaptability for the work he is doing.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Stipe, adjourned.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Agar, for a return showing:—

Copies of all correspondence between the King's Printer and Western Printers' Association, Limited during the period from September 9 to December 31, 1929.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.45 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 19—An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.
Hon. Mr. Anderson, Second reading Thursday next.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Anderson have leave to introduce Bill No. 20—An Act to amend The School Act (No. 2)

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, 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 on Thursday next.

Mr. Garner asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Who is printing the Sessional Papers, the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislature, the Orders of the day, and the Legislation being introduced at the Session?

Answer: Arrangements have not been made for the printing of the Sessional Papers. The Votes and Proceedings of the Legislature and the Orders of the Day are being printed by The McInnis Press, Limited, of Regina; Bills introduced at the Session are being printed by The McInnis Brothers, Limited, of Regina.

- (2) Were tenders called for this work?

Answer: Yes; letters calling for tenders were sent to the following firms in the city of Regina:

The Caxton Press, Limited;
The Central Press, Limited;
The Commercial Printers, Limited;
The McInnis Brothers, Limited;
The McInnis Press, Limited;
The Western Printers' Association, Limited.

- (3) Who tendered and what was the amount of the tenders?

Answer: Tenders were received from the following firms:

The Caxton Press, Limited;
The Commercial Printers, Limited;
The McInnis Brothers, Limited;
The McInnis Press, Limited.
The amount of each tender is as follows:

The Caxton Press, Limited—All charges to be based upon the Schedule of Prices issued by the King's Printer under date of April, 1928, less 25% over-time charge and less an additional discount of 10% but not stock.

The Commercial Printers, Limited—

| | |
|---|---------|
| First reading bills—with or without side notes, for 1 page and endorse..... | \$ 8.50 |
| 4 pages, 2 printed and endorse..... | 15.10 |
| 4 pages, 3 printed and endorse..... | 18.58 |
| 6 pages, 4 printed and endorse..... | 27.50 |
| 6 pages, 5 printed and endorse..... | 34.25 |
| 8 pages, 6 printed and endorse..... | 37.00 |
| 8 pages, 7 printed and endorse..... | 43.00 |
| All bills over 8 pages, including endorse—\$5.50 per page. | |

Third reading bills—

25 or 100 copies, necessary alterations extra, at per hour, \$2.50; 1 page, \$2.86; 2 pages, \$4.50; 4 pages, \$8.20; over 4 pages, per page \$2.00.

Statutes—2,200 copies, standing matter including all alterations and blank pages, per page, \$3.75; index pages, 8-point, per page, \$9.40; cover for \$32.50; binding in buckram, each \$1.00; binding in half calf, titled, each \$3.50.

Printing and binding Individual Acts:

| | |
|--|---------|
| 100 copies, 1 page | \$ 2.85 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies..... | .10 |
| 100 copies, 2 pages, per page..... | 2.00 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies..... | .12 |
| 100 copies, 4 pages, per page..... | 1.63 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies..... | .30 |
| 100 copies, 8 pages, per page..... | 1.60 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies..... | .39 |
| 100 copies, 16 pages, per page..... | 1.43 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies..... | .80 |
| 100 copies, 32 pages, per page..... | 1.40 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies..... | 1.60 |
| 100 copies, over 32 pages, per page..... | 1.35 |
| each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies, per page | .05 |

On individual Acts of less than 32 pages and not an even unit of 1, 2, 4, 8, 16 or 32 pages, the page rate per 100 copies would be the rate per page closest to any one of these units, and the additional 50 copies would also take the price closest to the unit taken; Example, A 13-page would take the 16-page rate of \$1.43 per page, and each additional 50 copies, per 50 copies, 80c.

| | |
|--|---------|
| Orders of the Day—150 copies each day, printed one side, 10 on 11-point as per your specifications and conditions of delivery, per page for first and additional pages | \$10.00 |
| Votes and Proceedings—375 copies each day, type 10 on 11-point, as per your specifications and conditions of delivery, per page..... | 6.00 |
| Journals—part standing from Votes and Proceedings, approximately 153 pages standing matter and 16 pages of index and covers, quantity 500 copies: Approximately 153 pages standing, including all necessary alterations, per page..... | \$ 2.30 |
| 6 pages, title and proclamations, per page..... | 3.60 |
| Index pages, approximately 16 pages, 8-point double, per page | 9.20 |
| Cover, four pages for..... | 13.00 |

McInnis Brothers, Limited—

Composition: 6-point, \$1.05 per 1M ems; 10 on 11, \$1.35 per 1M ems; hour rate, \$2.25 per hour.

Lock-up:

| Size | 1 p. | 2 pp. | 4 pp. | 8 pp. | 16 pp. |
|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 10x15 | .30 | .55 | .75 | .90 | |
| 11x17 | .40 | .60 | .80 | 1.00 | |
| 17x22 | .75 | 1.00 | 1.45 | 1.95 | 2.75 |
| 28x42 | | | | 3.20 | 4.50 |

Presswork:

| Size | 500 or less | First M. | Add'n'l M. |
|-------|-------------|----------|------------|
| 10x15 | 1.35 | 1.85 | 1.15 |
| 11x17 | 1.85 | 2.70 | 1.35 |
| 17x22 | 4.15 | 5.25 | 1.95 |
| 28x42 | 6.80 | 8.50 | 3.00 |

Folding: 12x19

| | | | |
|----------|------|------|------|
| 1 Fold | .60 | 1.10 | |
| 2 Folds | .70 | 1.35 | |
| 3 Folds | 1.25 | 1.80 | |
| 28x42 | | | |
| 4 pages | .70 | .85 | .60 |
| 8 pages | 1.25 | 2.00 | .95 |
| 16 pages | 1.95 | 3.10 | 1.05 |

All folding of less than 28x42 and more than 12x19 to be machine folded in 16 page signatures.

Gathering: King's Printer's List less 25%.

Stitching: King's Printer's List less 25%.

Trimming: King's Printer's List less 25%.

Glueing covers: King's Printer's List less 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %.

Binding: Copies bound in buckram on basis of last year's Statutes, \$1.20 per copy.

Copies bound in half calf with single title patch in gold, \$2.75 each.

Stock: Stock used in first and second reading bills to be figured at regular basis, plus profit of 25%; stock used in printing volume of the Statutes to be figured at 17 cents per pound, this to include profit.

These prices you will note are more than 25% better than the regular list and are quoted by us as a special inducement to you to award us the contract, in view of large volume of the work involved.

Re Orders of the Day—Votes and Proceedings—Journals. On the Orders of the Day and Votes and Proceedings we beg to quote the regular allowances as provided in the King's Printer's price list, less 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %. Stock to be figured on the regular basis plus 25% profit, but not to be subject to bonus allowance for overtime work.

On the printing of the Journals from standing type we beg to quote the same unit rates as quoted for the printing of the Bills and Statutes. In the case of the Journals stock to be figured at seventeen cents per pound, this to include printer's profit.

McInnis Press, Limited—Tender on Orders of the Day, Votes and Proceedings, and Journals only.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Orders of the Day..... | \$7.40 per page |
| Votes and Proceedings..... | 5.10 per page |
| Journals | .91 per copy |

- (4) How much or at what rate is this work being paid for?

Answer: This work is being paid for at the rate quoted on the lowest tender, and the lowest tender received the work.

Mr. Huston asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who was the Beer Vendor at Handel, Saskatchewan, prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: H. Schaeffer.

- (2) Was he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (3) By whom was he recommended when he received the the appointment?

Answer: By the Liquor Board.

- (4) Did the said Vendor take an active and partisan interest in the last election?

Answer: The Liquor Board had no knowledge of such activity.

- (5) Have his services been dispensed with?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Who is the new appointee?

Answer: W. Sutherland.

- (7) Is the new appointee a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Dunn asked the Government the following Question: which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Beer Vendor at Grayson?

Answer: Henry Hayes Willway.

- (2) When was the appointment made?

Answer: January 1st, 1930.

- (3) Was the present Vendor once a Conservative Member of the Saskatchewan Legislature?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) What is the age of the present Vendor?

Answer: 63.

Mr. Ayre asked the Government the following Question: which was answered by Hon. Mr. McPherson:

- (1) Is Arthur Kendall in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, in what capacity?

Answer: District Supervisor under the Liquor Board.

- (3) At what salary, and what expenses are allowed?

Answer: Salary \$200.00 per month, and actual traveling and sustenance expenses while absent from Regina.

- (4) Is this the Arthur Kendall who was engaged in political organization work against the Liberal Party during the Provincial Election Campaign of 1929 in the North-western part of the Province?

Answer: The Liquor Board has no knowledge of Mr. Kendall's activities prior to employment.

- (5) Where was his place of residence then and where does he reside now?

Answer: The Board is not aware of Mr. Kendall's place of residence before employment, but at the present time he resides in Regina.

- (6) Who previously held the position now occupied by him?

Answer: Mathew S. Collins.

Mr. Hanbidge asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. McConnell.

- (1) During the term of office of the Gardiner Government were tenders ever called for any printing which had to be done?

Answer: No.

- (2) If not, why were tenders not called for?

Answer: For reasons known to the former Government.

Mr. Hanbidge asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Is the Report of the Saskatchewan Grain Commission being printed?

Answer: Yes, the Report of the Saskatchewan Grain Commission is now being printed.

- (2) Were tenders ever called for?

Answer: Yes.

- (3) Who were asked to submit tenders?

Answer: Letters were sent to the following firms asking them to submit tenders:

Prince Albert

Herald Printing Company, Limited.

Regina

Caxton Press, Limited.

Central Press, Limited.

Commercial Printers, Limited.

McInnis Brothers, Limited.

McInnis Press, Limited.

Western Printers' Association, Limited.

Saskatoon

Elliott Printing Company, Limited.

Modern Press, Limited.

Star-Phoenix,

Moose Jaw

Times Company, Limited.

- (4) What were the various prices submitted?

Answer: The various prices submitted were as follows:
 Prince Albert, Herald Printing Company, Limited—
 no tender submitted.

Regina

Caxton Press, Limited—regular King's Printer's price list.

Central Press, Limited—\$13.40 per page.

Commercial Printers, Limited—\$12.80 per page.

McInnis Brothers, Limited—\$12.20 per page.
 (tabular \$2.60 extra)

McInnis Press, Limited—no tender submitted

Western Printers' Association—\$12.00 per page.

Saskatoon

Elliott Printing Company, Ltd.—\$13.00 per page.

Modern Press, Limited—\$16.85 per page, (tabular
 \$17.60 per page)

Star-Phoenix—\$12.50 per page.

Moose Jaw

Times Company, Limited—\$14.00 per page.

- (5) Who was awarded the contract?

Answer: The contract was awarded to the lowest tender;
 namely, The Western Printers' Association, Limited,
 of Regina.

Mr. Hanbidge asked the Government the following Question,
 which was answered by Hon. Mr. Stewart:

- (1) Was Chas. A. Henderson, Road Supervisor prior to
 September 9, 1929, on Highway 31, between Millerdale
 and Stranraer in the Kerrobert Constituency?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Was this the same C. A. Henderson who was publisher
 and proprietor of the Dodsland Prairie Times, a news
 paper published at Dodsland?

Answer: Do not know

- (3) Was this C. A. Henderson who was in charge of the
 "Whispering Campaign" in the Kerrobert Constituency
 in the last general election on behalf of the late adminis-
 tration?

Answer: Have no knowledge.

- (4) Were the services of the said C. A. Henderson as Road
 Supervisor dispensed with by the Minister of Highways
 in the new Government?

Answer: Yes, on September 21, 1929.

- (5) Was he notified by wire that his services would be no longer required?

Answer: No. He was notified by letter on September 18th.

- (6) If not, why not?

Answer: Did not seem necessary.

- (7) Was the said Henderson replaced by an efficient and capable Road Builder?

Answer: Yes.

Mr Hutcheon asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Who was the Supervisor of Beer Storage at Kerrobert prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: G. E. Barlett.

- (2) Did the said Supervisor take an active interest in the last general election as an active and partisan supporter of the late Government?

Answer: The Board had no knowledge of such activity.

- (3) When was he appointed and on whose recommendation was the appointment made?

Answer: May 19th, 1926, on the recommendation of the Liquor Board.

- (4) Have his services been dispensed with?

Answer: Yes.

- (5) Who is the new Supervisor of Beer Storage at Kerrobert?

Answer: Thomas Foreman.

- (6) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Taylor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Was there an Inspector of Beer Stores in the employ of the Liquor Commission prior to September 9, 1929, by the name of Curtis A. Willsie?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Did the said Willsie participate in the recent election campaign in the Kerrobert Constituency in an active and-partisan manner on behalf of the late Government?

Answer: The Board had no knowledge of such activity.

- (3) Has the said Willsie been dismissed from his position as Inspector?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) Was he a returned man?

Answer: No.

- (5) Was a successor by the name of Harry Griffin appointed from the Kerrobert Constituency?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Is he a returned man?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Loptson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Who is the Crown Prosecutor at Melville?

Answer: Harold Edward Ross.

- (2) Was he an Official Agent of a political candidate during the election of June 6, 1929?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Eades asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Was one A. E. Wahl the Beer Vendor at Tramping Lake prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Was the said Wahl a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (3) When was he appointed?

Answer: August 19th, 1925.

- (4) By whom was he recommended?

Answer: By the Liquor Board.

- (5) Have his services been dispensed with?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Did he engage in an active partisan participation in the recent election?

Answer: The Liquor Board had no knowledge of such participation.

- (7) Has a new Beer Vendor been appointed?

Answer: Yes.

- (8) If so, is he a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Given asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Who was the Beer Vendor at Fusilier, Saskatchewan, prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: P. A. Heffner.

- (2) By whom was he recommended?

Answer: By the Liquor Board.

- (3) Was he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (4) When was he appointed?

Answer: 1st May, 1928.

- (5) Is it not a fact that two returned men by the names of Guthrie and Thompson applied for the position before the beer store was opened up?

Answer: No applications received by the Liquor Board from Fusilier from persons named Guthrie and Thompson.

- (6) Why was a returned soldier not appointed?

Answer: At the time the store opened no Returned Soldier from Fusilier had made application.

- (7) Did the said Vendor take an active and partisan interest in the last election in be half of the late Government?

Answer: Not to the knowledge of the Liquor Board.

- (8) Have his services been dispensed with?

Answer: Yes.

- (9) Is the new Vendor a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

- (10) When was his appointment made?

Answer: December 28th, 1929.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. MacPherson:

- (1) Was James H. Lindsay, K.C., dismissed as Agent of the Attorney General at Prince Albert?

Answer: His appointment was discontinued.

- (2) If so, when was he dismissed and why was he dismissed?

Answer: His appointment was discontinued on the 25th of October 1929 and Samuel John Albert Branion, K. C. was appointed in his stead.

- (3) Is the said Lindsay a Bencher of the Law Society of Saskatchewan?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

- (5) Who was appointed in his place and stead?

Answer: See Answer to Question 2.

- (6) Was the new appointee at the time of his appointment President of the Provincial Conservative Association for Prince Albert?

Answer: The Department has no record of this matter.

- (7) Was the said new appointee actively engaged on behalf of the Conservative Candidate in the Prince Albert Constituency during the last Provincial election?

Answer: The Department has no record of this matter.

- (8) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (9) Who recommended his appointment to the Attorney General of Saskatchewan?

Answer: The Attorney General assumes responsibility for the appointment.

- (10) Was the Conservative Executive at Prince Albert consulted in the matter of this appointment?

Answer: See answer to question 9.

Mr Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by Hon. Mr. Munroe:

- (1) What allowance is being made to Inspectors Ewing and Rogers by the Government for expenses in connection with the carrying on of their public duties?

Answer: They are allowed actual expenses when travelling.

- (2) How much has been paid to each for expenses since the commencement of their employment, in respect to hotel expenses, travelling expenses, automobile hire or other expense?

Answer: Inspector Ewing has received \$195.75 for expenses to January 31, 1930, the date of last expense account he submitted, this amount being made up as follows:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Hotel expenses | 119.85 |
| Railway fares | 48.80 |
| Livery and taxi hire | 16.00 |
| Sleeping accommodation on trains | 7.50 |
| Expenses for telephone and postage..... | 3.60 |

Inspector Rogers has received \$188.60 for expenses to February 6, 1930, the date of the last expense account he submitted, this amount being made up as follows:

| | |
|--|----------|
| Hotel expenses | \$125.60 |
| Railway fares | 36.50 |
| Livery and taxi hire | 19.00 |
| Sleeping accommodation on trains | 7.50 |

- (3) Who recommended the appointment of these men to the Minister and what special qualifications have either or both of them for their jobs?

Answer: They were appointed as a result of personal application to the Minister.

Mr. Ewing possesses a First Class Teacher's Certificate for Saskatchewan, and has had twenty-five years' experience in commercial life in this province.

Mr. Rogers has a high school education, was a commercial traveller for fifteen years, and has also had additional private business experience.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:

- (1) Was one Hyatt in the employ of the Game Branch of the Department of Labour and Industries?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Was he dismissed from the service and, if so, when?

Answer: Yes. November 10th, 1929.

- (3) Why was he dismissed?

Answer: In the public interest.

- (4) If dismissed for cause, was he given an opportunity to answer the charges against him?

Answer: The Minister is always available for an interview. No opportunity was asked for.

- (5) Was he furnished with particulars of the charges, if any, against him?

Answer: See answer to Question 4.

- (6) Was he a returned soldier?

Answer: Hyatt's application for employment does not indicate any army service.

- (7) Who was appointed in his place?

Answer: E. W. Roach.

- (8) Who recommended the appointment of the new appointee to the Government?

Answer: The Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries recommended the appointment of the new appointee to the Government.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question: which was answered by Hon. Mr. Bryant:

- (1) Who is supplying coal to the Court House and Jail at Prince Albert?

Answer: The McDermid Lumber Company.

- (2) What kind of coal is being used and what price is being paid for it?

Answer: Tofield Headlight Coal at \$1.75 per ton, f.o.b. mine.

- (3) Were public tenders called for the purchase of this coal?

Answer: No.

- (4) If so, who tendered and what was the amount of the various tenders submitted?

Answer: See answer to Question 3.

- (5) Were tenders called for by public notice in the press?

Answer: See answer to Question 3.

- (6) If no tenders were called for, why not?

Answer: This is a standard mine price, and coal can be shipped through any dealer. It is the same coal and at the same price as has been used in previous years.

According to Order the following Bills were severally read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills:—

- Bill No. 01—An Act to confirm a certain Bylaw of the City of Saskatoon and a certain Agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and the City of Saskatoon of the other part and for other purposes.
- Bill No 06—An Act to amend Chapter 46 of the Statutes of 1910-11, as amended.
- Bill No. 02—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.
- Bill No. 05—An Act to amend An Act incorporating The Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons.
- Bill No. 010—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.
- Bill No. 03—An Act to incorporate The Sisters of the Order of St. Dominic.
- Bill No. 04—An Act respecting the London and Western Trusts Company Limited and the Standard Trusts Company.
- Bill No. 07—An Act dealing with certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw.
- Bill No. 08—An Act to confirm certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and a certain Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

By leave of the Assembly, the Order "Special Order" was reverted to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Lilly, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 21—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, 1925.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 22—An Act respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 23—An Act to amend The Town Planning Act, 1928.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 24—An Act to amend The Municipalities Relief Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 25—An Act to amend The Municipalities Seed Grain Act.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 26—An Act to amend The Treasury Department Act.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 27—An Act to amend The Liquor Act, 1925.

Hon. Mr. McPherson, Second reading Friday next.

Bill No. 28—An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1927.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Friday next.

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

Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and make recommendations concerning the Provincial Mental Hospitals and Mental Hygiene conditions in the Province.

(Sessional Paper No. 27)

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

(1) Has there been a change in the position of Agent of the Attorney General for the Kerrobert Judicial District?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, who was the Agent and who is now Agent?

Answer: Elton Beverley Hutcherson was formerly the agent and John Murton Hanbidge, K.C. is now the Agent.

- (3) Was the former Agent dismissed? and, if so, for what reason?

Answer: His appointment was discontinued.

- (4) Is the present Agent a brother of the Member for the Kerrobert Constituency in this Assembly?

Answer: Yes.

- (5) Is he also a law partner of the said Member?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) How much has been paid to the new Agent by the Government since his appointment?

Answer: \$403.37.

Mr Speaker,—I notice that during the Debate now proceeding there has been a great deal of interruption of Members during the course of their addresses and, as I feel sure that it is the wish of all Members that the Debates in this Assembly shall be conducted in an orderly manner, I would call the attention of all Members to the fact that while a Member who is speaking can be interrupted on a *bona fide* point of order or privilege, or for a question to be asked, or for the correction of an important misstatement, that an interruption by another Member, merely to reiterate what he may have said in his own address previously, can not be allowed; in any case, except it be on a point of order or privilege, it is only with the permission of the Member who may be speaking that any interruption may be made. In this connection I would quote Bourinot (4th Ed.) Page 353.

To avoid any misunderstanding, I now also wish to state that in future conduct of Debates I cannot allow unparliamentary language to be used by any Member, whether it is addressed or refers to another Member of this Legislature or any person outside of it, or whether it is quoted.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Huston adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6 o'clock. p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1930

The Hon. Mr. Buckle, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

Report of the Trustees of the Saskatchewan Agricultural Research Foundation for the period from February 14, 1928 to February 6, 1930, including Financial Statements for the years ending respectively on April 30, 1928 and April 30, 1929.

(*Sessional Paper No. 28*)

Mr. Therres asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) How many applications were received by the Liquor Commission for the position of Beer Vendor at Bruno?

Answer: Two.

- (2) How many of these applicants were returned soldiers?

Answer: Applicants did not state whether they were Returned Soldiers or not.

- (3) Who received the appointment?

Answer: William Godfrey.

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (5) On what date was he appointed?

Answer: December 13, 1929.

- (6) Upon whose recommendation was he appointed??

Answer: The Liquor Board.

Mr. Gordon asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What was the cost of the machinery purchased for use in the removal of snow from Provincial Highway No. 1 between Moose Jaw and Regina?

Answer:

| | |
|--|------------|
| One Snow King Rotary Plow purchased from Canada Tractor & Equipment Co., Regina | \$3,850.00 |
| One La Plant-Choate "V" Truck Snow Plow, purchased from Albert Olson Co., Regina | 860.45 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| One LaPlante Choate "V" Tractor Snow Plow and Cab, purchased from Albert Olson Co., Regina. | 3,830.00 |
| | \$8,540.45 |

Mr. Dunn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) Who is the Chief Game Commissioner?

Answer: A. E. Etter.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: November 18, 1929.

- (3) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: Twenty-seven hundred dollars (\$2700.00) per annum.

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

Mr. Patterson (Milestone) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Were any contracts for the erection of buildings let by the late Government after June 6th, 1929?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what contracts and for what buildings and what was the total cost of same?

Answer:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| New Wing, Weyburn Mental Hospital | |
| General contract | \$ 365,000.00 |
| Plumbing & Heating etc. | 185,598.00 |
| Addition to Power House, Weyburn | |
| Mental Hospital | 21,400.00 |
| Staff Building, North Battleford | |
| Mental Hospital | |
| General contract | 182,666.00 |
| Plumbing & Heating etc. | 47,930.00 |
| Court House, Estevan | 77,250.00 |
| Court House, Assiniboia | 56,400.00 |
| Nurses' Home, Prince Albert | |
| Sanitorium | 146,754.00 |
| Telephone Exchange, Kindersley | 4,881.00 |
| Power House at Leader | 7,520.00 |
| Power House at Shellbrook | 7,150.00 |

| | |
|-------|----------------|
| Total | \$1,102,549.00 |
|-------|----------------|

(3) Who were the contractors?

Answer:

Weyburn Mental Hospital
 General contract—Bird, Woodall & Simpson
 Plumbing & Heating—Vagg, Wilson & Company
 Addition to Power House—Bird, Woodall & Simpson
 Staff Building, North Battleford Mental Hospital
 General contract—A. W. Cassidy & Co. Ltd.
 Plumbing & Heating—J. Titerle
 Court House, Estevan—Wilson & Wilson Ltd.
 Court House, Assiniboia—J. L. Guay Construction Company
 Nurses' Home Prince Albert Sanitorium—Wilson & Wilson
 Telephone Exchange, Kindersley—John McKee
 Power House, Leader—McWilliam & Burden
 Power House, Shellbrook—Graham & Clunie

(4) What was the contract price in each case?

Answer: See answer to Question 2.

Mr. Johnson asked the Government the following Question: which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Munroe.

(1) What amount has been paid to each of the eleven temporary Inspectors in the employ of the Bureau of Child Protection for expenses from the date of their employment to February 15th, 1930?

Answer:

| Inspector | Date of employment | Expenses |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| W. J. Scott | Nov. 18, 1929 | \$306.30 |
| A. E. Ewing | Dec. 23, 1929 | 192.75 |
| B. H. Gray | Dec. 23, 1929 | 139.80 |
| W. H. Rogers | Dec. 23, 1929 | 188.60 |
| Percy Dallin | Jan. 6, 1930 | 148.30 |
| R. W. Morrow | Jan. 28, 1930 | 55.85 |
| C. Buckle | Feb. 10, 1930 | No expense account |
| A G. R. Bomford | Feb. 10, 1930 | submitted as yet |
| W. Waselenchuk | Feb. 10, 1930 | " " " |
| R. Bocz | Jan. 28, 1930 | " " " |
| H. A. Keown | Dec. 9, 1929 | " " " |

Mr. Eades, asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) What was the cost of printing the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs in 1928?

Answer: \$3,744.25.

- (2) What was the name of the contractor for the work?

Answer: The Leader Publishing Company, Limited, of Regina.

- (3) What contractor was the successful tenderer on the work of printing this report in October, 1929?

Answer: The Leader-Post Publishing Company, Limited, but very shortly after their tender was accepted The Commercial Printers, Limited, took over the job plant of The Leader-Post Publishing Company, Limited, and the account for the job was rendered by and paid to The Commercial Printers, Limited of Regina.

- (4) What was the amount of the tender and what saving does it represent as against the price charged by the contractor in 1928?

Answer: \$2,263.00. This amount represents a saving of \$1,481.25.

- (5) Was the contractor for the work in 1928 the same contractor who was the successful tenderer in 1929?

Answer: No. The successful tenderer purchased the Job Plant of The Leader Publishing Company, Ltd., after the defeat of the Gardiner Government.

- (6) If so, did the manager of this Concern give evidence before the Public Accounts Committee in 1929 to the effect that in the event of tenders being called on Government Printing contracts, the prices tendered by his firm would be the same as those charged under the King's Printer's schedule?

Answer: Mr. Lance, who gave evidence before the Public Accounts Committee in 1929, was manager of the Leader Publishing Co., Job Plant. The same gentleman is now manager of The Commercial Printers, Limited, the successful tenderer in this case.

- (7) Was the said manager under Oath when he gave the evidence referred to?

Mr. Strath asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Is R. M. Johnson in the employ of the Government?

Answer: No.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Registrar under The Security Frauds Prevention Act?

Answer: Ernest Arthur Mathews.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: 25th November 1929.

- (3) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: \$2,100.00 per annum.

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Is A. W. Beale in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) By what Department and in what capacity is he employed?

Answer: He is employed in the Department of Telephones as night watchman at the warehouse.

- (3) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: \$75.00 per month.

- (4) How long has he been employed?

Answer: He has been employed since the 8th of February, 1930.

Mr. Taylor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Who printed the June, 1929, issue of the Regina City Telephone Directory?

Answer: The Leader Publishing Company, Limited, of Regina.

- (2) What was the price paid for the work?

Answer: \$4,584.02.

- (3) Was this an entirely new job of printing or was it printed from standing type?

Answer: This job was printed from part standing type and part new type.

- (4) Did the Leader Publishing Company print the January 1930, issue of the said Directory?

Answer: No.

- (5) What was the amount of the saving effected by the change of printers?

Answer: \$396.47.

Mr. Hanbidge asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Was Joe Blanche in the employ of the Liquor Board prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) What were his duties?

Answer: District Supervisor.

- (3) When was he employed?

Answer: From April 3, 1926.

- (4) Who recommended him?

Answer: The Liquor Board.

- (5) Did he draw a salary from the Liquor Board for the two months prior to June 6, 1929?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Was he in charge of the political organization of the late Government in the Rosetown and Elrose constituencies prior to June 6, 1929?

Answer: Not to the knowledge of the Liquor Board.

- (7) If so, was he handling such political organization with the consent of the former Government?

Answer: See answer to question 6.

- (8) Was the former head of the Liquor Board not aware of the fact that for weeks prior to June 6, 1929, the said Blanche was engaged solely in political organization work?

Answer: See answer to Question 6.

Mr. Given asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson.

- (1) Who was the Beer Vendor at Fiske prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: T. A. Mitchell

(2) Was he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

(3) Has he been dismissed?

Answer: Yes.

(4) Has he been replaced by a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Gordon,—For a Return showing:—

- (1) Copies of all questionnaires sent out to School Inspectors from September 9, 1929, to the present date.
- (2) Copies of all replies received to such questionnaires.

According to Order, Bill No. 09—An Act to incorporate The Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills.

By leave of the Assembly, the Order “Special Order” was reverted to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. McGregor adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10.50 o'clock.

REGINA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1930.

Mr. Gordon asked the Government the following Question:—
which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) What was the cost to the Liquor Board of beer purchased from each brewery located within the Province during the calendar year 1929?

Answer:

| | Cost to Board of Beer Purchased | Prepaid Express Freight and Cartage Chargeable to Breweries. | Payments to Breweries |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Adanac Brewing Co. Ltd. | \$273,452.52 | \$3,970.43 | \$269,482.09 |
| American Brewing Co. Ltd. | 430,602.18 | 5,935.34 | 424,666.84 |
| The Hub City Brewing Co., Ltd. | 249,198.85 | 4,003.36 | 245,195.49 |
| Prince Albert Breweries Ltd. | 664,578.57 | 8,909.52 | 655,669.05 |
| Red Wing Brewing Co., Ltd. | 28,616.63 | 331.40 | 28,285.23 |
| The Regina Brewing Co. Ltd. | 445,753.52 | 6,136.53 | 439,616.99 |
| The Saskatoon Brewing Co. Ltd. | 787,872.00 | 10,476.73 | 777,395.27 |
| The Sour's Breweries, Ltd. | 162,480.26 | 3,206.30 | 159,273.96 |
| Star Brewing Co. Ltd. | 96,269.08 | 1,192.80 | 95,076.28 |
| Total Saskatchewan | \$3,138,823.61 | \$44,162.41 | \$3,094,661.20 |

- (2) What was the cost to the Board of all beer purchased during the same period from all breweries without the Province?

Answer:

| | Cost to Board of Beer Purchased | Prepaid Express Freight and Cartage Chargeable to Breweries. | Payments to Breweries |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Calgary Brewing & Malting Co., Ltd. | \$747,782.11 | \$9,531.61 | \$738,250.50 |
| The Drewry's Limited..... | 759,204.62 | 10,137.02 | 749,067.60 |
| The Lethbridge Breweries Ltd..... | 459,819.80 | 5,943.79 | 453,876.01 |
| Pelissiers' Limited | 198,034.64 | 2,881.67 | 195,152.97 |
| Premier Brewing Co., Ltd. | 2,352.67 | 55.21 | 2,297.46 |
| Shea's Winnipeg Brewery Ltd. | 562,666.08 | 7,332.26 | 555,333.82 |
| Total Outside | \$2,729,859.92 | \$35,881.56 | \$2,693,978.36 |

- (3) What was the amount paid to each individual brewery during the said period?

Answer: See answers to questions 1 and 2.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell.

- (1) What was the amount paid for travelling and other expenses to William J. Gibbins employed in the Department of Municipal Affairs for the month of October, 1929?

Answer: \$237.06.

Mr. Agar asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Has the Government retained the firm of Duckworth and Nut to make investigations or secure information for the Government?

Answer: No.

- (2) If so, under what arrangement is the firm working?

Answer: See answer to Question (1)

- (3) What amount has already been paid to this firm or any member thereof by way of retainer, salary or expenses?

Answer: See answer to Question (1)

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Patterson (Pipestone)—For a Return showing:—

Copies of all Reports respecting the Department of Telephones received from O. J. Godfrey and George Munnoch and Company.

By leave of the Assembly the Order "Special Order" was reverted to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades of the tenth instant.

Saturday, February, 22, 1930.

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. MacPherson, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 12.50 o'clock. a.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1930.

Mr. Eades, from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the first report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Eades as its Chairman.

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same with amendment:

Bill No. 04—An Act respecting the London and Western Trusts Company, Limited and the Standard Trusts Company.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 29—An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 30—An Act for the Licensing of Book Agents.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 31—An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1929

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 32—An Act to amend The Prairie and Forest Fires Act.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second reading Thursday next.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is one Cornelius Rink of Regina in the employ of the Government?

Answer: No.

Mr. McIntosh asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Is one George Munnoch in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes, temporarily.

- (2) If so, in what Department, and in what capacity is he employed?

Answer: He has been employed in connection with the Telephone Department, the Department of Public Works, and in general investigation of irregularities.

- (3) Where is his place of residence?

Answer: Winnipeg, Manitoba, and Calgary, Alberta.

- (4) What salary is he being paid, and what allowance is being made him for expenses?

Answer: \$15.00 per day and actual expenses.

- (5) What is the nature of his work?

Answer: He is an investigator and efficiency expert.

Mr. Parker (Touchwood) asked the Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) What kind of coal is being supplied to the Government Buildings at Moosomin?

Answer: Bellevue Steam Lump coal to Jail, Saskatchewan briquettes to Court House and Land Titles Building.

- (2) What price is being paid for it?

Answer: Bellevue Steam Lump, \$10.50 per ton.
Saskatchewan briquettes, \$11.65 per ton.

- (3) Who is supplying it?

Answer: Bellevue Steam Lump—O. Neff.
Saskatchewan briquettes—Western Dominion Collieries.

- (4) Were tenders for coal supply called for?

Answer: No. We started the season using briquettes in order to use up the 20,000 tons purchased by the late Government, but this proving unsatisfactory in the Jail after the season was advanced we purchased new coal at the market price from the local agent without tender as it was urgently required, and the coal being used is the most satisfactory for the heating plant.

- (5) Was contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Answer: See answer to No. 4.

Mr. Strath asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) Who was the Manager of the Swift Current Employment Office?

Answer: A. B. Shaw.

- (2) Were his services satisfactory?

Answer: As an office manager, yes, but he seemed unable to obtain the confidence of some of the patrons of the office.

- (3) Has he been discharged?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) If so, on what date?

Answer: February 1st, 1930.

- (5) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Who has been appointed to the position?

Answer: Geoffrey Mayhew.

- (7) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

Mr. Ayre asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is one J. L. McKennitt in the employ of the Government?

Answer: No.

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Has one William Allen formerly of Disley and now in the employ of the Government ever been convicted in the Province for any offence against the laws of the Province or Federal laws in force in the Province?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, when, where, and by whom was he convicted?

Answer: On the 8th of December 1922 at Regina by A. Grainger, J.P., and fined \$50.00 and costs for having liquor in a place other than a dwelling house contrary to the provisions of The Saskatchewan Temperance Act.

- (3) What penalty was imposed on him each time of conviction?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

- (4) What was the nature of the offence for which he was convicted in each instance?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Has R. M. Robinson been in the employ of the Department of Highways and, if so, between what dates?

Answer: Yes. He was employed temporarily from September 14th to November 30, 1929.

- (2) In what capacity was he employed?

Answer: Inspector of Relief road work.

- (3) What salary was he paid?

Answer: \$6.00 per day

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson.

- (1) Who is the Beer Vendor at Meacham?

Answer: Carl Carlson.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: November 21st, 1929.

- (3) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (4) From whom did the Liquor Board receive applications for the position?

Answer: Carl Carlson, Richard J. F. G. Titman, Wm. M. Barrand, all of Meacham, Saskatchewan, and Stanley Clouston of Peterson, P.O. Saskatchewan.

- (5) How many of these applicants were returned soldiers?

Answer: Three.

- (6) Why was a returned soldier not given the preference when the appointment was made?

Answer: Because the Liquor Board appointed Carl Carlson.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) In connection with the coal purchased for the Court House and Jail at Prince Albert what price per ton is being paid for this coal delivered at the buildings in question?

Answer: Prince Albert Jail—\$4.75 F.O.B. track, as follows:

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Coal | \$1.75 |
| Freight | 2.90 |
| Switching approx. | .10 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$4.75 |

Court House and Land Titles Building—\$5.50 as follows:

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Coal | \$1.75 |
| Freight | 2.90 |
| Switching approx. | .10 |
| Cartage | .75 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$5.50 |

- (2) Is it a fact that the price now being paid is twenty-five cents a ton higher than the price paid for same coal in 1928-1929.

Answer: No.

- (3) If not, is it any higher than said 1928-29 price?

Answer: See answer to No. 2.

- (4) If so, why such increase?

Answer: See answer to No. 2.

- (5) Is it a fact that the same firm now supplying said institutions is supplying the same coal to the City of Prince Albert as a result of a public tender at a price considerably less than the price charged the Government?

Answer: The Government has no information on this matter, price is the same as in previous year.

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

Ordered, That when the Assembly adjourns on Tuesday, February 25, it do stand adjourned until Thursday, February 27, 1930, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Eades, seconded by Mr. Taylor,

That an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, as follows:—

TO HIS HONOUR, THE HONOURABLE H. W. NEWLANDS,

Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,—

We, His Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, in Session assembled,

humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

The debate continuing, and the question being put, it was agreed to.

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

Ordered, That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

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

Resolved, That Duncan Selby Hutcheon, Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of Arm River, be the Deputy Speaker of this Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell, seconded by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson

Resolved, That this Assembly will on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider a Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Buckle

Resolved, That this Assembly will on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

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

Public Accounts of the Province of Saskatchewan for the fiscal period ended April 30, 1929. *(Sessional Paper No. 29)*

Also,—Statement of Attorney General's Opinions; Treasury Board Decisions; and of Special Warrants and Expenditures thereunder for the fiscal year 1928-29.

(Sessional Paper No. 30)

Also,—Annual Report of the Administration of The Agricultural Aids Act for the fiscal year 1928-29.

(Sessional Paper No. 31)

And also,—Annual Report of the Provincial Auditor upon the accounts of the Administrator of Estates of the Mentally Incompetent for the fiscal year ended April 30, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 32)

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bryant,

Ordered, That the Public Accounts of the Province of Saskatchewan for the fiscal period ended April 30, 1929, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing.

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

Bill No. 3—An Act to amend The Jury Act.

Bill No. 4—An Act to provide for the Registration of Corporation Securities.

Bill No. 6—An Act to amend The Partnership Act.

Bill No. 7—An Act to amend The Homesteads Act.

Bill No. 8—An Act to amend The Assignment of Book Debts Act 1929.

Bill No. 12—An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

Bill No. 14—An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

Bill No. 15—An Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act, 1929.

Bill No. 22—An Act respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.

Bill No. 24—An Act to amend The Municipalities Relief Act, 1929.

Bill No. 25—An Act to amend The Municipalities Seed Grain Act.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.15 o'clock. p.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1930.

Mr. Eades, from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the second report of the said committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same with amendment:—

Bill No. 08—An Act to confirm Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and a Certain Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is the Government aware that Police Magistrate Torney, subsequent to his appointment as Police Magistrate, addressed a political meeting in the City of Moose Jaw?

Answer: No.

- (2) Does the Government approve of such action by a Civil Servant?

Answer: No.

Mr. Strath to ask the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Manager of the Liquor Store at Kipling?

Answer: W. T. H. Parr.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: December 17, 1929.

- (3) What are his qualifications?

Answer: Good public school education and business experience.

- (4) By whom was he recommended to the Attorney General?

Answer: The Liquor Board assumes responsibility for the appointment.

- (5) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

Mr. Gordon asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is one Reese in the employ of the Liquor Board?

Answer: Yes, F. Reese.

- (2) If so, when was he appointed and from what date?

Answer: April 5th, 1926.

- (3) In what capacity is he employed?

Answer: Beer Store Vendor, Theodore, Saskatchewan.

- (4) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: Ninety Dollars (\$90.00) per month.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Bryant, seconded by Mr. Hanbidge,

That all matters referred to in the Declarations of J. B. Wilson, James Gallon, Sterling McGonigal, Thomas R. Duckworth, James Taylor, James McKenzie, Joseph McKenzie, and Smoky Johnson be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing to inquire into, call witnesses and hear evidence upon:

- (a) All matters pertaining to the administration of affairs by the Liquor Commission:
- (b) All matters pertaining to the administration of the Liquor Laws under the Liberal administration in Saskatchewan:
- (c) All matters pertaining to the interference with the administration of justice by Civil Servants or others:
- (d) All matters pertaining to the administration of the Regina Jail camp on the Parliament Buildings grounds and the administration of the Regina Jail, with particular reference to all matters pertaining to the dismissal of Thomas Hayes and others from the staff of the said Regina Jail.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr. Spence,

That all the words after "That" to the end of the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this Assembly do humbly petition His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to appoint a Commission of at least three Judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench for Saskatchewan, or of His Majesty's Court of Appeal of the said Province, or from both of said Courts, for the purpose of enquiring into the statements made in the Statutory Declarations, now a part of the record of this Assembly, and placed therein by the Minister of Public Works, and for the purpose of enquiring into any other matter which the Government of the Province may see fit to refer to such Commission, and that such Commission do report to this Legislature."

The debate continuing, it was moved by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson.

That the debate be now adjourned.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Fraser | Benson |
| Whatley | Smith | Horner |
| Stipe | (Moose Jaw City) | Patterson |
| Buckle | Warren | (Milestone) |
| MacPherson | Given | McLean |
| Anderson | Gryde | Huston |
| McConnell | Cobban | Greaves |
| Bryant | Grassick | Hanbidge |
| Stewart | Merkley | Lilly |
| Smith | Munroe | McLeod |
| (Swift Current) | Whittaker | Eades |
| Bennett | Arthur | Miller—33 |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| Parker | Grant | Hall |
| (Touchwood) | Therres | Loptson |
| Finlayson | McGregor | Johnson |
| Gordon | Hogan | Strath |
| Spence | McIntosh | Parker |
| Davis | Cockburn | (Pelly) |
| Gardiner | Paulson | Dunn |
| Uhrich | Agar | Garner |
| Patterson | Huck | Ayre—26 |
| (Pipestone) | | |
| Clinch | | |

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

On the following Bills progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again:

Bill No. 12—An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

Bill No. 22—An Act respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.

Bill No. 24—An Act to amend The Municipalities Relief Act, 1929.

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

Bill No. 8—An Act to amend The Assignment of Book Debts Act, 1929.

Bill No. 14—An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

Bill No. 15—An Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act, 1929.

Bill No. 25—An Act to amend The Municipalities Seed Grain Act.

The following Bills were severally reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:

Bill No. 6—An Act to amend The Partnership Act.

Bill No. 3—An Act to amend The Jury Act.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting:

Bill No. 5—An Act to amend The Marriage Act, 1924.

Bill No. 9—An Act to amend The Executions Act.

Bill No. 13—An Act to amend The Corporations Taxation Act.

Bill No. 16—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Northern Saskatchewan Co-operative Stock Yards, Limited.

Bill No. 17—An Act to amend The Horticultural Societies Act, 1928.

Bill No. 26—An Act to amend The Treasury Department Act.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10.20 o'clock, p.m. until Thursday, February 27, 1930, at 3 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1930.

Mr. Eades, from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills presented the third report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same without amendment:—

Bill No. 06—An Act to amend Chapter 46 of the Statutes of 1910-11, as amended.

Your Committee also has had under consideration the following Bills and has agreed to report the same with amendments:—

Bill No. 03—An Act to incorporate The Sisters of The Order of Saint Dominic;

Bill No. 05—An Act to amend An Act incorporating The Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons;

Bill No. 09—An Act to incorporate The Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Munroe have leave to introduce Bill No. 33—An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Permanent Cancer Commission.

The Hon. Mr. Munroe, 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 for second reading on Monday next.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 34—An Act respecting Agreements for Payments to Vendors, Lessors and Others by Shares of Crops.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Monday next.

Bill No. 35—An Act to amend The Companies Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Monday next.

Bill No. 36—An Act respecting the Amalgamation of Lloydminster.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second reading, Monday next.

Bill No. 37—An Act respecting Barbers and Beauticians.

Mr. Given, Second reading Monday next.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Anderson have leave to introduce Bill No. 38—An Act to authorize the Guarantee by the Government of Saskatchewan of Certain Advances made to the Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, 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 and read the first time; by leave of the Assembly the provisions of Standing Order 42 were suspended and the said Bill was read the second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole this day.

The Hon. Mr. McConnell, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board for the year ended December 31, 1929.

(*Sessional Paper No. 33*)

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Is T. A. McInnis, Commissioner of Publications, a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (2) Is he the "T. A. McInnis" who wrote an article appearing in The Winnipeg Tribune on February 1, 1930 entitled "Saskatchewan Claims"?

Answer: Yes.

- (3) If so, was this article written under instructions from the Government and as a regular part of his duties as Commissioner of Publications?

Answer: This article was not written under instructions from the Government and was not written as part of his duties as Commissioner of Publications. It was not written in the office of the Bureau, but was a work undertaken by him prior to his appointment.

- (4) Is he related to, and, if so, in what way, the proprietors of McInnis Bros. Limited?

Answer: He is a brother of Major Walter McInnis and of Alderman E. B. McInnis.

- (5) Is he financially interested in the McInnis Press?

Answer: No.

Mr Gordon asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Were any contracts for gravelling Provincial Highways made subsequent to September 9, 1929, for which tenders were not called?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) What was the name of the contractor, the section of highway and the amount of each such contract?

Answer: Stevens Bros. (Saskatchewan) Ltd., Broadview to Wolseley, estimated amount of contract, \$51,000, awarded in lieu of Esterhazy to Dubuc and Dubuc to Neudorf contracts, which were cancelled. Evans Gravel Surfacing Co., Wolseley to Indian Head, estimated amount of contract, \$47,500, awarded in lieu of Humboldt East and West contract, which was cancelled.

T. V. Simpson, Yorkton North, \$3,000.

S.D. Brooks, Sutherland to Forestry Farm, \$3,512.10.

Mr. Therres asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Why was the appointment of Dr. H. R. Fleming of Humboldt, as a Coroner, cancelled?

Answer: The Lieutenant Governor in Council in the exercise of his discretion saw fit to discontinue the appointment.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is E. A. Mathews, Registrar under the Security Frauds Prevention Act, the E. A. Mathews whose letter "In Defence of Mr. Meighen" appears in the Regina Daily Star of February 18, 1930?

Answer: No.

Mr. Miller asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Was the contract for gravelling nine miles East of Biggar on No. 14 Highway advertised for tenders?

Answer: No.

- (2) If not, why not?

Answer: No contract for nine miles was awarded, but a contract was awarded for 14.6 miles of gravelling on the Perdue to Biggar Highway, Project 14. Owing to the lateness of the season, time would not permit advertising for tenders. Contract was afterwards enlarged to include regravelling of 3.1 miles on the Biggar East road, same project, making a total of 17.7 miles gravelled.

- (3) If so, in what papers was the advertisement inserted?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

- (4) How much time was given contractors to put in tenders?

Answer: See answer to questions 2 and 3.

- (5) Did Evans and Company tender for same?

Answer: Prices were submitted by the Evans Gravel Surfacing Co. and their prices being satisfactory to the Department, a contract was awarded to this Company on October 13th, 1928.

- (6) What was the amount of tender?

Answer: The amount paid under this contract was \$50,-736.55.

Mr. Miller asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Munroe:—

- (1) Does St. Margaret's Hospital at Biggar receive a Government grant?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what grant does it receive?

Answer: A grant of fifty cents per patient per day, in accordance with the provisions of The Hospitals Act.

- (3) Does a hospital have to be up to a certain standard in respect to building, staff and equipment before it is entitled to receive a government grant?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) Is St. Margaret's Hospital up to the standard in respect to building, in respect to equipment and in respect to staff?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Miller asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Was E. Walline employed by the Liquor Board for the Liquor Store at Biggar in 1927?

Answer: E. E. Wallin was employed from December 10th, 1925 to September 10th, 1927 in the Liquor Store at Biggar.

- (2) Was he discharged in 1927?

Answer: No.

- (3) Was he a disabled returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) Why was he discharged?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

- (5) Was the former vendor's wife placed on the Liquor Board staff in his stead?

Answer: No.

- (6) Was one M. Playford, employed by the Liquor Board at Biggar, the vendor's wife?

Answer: K. M. Playford employed in the store at Biggar was the Vendor's wife.

Mr. Miller asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Was contract for gravelling three miles East of Biggar on No. 14 Highway advertised for tenders?

Answer: No.

- (2) Did O. Woods tender for same?

Answer: When tenders were called for the construction of the Perdue and Biggar Highway and the contract was awarded to Fred Mannix, no gravelling was considered necessary. During the progress of the work it was revealed that the surfacing with gravel of two and one-half miles of highway would be advantageous to the road, and, therefore, the contractor was requested to submit a price for gravelling. The price submitted by Contractor Mannix of \$3.00 per cubic yard was regarded as being too high, and the departmental engineer in charge of the work was instructed by the Department to secure quotations from local parties. He secured a price from O. Woods of \$1.70 per cubic yard which he considered to be reasonable, and submitted this quotation to the Chief Field Engineer who recommended that the offer of Woods be accepted. On his recommendation Woods' offer for this gravelling work was accepted by the Deputy Minister.

- (3) What was the amount of contract?

Answer: \$6,488.50.

Mr. Parker (Touchwood), asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is one John Wilkinson in the employ of the Government?

Answer: No.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Agar, for a Return showing:

The amount authorized by the Department of Highways between September 9, 1929, and December 31, 1929, for expenditure in each constituency for each of the following purposes:

- (1) Gravelling Provincial highways;
- (2) Reconditioning Provincial highways;
- (3) New construction Provincial highways;
- (4) Grants to Rural Municipalities;
- (5) Expenditures by Rural Municipalities to be repaid to them out of 1930-31 appropriation;
- (6) Capital Account Bridges;
- (7) Timber Bridges.

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

Bill No. 04—An Act respecting the London and Western Trusts Company, was reported without amendment, read the third time and passed.

Bill No. 08—An Act to confirm Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and a Certain Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware, progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 3—An Act to amend The Jury Act.

Bill No. 6—An Act to amend The Partnership Act.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 38—An Act to authorize the Guarantee by the Government of Saskatchewan of Certain Advances made to the Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited, which was reported without amendment, and, by leave of the Assembly, read the third time and passed.

According to Order, the Hon. Mr. Anderson moved,
That Bill No. 1—An Act to amend The School Act (No. 1) be now read the second time.

A debate arising, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Gardiner, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 39—An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second reading Tuesday, March 11, 1930.

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

Ordered, That when the Assembly adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Monday, March 10, 1930, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the following Bills, which were reported without amendment, read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 06—An Act to amend Chapter 46 of the Statutes of 1910-11, as amended.

Bill No. 03—An Act to incorporate The Sisters of the Order of Saint Dominic.

Bill No. 05—An Act to amend An Act incorporating The Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons.

Bill No. 09—An Act to incorporate The Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited.

Bill No. 08—An Act to confirm Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and a Certain Agreement entered into between the City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

By leave of the Assembly, the Order "Government Orders" was reverted to.

Mr. Speaker:

With reference to the point of Order raised by the Honourable The Premier in yesterday's debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 1, An Act to amend the School Act (No. 1), as to the relevancy of the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I now rule that when a Bill to amend any Act comes up for second Reading that the principle of the original Act may properly be discussed in connection with the Second Reading of the Bill, providing, of course, that the Member speaking can satisfy the House that his remarks are strictly relevant to the amending Bill; in other words, that the principle involved in the amendments proposed in the Bill do affect certain other principles in the original Act.

I would, therefore, rule that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition might proceed with his remarks if he can explicitly state and prove that they are strictly in accordance with this principle.

It must not be overlooked, however, that the question before the Assembly is "that Bill No. 1, An Act to amend the School Act (No. 1) be now read the Second time," and that the only amendment to same which can now be considered is as to the time for this Second Reading or to the effect that the principle of the Bill might adversely affect or contradict some principle in the original Act; that is, that no amendments of any clauses in the amending Bill can be made at this stage; such amendments would have to be made in Committee.

In connection with this matter, I would quote the following from Bourinot (4th Ed. Page 340 and 509), and Beauchesne (2nd Ed. Sec. 755).

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Anderson,

That Bill No. 1—An Act to amend The School Act, (No. 1), be now read the second time.

The debate continuing,

9.10 o'clock p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the chamber and taken 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 to amend The Jury Act.

An Act to amend The Partnership Act.

An Act to amend The Assignment of Book Debts Act, 1929.

An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

An Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act, 1929.

An Act to amend The Municipalities Seed Grain Act.

An Act to authorize the Guarantee by the Government of Saskatchewan of certain advances made to the Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.

An Act to incorporate The Sisters of the Order of Saint Dominic.

An Act respecting the London and Western Trusts Company, Limited and the Standard Trusts Company.

An Act to amend An Act incorporating The Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons.

An Act to amend Chapter 46 of the Statutes of 1910-11, as amended.

An Act to confirm Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw and a Certain Agreement entered into between The City of Moose Jaw and Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.

An Act to incorporate The Northern Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Limited.

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 the Lieutenant Governor then retired from the Chamber.

The debate continuing, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr Gardiner, seconded by Mr. Dunn,

That all the words after "That" in the said motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"the further consideration of the said motion be deferred until the said Bill provides that the clauses thereof should only apply in those districts wherein any minority of the resident ratepayers having children attending the school object to the presence of religious emblems in the school during school hours or the teaching by persons wearing a religious garb in such school and that in the event of complaint by such minority the Minister shall have the power to order the removal of such emblems or the discontinuance from teaching of any teacher wearing a religious garb."

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

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| Parker | Therres | Hall |
| (Touchwood) | Grant | Johnson |
| Finlayson | McGregor | Strath |
| Gordon | Hogan | Parker |
| Spence | McIntosh | (Pelly) |
| Davis | Cockburn | Dunn |
| Gardiner | Paulson | Garner |

| | | |
|-------------|------|-----------|
| Uhrich | Agar | Ayre |
| Patterson | Huck | Morken—26 |
| (Pipestone) | | |
| Clinch | | |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Smith | Horner |
| Stipe | (Moose Jaw City) | Patterson |
| Buckle | Warren | (Milestone) |
| MacPherson | Given | McLean |
| Anderson | Gryde | Huston |
| McConnell | Cobban | Taylor |
| Bryant | Grassick | Greaves |
| Stewart | Merkley | Hanbidge |
| Smith | Munroe | Lilly |
| (Swift Current) | Whittaker | McLeod |
| Bennett | Arthur | Eades |
| Fraser | Benson | Miller—33 |

The debate continuing,

Saturday, March 1, 1930.

and the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Smith | Horner |
| Stipe | (Moose Jaw City) | Patterson |
| Buckle | Warren | (Milestone) |
| MacPherson | Given | McLean |
| Anderson | Gryde | Huston |
| McConnell | Cobban | Taylor |
| Bryant | Grassick | Greaves |
| Stewart | Merkley | Hanbidge |
| Smith | Munroe | Lilly |
| (Swift Current) | Whittaker | McLeod |
| Bennett | Arthur | Eades |
| Fraser | Benson | Miller—33 |

NAYS.

Messieurs.

| | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| Parker | Grant | Hall |
| (Touchwood) | Therres | |
| Finlayson | McGregor | Johnson |
| Gordon | Hogan | Strath |
| Spence | McIntosh | Parker |
| Davis | Cockburn | (Pelly) |

Clinch
Gardiner
Uhrich
Patterson

Paulson
Agar
Huck

Dunn
Garner
Ayre
Morken—26

(Pipestone)

The said Bill was accordingly read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

The Assembly then adjourned at 1.05 o'clock a.m. until Monday, March 10, 1930.

REGINA, MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 40—An Act respecting the Engineering Profession.
Mr. Bennett, Second reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 41—An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Securities.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 42—An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 44—An Act to amend The Land Titles Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 45—An Act to provide for a Weekly Half-holiday for Shop Employees in Certain Cities.

Mr. Given, second reading Wednesday next.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. MacPherson have leave to introduce Bill No. 43—An Act to amend The Infants Act.

The Hon. Mr. MacPherson, 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 on Wednesday next.

Mr. Strath asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

(1) Who is the Sheriff at Swift Current?

Answer: James Taylor.

(2) When was he appointed and what salary is he being paid?

Answer: 29th October 1929 at a salary of \$2,500.00 per annum.

(3) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

(4) Did the Government give consideration to the appointment of a returned soldier to this position?

Answer: No returned soldier made application.

- (5) Did the present Sheriff during the last Provincial election campaign assist the present Attorney General in addressing public meetings at Neville and Swift Current in support of the Conservative candidate?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Dunn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Has A. W. Beale, recently employed by the Department of Telephones as a night watchman, ever been convicted in the Province for any offence against the laws of the Province or Federal laws in force in the Province?

Answer: A. W. Beale who was temporarily employed as night watchman in the Department of Telephones between the 8th day of February, 1930, and the 28th day of February, 1930, has been so convicted.

- (2) What was the nature of each offence for which he was convicted?

Answer: 27th December 1921 for selling Liquor contrary to The Saskatchewan Temperance Act and fined \$750.00 and costs.

3rd August 1923 for selling Liquor contrary to The Saskatchewan Temperance Act and fined \$400.00 and costs.

5th January 1925 for keeping Liquor for sale contrary to The Saskatchewan Temperance Act and fined \$200.00 and costs.

7th October 1927 for excessive purchase of liquor contrary to The Liquor Act 1925, and fined \$40.00.

- (3) What was the date of each conviction and what penalty was imposed?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. McConnell, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Buckle,

That all matters referred to in the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements as at December 31, 1929, by Walter Weston, Chartered Accountant, concerning the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board, which report has been laid on the Table, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing for the purpose of having said Report and Statements enquired into, and for the purpose of such inquiry to call witnesses and hear evidence concerning same.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. Spence,

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

“the accounts and business dealings, together with all the correspondence, of the Farm Loan Board be submitted to an investigation and thorough audit by an auditing firm of at least national reputation, such as Price, Waterhouse and Company, who can bring to bear upon such audit an experience gained by auditing the books of other organizations engaged in similar business over a like area and period, and that their report be submitted to this House for consideration at the earliest time possible.”

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

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| Parker | Clinch | Hall |
| (Touchwood) | Grant | Marion |
| Finlayson | Therres | Loptson |
| Gordon | McGregor | Johnson |
| Spence | Hogan | Strath |
| Davis | McIntosh | Dunn |
| Gardiner | Cockburn | Ayre |
| Uhrich | Paulson | Morken—26 |
| Patterson | Agar | |
| (Pipestone) | Huck | |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Fraser | Horner |
| Whatley | Smith | Patterson |
| Stipe | (Moose Jaw City) | (Milestone) |
| Buckle | Given | McLean |
| MacPherson | Gryde | Taylor |
| Anderson | Cobban | Greaves |
| McConnell | Grassick | Hanbidge |
| Bryant | Merkley | Lilly |
| Stewart | Munroe | McLeod |
| Smith | Whittaker | Eades |
| (Swift Current) | Arthur | Miller—32 |
| Bennett | Benson | |

The question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to unanimously.

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

Bill No. 10—An Act to amend The School Grants Act, 1920.

Bill No. 11—An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Bill No. 19—An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

- Bill No. 2—An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.
- Bill No. 27—An Act to amend The Liquor Act, 1925.
- Bill No. 29—An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.
- Bill No. 30—An Act for the Licensing of Book Agents.
- Bill No. 31—An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.
- Bill No. 35—An Act to amend The Companies Act, 1929.
- Bill No. 32—An Act to amend The Prairie and Forest Fires Act.
- Bill No. 23—An Act to amend The Town Planning Act, 1928.
- Bill No. 36—An Act respecting the Amalgamation of Lloydminster.

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

On Bill No. 4—An Act to provide for the Registration of Corporation Securities, progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

Bill No. 5—An Act to amend The Marriage Act, 1924, which was reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting.

Bill No. 13—An Act to amend The Corporations Taxation Act, which was reported without amendment, read the third time and passed.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10.40 o'clock. p.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 46—An Act to amend The Drugless Practitioners Act.

Mr Patterson (Milestone), Second Reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 47—An Act to provide for One Day of Rest in Seven for Certain Employees.

Mr. Patterson (Milestone), Second Reading Thursday next.

The Hon. Mr. McConnell delivered a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:—

H. W. NEWLANDS,
Lieutenant Governor.

The Lieutenant Governor transmits Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the twelve months ending April 30, 1930, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

(Sessional Paper No. 34)

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bryant,

Ordered, That the said Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) What amount has been spent to date in connection with the draining of Wascana Lake and the building of retaining wall?

Answer: Draining of Lake, 21 Cents.

Repairing of retaining wall on front of Government property, \$5,217.85.

- (2) On what basis is the work being conducted?

Answer: As a relief measure, by day labor, at the current wage.

Mr. Huston asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) What was the cost of the last Royal Grain Inquiry Commission?

Answer: \$117,169.54.

- (2) What was the amount paid to each member of the Commission?

Answer:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Chief Justice Hon. J. T. Brown | \$14,000.00 |
| Dean W. J. Rutherford | 7,000.00 |
| A. J. Stoneman | 7,000.00 |

Moved by Mr. Given, seconded by Mr. Gryde,

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Dominion Government should grant to the Provinces federal aid for highway construction and that such federal aid should be based on mileage and not on population; and further, that this Assembly urge the Federal Government to undertake, during the year 1930, the construction of a Trans-Canada Highway.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Spence, seconded by Mr. Gordon,

That all the words after "based on" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"such additions to the annual free subsidies as are now received by the Provinces from the Federal authority and be increased by a sum sufficient to permit the Provinces to undertake a more extensive programme of highway construction and that such programme shall include Saskatchewan's share of a Trans-Canada Highway."

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Davis, adjourned.

According to Order, Bill No. 37—An Act respecting Barbers and Beauticians, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

According to Order, Bill No. 5—An Act to amend The Marriage Act, 1924, was read the third time and passed.

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 to amend The School Act (No. 1).

Bill No. 10—An Act to amend The School Grants Act, 1920.

Bill No. 29—An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.

Bill No. 31—An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1929.

- Bill No. 35—An Act to amend The Companies Act, 1929.
- Bill No. 36—An Act respecting the Amalgamation of Lloydminster.
- Bill No. 26—An Act to amend The Treasury Department Act.
- Bill No. 16—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Northern Saskatchewan Co-operative Stock Yards, Limited.
- Bill No. 17—An Act to amend The Horticultural Societies Act, 1928.
- Bill No. 32—An Act to amend The Prairie and Forest Fires Act.

The following Bills were severally reported with amendment considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:—

- Bill No. 4—An Act to provide for the Registration of Corporation Securities.
- Bill No. 9—An Act to amend The Executions Act.
- Bill No. 22—An Act respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.

On the following Bill progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again:

- Bill No. 12—An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1930.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Merkley have leave to introduce Bill No. 48—An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1928.

The Hon. Mr. Merkley, 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 for second reading on Friday next.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 49—An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928.
Hon. Mr. Merkley, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 50—An Act to amend The Timber Taxation Act.
Hon. Mr. Merkley, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 51—An Act to amend The Steam Boilers Act.
Hon. Mr. Merkley, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 52—An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.
Mr. Given, Second Reading Friday next.

Mr. McLeod asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What was the total construction cost of the two miles of Provincial Highway East of the Town of Wilkie, being the two miles East of Sections 5 and 8 in Township 40, Range 19, West of the 3rd Meridian?

Answer: Total cost, \$8,521.84.

- (2) Who was the Contractor?

Answer: W. C. Wells, Wilkie, Sask.

- (3) How was the expenditure distributed?

Answer:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Amount paid to Contractor for excavation, rip-rap and installation of culverts | \$6,314.24 |
| Cost of culvert material, supervision, etc. | 2,207.60 |
| Total | \$ 8,521.84 |

Mr Hanbidge asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Was one M. Pachall convicted in June 1925 of any offence against the laws of the Province of Saskatchewan?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, of what offence was he convicted and what penalty was imposed?

Answer: For violation of The Saskatchewan Election Act and fined \$100.00 and costs.

- (3) If the penalty was by way of fine, was the said fine paid?

Answer: No.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) What was the total amount paid to R. M. Johnson in connection with the purchase of seed oats?

(a) For salary

(b) For expenses.

Answer:

(a) \$1,137.50

(b) Sustenance, \$487.40
Railway Fares \$296.55

- (2) What was the total number of bushels of seed oats purchased?

Answer: 256,305 bushels.

Delivered to date 194,931 bushels.

- (3) What is the average cost per bushel to the Government of all seed oats purchased?

Answer: As some of these oats have not yet been delivered, and as ultimate cost would include cleaning, storage, shrinkage and transportation charges, cost cannot yet be determined.

Mr. Agar asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) How many persons are employed in No. 1 Liquor Store Regina?

Answer: Ten.

- (2) What are their names and what position is held by each?

Answer:

J. S. Brundige

Vendor

C. E. McQuaid

Assistant Vendor

| | |
|-----------------|---------|
| R. Baird | Cashier |
| P. Potter | Cashier |
| R. E. Beaver | Clerk |
| C. Slade | Clerk |
| T. W. Reese | Clerk |
| G. R. Boylan | Clerk |
| E. P. Bultitude | Clerk |
| D. Hibbs | Clerk |

- (3) How many persons were employed in this Liquor Store on September 9, 1929?

Answer: Ten

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Are Doctors Valens and Des Rosiers of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Coroners of the Province of Saskatchewan?

Answer: No.

- (2) If not, when were they appointed to this position and when were their respective appointments cancelled?

Answer: Doctor J. A. Valens appointed 12th November 1912, and resigned 2nd June 1921. Reappointed 4th August 1921, and cancelled 16th January 1930.

Doctor J. P. Des Rosiers appointed 12th November 1912 and cancelled 16th January 1930.

- (3) Was there ever any complaint against them or either of them in the fulfilment of their duties in such position and, if so, what was the nature of the complaint or complaints?

Answer: Complaints were received to the effect that Dr. Des Rosiers had, over a long period, retained cheques payable to witnesses and jurors, and on investigation it was found he had retained 210 cheques covering a period as far back as 1917.

- (4) Why were their appointments cancelled?

Answer: The Lieutenant Governor in Council in the exercise of his discretion saw fit to cancel the appointments.

- (5) Were other coroners appointed in their place and stead and, if so, when were such appointments made and who were appointed?

Answer: No person has been appointed as coroner in Saskatoon since the above appointments were cancelled.

- (6) Who recommended the cancellation of said appointments to the Minister and who recommended their successors in office to him?

Answer: See answer to question 5.

Mr. Davis asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) Is one Harry Wardinsky at present in the employ of the Government and, if not, have arrangements been made with him to enter the employ of the Government?

Answer: Harry Wardinsky is not in the employ of the Government and no arrangements have been made or considered with him to enter the employ of the Government.

- (2) What are his duties, or what are his duties to be and under what branch of the Government is he or will he be employed?

Answer: See answer to No. 1.

- (3) Is the said Wardinsky at present taking a course at the University of Saskatchewan or elsewhere upon the subject of Weed Control and, if so, at whose expense is he taking this Course?

Answer: The said Wardinsky is attending a ten-day short course for Weed Inspectors at the University of Saskatchewan. The Government has no knowledge as to who is paying his expenses.

- (4) Has the said Wardinsky ever been convicted of any offence in the Province of Saskatchewan against any law in force therein.

Answer: Yes.

- (5) What agricultural experience has he had or what are his qualifications for the job he occupies or is intended he shall occupy.

Answer: The Government has no knowledge as to this.

- (6) Is the said Wardinsky an undischarged bankrupt and has he ever been prosecuted upon a charge of arson?

Answer: The said Wardinsky is not an undischarged bankrupt. The Government has no knowledge of his ever having been prosecuted upon a charge of arson.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 4—An Act to provide for the Registration of Corporation Securities.

Bill No. 9—An Act to amend The Executions Act.

Bill No. 22—An Act respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.

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

Bill No. 41—An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Securities.

Bill No. 43—An Act to amend The Infants Act.

Bill No. 44—An Act to amend The Land Titles Act, 1929.

Bill No. 39—An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

Bill No. 42—An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, that there be granted to His Majesty for the twelve months ending April 30, 1930, the following sums:

Vote. No.

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------|
| 1. | For Legislation | \$ 25,180.00 |
| 2. | For Executive Council..... | 232,430.00 |
| 3. | For Attorney General—Administration..... | 1,700.00 |
| 4. | For Attorney General—Criminal Investigations | 67,500.00 |
| 5. | For Attorney General—Registration of Land Titles | 11,550.00 |
| 6. | For Attorney General—Miscellaneous Services.. | 5,200.00 |
| 7. | For Provincial Secretary..... | 26,050.00 |
| 8. | For Treasury—Audit | 7,500.00 |
| 9. | For Treasury—Miscellaneous (Chargeable to Revenue) | 470,480.00 |
| 10. | For Treasury—Miscellaneous (Chargeable to Capital) | 200,000.00 |
| | being: | |
| | To provide for advances to The Saskatchewan Power Commission for the acqui- sition, purchase and construction of Power Plants..... | \$200,000.00 |
| 11. | For Public Works (Chargeable to Revenue)— Public Buildings and Institutions (Mainte- nance and administration)..... | 310,000.00 |
| 12. | For Public Works (Chargeable to Capital)— Public Buildings (Construction) | 607,000.00 |
| 13. | For Highways—Public Improvements (Charge- able to Revenue)..... | 340,000.00 |
| 14. | For Highways—Public Improvements (Charge- able to Capital)..... | 2,130,000.00 |
| 15. | For Education | 22,000.00 |
| 16. | For Agriculture—Assistance to General Agri- cultural Interests | 210,900.00 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 17. For Agriculture—Assistance to Live Stock Industry | 58,850.00 |
| 18. For Agriculture—Assistance to Dairy Industry | 5,000.00 |
| 19. For Agriculture—Improvement and Protection of Field Crops..... | 212,000.00 |
| 20. For Agriculture—Co-operation and Markets..... | 58,650.00 |
| 21. For Municipal | 4,300.00 |
| 22. For Public Health..... | 43,500.00 |
| 23. For Railways, Labour and Industries—Labour and Employment Offices | 55,000.00 |
| 24. For Bureau of Child Protection..... | 132,250.00 |
| 25. For Civil Service Commissioner's Office..... | 350.00 |

The said Resolutions were reported and ordered to be received at the next sitting of the Assembly, and the Committee given leave to sit again at next sitting.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6.45 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1930.

Mr. Eades, from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the fourth report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same without amendment:—

Bill No. 01—An Act to confirm a certain Bylaw of the City of Saskatoon and a certain Agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and The City of Saskatoon of the other part and for other purposes.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 53—An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second Reading, Monday next.

By leave of the Assembly,

The Question on the Orders of the Day, to be asked by Mr. Horner with regard to the conviction of one Shatsky was withdrawn.

Mr. McIntosh asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) How many beer store inspectors were employed by the Liquor Board in each of the months of August, September, October, November and December 1929, and January and February 1930?

| | |
|--|-------|
| <i>Answer:</i> 1929 August and September | five |
| October | six |
| November | seven |
| December | eight |
| 1930 January | nine |
| February | seven |

- (2) How many were employed in the same months of August to December 1928 and January and February 1929?

Answer: 1928 August, September and October four
1928 November, December and
1929 January and February five

- (3) What are the names and addresses of all beer store inspectors employed during said periods?

Answer: August, September and October 1928.
T. W. Fawcett, 707 6th Avenue, Saskatoon.

E. E. Fisher, 1136 Garnet Street, Regina
 Price Hughes, 1201 Robinson Street, Regina.
 H. L. Gathercole, 1443 Princess Street, Regina.

November 1928 to February, 1929.

T. W. Fawcett, 707 6th Avenue, Saskatoon.
 E. E. Fisher, 1136 Garnet Street, Regina.
 Price Hughes, 1201 Robinson Street, Regina.
 C. H. Willsie, 501 Glengary Block, Saskatoon.
 W. Barton, 1129 Broder Street, Regina.

August and September 1929.

T. W. Fawcett, 707 6th Avenue, Saskatoon.
 E. E. Fisher, 1136 Garnet Street, Regina.
 Price Hughes, 1201 Robinson Street, Regina.
 C. H. Willsie, 501 Glengary Block, Saskatoon
 W. Barton, 1129 Broder Street, Regina.

October, 1929

Messrs. Fawcett, Fisher, Willsie, Hughes and Barton
 Address as above.
 Ora Fitzpatrick, 1175 Rae Street, Regina.

November, 1929.

Messrs. Fawcett, Fisher, Willsie, Hughes, Barton and
 Fitzpatrick, addresses as above.
 H. Griffin, Kerrobert, Sask.

December 1929.

Messrs. Fawcett, Fisher, Willsie, Hughes, Barton,
 Fitzpatrick, Griffin, Addresses as above.
 John S. Walker, 2438 Montague Street, Regina.

January 1930.

Messrs. Fawcett, Fisher, Willsie, Hughes, Barton,
 Fitzpatrick, Griffin, Walker, addresses as above.
 A. H. Allingham, Broadview, Sask.

February 1930.

Messrs. Fawcett, Fisher, Barton, Fitzpatrick, Grif-
 fin, Walker and Allingham, Addresses as above.

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question,
 which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Have arrangements been made for the transfer of Liquor Store No. 2 in Regina from its present location on Eleventh Avenue to a new location on Scarth Street?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) When will the transfer be actually made?

Answer: Arrangements are under way to transfer on Thursday evening, March 13th. New store to open on Friday March 14th.

- (3) What compensation, if any, is being paid to the landlord of present premises for his consent to cancellation of lease?

Answer: None, Lease expires March 31st, and Board has been notified the Owner did not wish to renew.

- (4) What rent per month is being paid for present premises?

Answer: \$225.00; this rental does not include the supplying of heat.

- (5) What rent per month is to be paid for new premises?

Answer: \$275.00; this rental includes the supplying of heat.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Beer Store Vendor at Truax, when was he appointed and what salary does he receive?

Answer: Bruce Scamahorn; appointed November 26th 1929; salary \$100.00 per month.

- (2) Who was vendor at said store prior to the appointment of present vendor?

Answer: Malcolm McTavish.

- (3) Was the former vendor dismissed or did he resign?

Answer: He was dismissed.

- (4) If he was dismissed, why was he dismissed, and if he resigned, what reason did he give for his resignation?

Answer: Because the Liquor Board appointed Bruce Scamahorn, a returned man.

- (5) Are the services of the present vendor satisfactory?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Is it the case that the present vendor has engaged the former vendor to manage said store for him?

Answer: Not to the knowledge of the Liquor Board.

- (7) If so, what is being paid to former vendor by present vendor for his services?

Answer: See answer to question 6.

Mr. Therres asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the beer store Vendor at Pleasantdale?

Answer: John McPhail.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: January 8th, 1930.

- (3) Who was Vendor prior to the appointment of present Vendor?

Answer: A. H. Young.

- (4) When did his services with the Board terminate?

Answer: January 7th, 1930.

- (5) Is the former Vendor still in charge of the store under an arrangement with the new Vendor?

Answer: The Board is informed that the new Vendor has employed as his assistant the former Vendor.

- (6) If so, how much is being paid by way of salary by the Board to the new Vendor and how much is he in turn paying the former Vendor for conducting said beer store?

Answer: The Liquor Board pays its Vendor at Pleasantdale a monthly salary of \$100.00, and holds him responsible for the proper conduct of the store. He may employ an assistant if he desires and make his own arrangements with his employee regarding salary. The Board has no knowledge of what amount is paid.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Was one A. W. Beale, temporarily employed by the Department of Telephones as a watchman, in the employ of the Government prior to his employment in said Department?

Answer: No.

- (2) If so, in what Department was he employed?

Answer: See answer to question 1.

- (3) How long was he employed and why were his services dispensed with?

Answer: Twenty days. The question of his convictions under the Liquor Act having been brought to the attention of the Government, he was dismissed, although he was doing his work in a perfectly satisfactory manner.

- (4) If he was dismissed, why was he dismissed?

Answer: See answer to question 3.

Mr. Hogan, for Mr. Garner, asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Is C. C. Smith now or has he been in the employ of the Department of Highways in the Estevan District, and if so, when was he employed, how long did he remain in

the employ of the Department, what amount was paid him from commencement of employment to date by way of salary and expenses?

Answer: Yes. Supervisor of Provincial Highways in Estevan District from October 25, 1929, to November 15, 1929. He has received no salary or expenses.

- (2) Is this the same C. C. Smith who was subsequently elected president of the Assiniboia Conservative Association?

Answer: Have no information.

- (3) Is this the same C.C. Smith who at one time was a Conservative Candidate in this Province for a Federal Constituency in the Province?

Answer: Have no information.

- (4) Was he a candidate for a Provincial Constituency on behalf of the Conservative Party?

Answer: Have no information.

Mr. Johnson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Has one McInnis been appointed Vendor of Beer Store at Kayville?

Answer: Daniel McGinnis has been appointed Vendor at Kayville.

- (2) If so, when was he appointed and what salary is he being paid?

Answer: November 4th, 1929, at a salary of \$90.00 per month.

- (3) Was this man an applicant for this position when this store was first opened?

Answer: The store opened in September, 1927, and at that time Mr. McGinnis was not an applicant. He had applied for the position in April, 1927, stating if he did not get the appointment then he would look for other employment.

- (4) If so, why was he not appointed at that time?

Answer: See answer to question 3.

- (5) Is the Board satisfied with the services of this man since his appointment?

Answer: Yes.

The following Orders of the Assembly were issued to the proper Officers:—

By Mr. Uhrich, for a Return showing:

Copies of all petitions, telegrams and correspondence passing between the Liquor Board, the Government and H. W. Fisher, and Jacob G. Wahl of Hague and Henry H. Doerksen of Rosthern, in reference to the Beer Store at Hague and the appointment of a Vendor for the said store.

By Mr. Morken, for a Return showing:

- (1) In the case of retirement from the services of the Liquor Board by dismissal or otherwise, in how many cases retiring officials have been given one month's pay in lieu of one month's notice.
- (2) The total amount paid by the Board to date from September 1, 1929, to retiring officials by way of salary in lieu of notice.
- (3) The total amount paid to persons replacing said retiring officials for their services during the period for which said salary in lieu of notice was paid?
- (4) The number of changes of premises for liquor or beer stores made since September 1, 1929, to this date.
- (5) Where the said changes have been made.
- (6) From whom premises were rented prior to changes and from whom they are now rented.
- (7) The amount of rent paid per month in respect of premises prior to change and what is being paid now in each case.
- (8) If in any case a month's rent was paid in lieu of one month's notice of termination of lease and, if so, in what case or cases.
- (9) The total amount paid during said period by way of rent in lieu of notice.
- (10) The total amount paid during said period for new premises in those cases where new premises were occupied as a result of cancellation of tenancy in which rent was paid in lieu of notice.

Moved by Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Eades,

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Provincial Governments should be consulted by the Dominion Government on all matters of immigration affecting such Provinces, and that this Assembly approves of the action of the Saskatchewan Government relative to the proposed Mennonite immigration.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. McIntosh, seconded by Mr. Dunn,

That all the words after the first "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"in the opinion of this Assembly there should be close co-operation between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government on all matters of immigration affecting this Province."

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Eades, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.50 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 54—An Act respecting Embalmers.

Mr. Hanbidge, Second Reading Tuesday next.

Bill No. 55—An Act to incorporate The Ladies' Hairdressers' Association of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Smith (Moose Jaw City), Second Reading Tuesday next.

Bill No. 56—An Act respecting The Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1930.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Tuesday next.

By leave of the Assembly,

The Question on the Orders of the Day, to be asked by Mr. Cockburn with regard to the employment by the Government of special investigators, detectives or efficiency experts, was withdrawn, at the request of the Government.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

(1) Is F. Elliott in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

(2) In what capacity is he employed and what salary is he being paid?

Answer: Information Officer, at a salary of \$1320.00 per annum.

(3) When was he employed?

Answer: November 8th, 1929.

(4) How long has he been resident in Saskatchewan?

Answer: Three years and three months.

(5) Who held the position formerly?

Answer: James Boyle who was four years past the age of retirement which is 65.

(6) What salary was he paid?

Answer: \$1320.00 per annum.

The Order of the Day being called for the Question by Mr. Bennett,

Ordered, That the said Question stand as an Order of the Assembly for a Return showing:—

- (1) The total cost per mile for grading the Regina-Moose Jaw, No. 1 Highway.
- (2) The total cost per mile of reconditioning the said Highway.
- (3) The total cost per mile of gravelling the said Highway.
- (4) The total cost per mile of oiling the said Highway.
- (5) The total mileage of said Highway from Moose Jaw to Regina.

Mr. Bennett asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What contracts for standard earth grades on Provincial Highways were let after June 6? What are the mileages and in what constituencies?

| Contracts | Mileage | Constituency |
|---------------------------|---------|----------------|
| Woodrow to Meyronne | 5.5 | Willow Bunch |
| Success East | 12 | Swift Current |
| Unity West Extension | 12 | Wilkie |
| Radville North | 4 | Weyburn |
| Torquay South | 10 | Estevan |
| Kincaid to Hazenmore | 5 | Willow Bunch |
| Hodgville North Extension | 2 | Notukeu |
| Weyburn to McTaggart | 6 | Gravelbourg |
| Parkside to Leask | 7.5 | Weyburn |
| Domremy to St. Louis | 18 | Shellbrook |
| Maple Creek West | 12 | Kinistino |
| Lloydminster East | 18 | Maple Creek |
| Lloydminster East | 8 | Lloydminster |
| Duff to Fenwood | 11 | Pheasant Hills |
| Estevan East | 1.5 | Estevan |
| Cadillac South Extension | 2 | Notukeu |
| Maple Creek North | 1.5 | Maple Creek |
| Balgonie to McLean | 3 | Lumsden |
| Tuffnell South | 8 | S. Qu'Appelle |
| Melfort to Clemens | 2 | Wynyard |
| | 6 | Melfort |

- (2) How many of these constituencies were represented by Liberal members before June 6? How many after June 6?

Answer: Represented by Liberal Members before June 6th,—15 out of 17.

Represented by Liberal Members after June 6th—
11 out of 17.

Mr. Bennett asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What was the total cost of construction of Highway No. 8 from Rocanville to a point 3.84 miles South? What are the details of such cost?

Answer: Total cost \$22,317.00 expended as follows:—

| | | |
|---|----|-----------|
| Culvert material, engineering & supervision | \$ | 4,356.38 |
| Grading, culvert installation, etc., 1925 | | 543.35 |
| do 1926 | | 3,965.99 |
| do 1927 | | 9,987.39 |
| do 1928 | | 3,463.89 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | \$ | 22,317.00 |

- (2) Was the contract let by tender? If not, who recommended the contractor?

Answer: No.

Under instructions from the Minister of Highways, this work was authorized, and it was decided to have same done by day labour under a departmental foreman. In 1925, Foreman J. Goodman was appointed on the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Highways. In 1926 and 1927, Foreman J. L. McEwen was appointed on the recommendation of District Superintendent James Cameron. In 1928, Contractor L. J. McFadyen was engaged to complete the work upon the recommendation of the Chief Field Engineer.

- (3) What are the names of the different contractors?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

- (4) Did the previous Administration pay the transportation cost on the horses of any contractors in connection with this work and, if so, what are the details thereof?

Answer: No freight paid on contractors' horses. Freight was paid for moving horses and outfit of Foreman J. L. McEwen to Moosomin from work on which he was engaged, and return. Freight charges, \$246.29.

- (5) What was the cost per cubic yard?

Answer: Approximately 60c.

The Order of the Day being called for the Question by Mr. Agar,

Ordered, That the said Question stand as an Order of the Assembly for a Return showing:—

- (1) The amount authorised by the Department of Highways during each fiscal year from May 1, 1921, to May 1, 1929, and during 1929 from May 1 to September 1 for expenditure upon roads, ferries and bridges, from both Capital and Revenue Account.

- (2) The amount expended by the said Department during each of the said fiscal years and during the period from May 1, 1929, to September 1, 1929, upon roads, ferries and bridges, from both Capital and Revenue Account.
- (3) How much of the amount authorised during each of the above periods was cancelled before the end of the period.
- (4) How much of the amount authorised during each of the above periods was carried over into the succeeding year for construction.

Mr. Parker (Pelly) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Has the work of repairing the Wascana Lake retaining walls been completed?

Answer: No.

- (2) If not, what work still has to be done?

Answer: Some of the retaining wall has still to be taken down, a little earth fill has to be made and the rip-rap has to be placed.

- (3) What is the estimated cost of completing the work?

Answer: No estimate has been made.

- (4) Does the Government intend to do any other work in connection with beautifying or improving the lake?

Answer: Not at present.

Mr. Parker (Pelly) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Was Fred Solomon employed in connection with the repairing of the retaining wall on Wascana Lake?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) What was the total amount paid to him in connection with this work?

Answer: Rock for rip-rap at \$3.00 per cord.....\$ 410.37
 Earth fill with power digger, at 50c per
 cubic yard\$1667.50

Total amount.....\$2077.87

Mr. Strath asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is R. O. Coglán of Elbow, Saskatchewan, a coroner of the Province?

Answer: No.

- (2) Has his appointment been cancelled, and, if so, when was such cancellation made and when does such cancellation take effect?

Answer: Yes, on the 4th of March, 1930, to take effect on the 14th of March, 1930.

- (3) Is the said R. Ó. Coglean a duly qualified Medical Practitioner of the Province?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) Who has been appointed in his place and stead?

Answer: D. W. Coventry.

- (5) What occupation does such new appointee follow?

Answer: Undertaker.

- (6) Is he a duly qualified medical practitioner?

Answer: No.

According to Order, Resolutions Nos. 1 to 25, adopted in Committee of Supply on the 12th instant, were received, read twice and agreed to.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1930, the sum of five million, two hundred and thirty-seven thousand, three hundred and ninety dollars be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

The said Resolution was reported, read twice and agreed to, and the Committee given leave to sit again.

Leave having been granted, the Hon. Mr. McConnell presented Bill No. 57—An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service of the Fiscal Year ending the Thirtieth day of April, 1930.

The said Bill was received and read the first time.

By leave of the Assembly, and under Standing Order 55, the said Bill was then read the second and third time and passed.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Given,

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Dominion Government should grant to the Provinces Federal aid for highway construction and that such Federal aid should be based on mileage and not on population; and further, that this Assembly urge the Federal Government to undertake during the year 1930 the construction of a Trans-Canada Highway.

And the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Spence,

That all the words after "based on" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"such additions to the annual free subsidies as are now received by the Provinces from the Federal authority and be increased by a sum sufficient to permit the Provinces to undertake a more extensive programme of highway construction and that such programme shall include Saskatchewan's share of a Trans-Canada Highway."

The debate continuing, by leave of the Assembly, the said motion and amendment thereto were withdrawn.

By leave of the Assembly,

Moved by Mr. Given, seconded by Mr. Gryde,

That this Assembly urge the Federal Government to take immediate action to provide for the construction and maintenance of a Trans-Canada Highway.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Horner,

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Provincial Governments should be consulted by the Dominion Government on all matters of immigration affecting such Provinces, and that this Assembly approve of the action of the Saskatchewan Government relative to the proposed Mennonite immigration.

And the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. McIntosh,

That all the words after the first "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

"in the opinion of this Assembly there should be close co-operation between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government on all matters of immigration affecting this Province."

The debate continuing,

5.15 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 has voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service. In the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour the following Bill:—

“An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service of the fiscal year ending the Thirtieth day of April, 1930.”

to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Royal Assent to this Bill was announced by the Clerk:

“In His Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor doth thank the Legislative Assembly, accepts their benevolence and Assents to this Bill.”

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor then retired from the Chamber.

The debate resuming, and the question being put on the said amendment it was negatived on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| Finlayson | Therres | Loptson |
| Gordon | McGregor | Johnson |
| Spence | Hogan | Strath |
| Davis | McIntosh | Parker |
| Gardiner | Cockburn | (Pelly) |
| Uhrich | Paulson | Dunn |
| Patterson | Huck | Garner |
| (Pipestone) | Hall | Ayre |
| Clinch | Marion | Morken—25 |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Smith | Horner |
| Whatley | (Moose Jaw City) | Patterson |
| Buckle | Warren | (Milestone) |
| MacPherson | Given | McLean |
| Anderson | Gryde | Huston |
| McConnell | Grassick | Taylor |
| Bryant | Merkley | Greaves |
| Stewart | Munroe | Hanbidge |
| Smith | Whittaker | Lilly |
| (Swift Current) | Arthur | McLeod |
| Bennett | Benson | Eades |
| | | Miller. —31 |

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

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Given | Patterson |
| Whatley | Gryde | (Milestone) |
| Buckle | Benson | McLean |
| Anderson | Grassick | Huston |
| McConnell | Whittaker | Taylor |
| Bryant | Warren | Greaves |
| Stewart | Merkley | Hanbidge |
| Smith | Munroe | Lilly |
| (Swift Current) | Arthur | McLeod |
| Bennett | Horner | Eades |
| Smith | | Miller—30 |
| (Moose Jaw City) | | |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| Finlayson | McGregor | Lopton |
| Gordon | Hogan | Johnson |
| Spence | McIntosh | Strath |
| Davis | Cockburn | Parker |
| Uhrich | Paulson | (Pelly) |
| Patterson | Huck | Dunn |
| (Pipestone) | Hall | Ayre |
| Clinch | Marion | Morken—23 |
| Therres | | |

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments:—

Bill No. 40—An Act respecting the Engineering Profession.

Bill No. 45—An Act to provide for a Weekly Half-holiday for Shop Employees in Certain Cities.

Bill No. 46—An Act to amend The Drugless Practitioners Act.

Bill No. 47—An Act to provide for One Day of Rest in Seven for Certain Employees.

Bill No. 52—An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.

By leave of the Assembly, the Order "Motions" was reverted to.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Johnson, for a Return showing:

The names of all employees of the Government who have been dismissed since September 9, 1929, the position held by each, the salary being paid at the time of dismissal, the date of dismissal and the length of service in each case.

By leave of the Assembly, the Order "Government Orders" was reverted to.

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

Bill No. 28.—An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1927.

Bill No. 34.—An Act respecting Agreements for Payments to Vendors, Lessors and Others by Shares of Crops.

Bill No. 48.—An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1928.

Bill No. 49.—An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928.

Bill No. 50.—An Act to amend The Timber Taxation Act.

Bill No. 51.—An Act to amend The Steam Boilers Act.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11.50 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1930.

Mr. Warren, from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the fifth report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same with amendment:

Bill No. 07—An Act dealing with Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 58—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act, 1922.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 59—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 60—An Act to amend The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

The Hon. Mr. Bryant, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

Report of the Public Service Inquiry Commission of the Province of Saskatchewan, dated March 17, 1930.

(Sessional Paper No. 35)

The Hon. Mr. Stewart, a member of the Executive Council, presented Return to an Order of the Assembly, dated February 27, 1930, showing:—

The amount authorized by the Department of Highways between September 9, 1929, and December 31, 1929, for expenditure in each constituency for each of the following purposes:—

- (1) Graveling Provincial highways;
- (2) Reconditioning Provincial highways;
- (3) New construction Provincial highways;
- (4) Grants to Rural Municipalities;
- (5) Expenditures by Rural Municipalities to be repaid to them out of 1930-31 appropriation;
- (6) Capital Account Bridges;
- (7) Timber Bridges.

(Sessional Paper No. 36)

Mr. Gordon asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Has T. W. Reese, employed in the No. 1 Liquor Store, Regina, ever been convicted of any offence against any law in effect in the Province?

Answer: No.

- (2) If so, what was the nature of the offence and what penalty was imposed?

Answer: See answer to question 1.

Mr. Johnson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) Has T. G. McManus been in the employ of the Government at any time since September 9, 1929?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, during what period was he employed?

Answer: December 17th, 1929, to January 31, 1930.

- (3) What was the nature of his employment and what salary was he paid?

Answer: Assisting in the registration of and securing work for unemployed at a salary of \$125.00 per month.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) How many appointments have been made to the staff of the Debt Adjustment Bureau since September 9, 1929?

Answer: Two.

- (2) What is the name of each person appointed, the date appointed and salary being paid?

Answer: George Wilson, appointed October 21, 1929, at a salary of \$137.50 per month; transferred on January 18, 1930, to the Live Stock Branch in connection with administration of fodder relief in the dried out area.

T. Durrant, appointed January 2, 1930, at a salary of \$137.50 per month.

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

Bill No. 53—An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.

Bill No. 18—An Act to amend The Brand Act.

Bill No. 33—An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Permanent Cancer Commission.

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. 19—An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

Bill No. 49—An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928.

Bill No. 39—An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

Bill No. 27—An Act to amend The Liquor Act, 1925.

Bill No. 50—An Act to amend The Timber Taxation Act.

Bill No. 51—An Act to amend The Steam Boilers Act.

The following Bills were severally reported with amendment considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:—

Bill No. 44—An Act to amend The Land Titles Act, 1929.

Bill No. 24—An Act to amend The Municipalities Relief Act, 1929.

Bill No. 48—An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1928.

Bill No. 23—An Act to amend The Town Planning Act, 1928.

Bill No. 30—An Act for the Licensing of Book Agents.

Bill No. 41—An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Securities.

On the following Bills progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again:—

Bill No. 11—An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Bill No. 2—An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Bryant,

That all matters referred to in the Declarations of J. B. Wilson, James Gallon, Sterling McGonigal, Thomas R. Duckworth, James Taylor, James McKenzie, Joseph McKenzie, and Smoky Johnson be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing to inquire into, call witnesses and hear evidence upon:

- (a) All matters pertaining to the administration of affairs by the Liquor Commission:
- (b) All matters pertaining to the administration of the Liquor Laws under the Liberal administration in Saskatchewan:
- (c) All matters pertaining to the interference with the administration of justice by Civil Servants or others:
- (d) All matters pertaining to the administration of the Regina Jail camp on the Parliament Buildings grounds and the administration of the Regina Jail, with particular reference to all matters pertaining to the dismissal of Thomas Hayes and others from the staff of the said Regina Jail.

And the proposed amendment thereto, of Mr. Davis,

That all the words after "That" to the end of the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this Assembly do humbly petition His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to appoint a Commission of at least three Judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench for Saskatchewan, or of His Majesty's Court of Appeal of the said Province, or from both of said Courts, for the purpose of enquiring into the statements made in the Statutory Declarations, now a part of the record of this Assembly, and placed therein by the Minister of Public Works, and for the purpose of enquiring into any other matter which the Government of the Province may see fit to refer to such Commission, and that such Commission do report to this Legislature."

The debate continuing, by leave of the Assembly, the said motion and amendment thereto were withdrawn.

By leave of the Assembly,

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

That this Assembly do humbly petition His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to appoint a Commission of at least three Judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench for Saskatchewan, or of His Majesty's Court of Appeal of the said Province, or from both of said Courts, for the purpose of enquiring into the statements made in the Statutory Declarations, now a part of the record of this Assembly, and placed therein by the Minister of Public Works, and the member for Prince Albert, and for the purpose of enquiring into any other matter which the Government of the Province may see fit to refer to such Commission, including any matter which has to do with the administration of the Liquor Commission; the administration of the Liquor Board under the late administration; or the administration of justice in the Province, and that such Commission do report to this Legislature.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Patterson (Pipestone), for a Return showing:

Copies of all letters relating to the Western Farm Loan Board Report received from any Bond Dealers, Financial Agents or Investment Bankers.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10.45 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 61—An Act to amend The Masters and Servants Act.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 62—An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, 1927.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 63—An Act to amend The Game Act, 1924.
Hon. Mr. Merkley, Second Reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 64—An Act to regulate the Speed and Operation of Vehicles on Highways.
Hon. Mr. Merkley, Second Reading Thursday next.

The Hon. Mr. McConnell delivered a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, which was read by Mr. Speaker as follows:—

H. W. NEWLANDS,
Lieutenant Governor.

The Lieutenant Governor transmits Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the twelve months ending April 30, 1931, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

(Sessional Paper No. 37)

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bryant,

Ordered, That the said Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Mr. Stewart, a member of the Executive Council, presented Return to an Order of the Assembly dated March 14, 1930, showing:—

- (1) The total cost per mile for grading the Regina-Moose Jaw, No. 1 Highway.
- (2) The total cost per mile of reconditioning the said Highway.
- (3) The total cost per mile of gravelling the said Highway.
- (4) The total cost per mile of oiling the said Highway.
- (5) The total mileage of said Highway from Moose Jaw to Regina.

(Sessional Paper No. 38)

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Was a contract for gravelling the Humboldt-Bruno Provincial Highway cancelled?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Was the contractor awarded another contract in lieu of the one which was cancelled?

Answer: Yes.

- (3) What was the location of the new contract and how many miles was it?

Answer: Wolseley to Indian Head Section of No. 1 Highway. 18.45 miles.

- (4) Were the unit prices altered as between the two contracts and, if so, what were the differences?

Answer: Yes.

Humboldt East and West Contract Unit Prices:

| | |
|--|-----|
| (a) Stripping per cu. yd. | 20c |
| (b) Excavating, screening, crushing & loading gravel to trucks, per cu. yd. | 55c |
| (c) Hauling & dumping gravel per cu. yd. mile | 17c |

Wolseley-Indian Head Contract Unit Prices:

| | |
|--|-----|
| (a) Stripping per cu. yd. | 20c |
| (b) Excavating, screening, crushing & loading gravel to trucks, per cu. yd. | 55c |
| (c) Hauling & dumping gravel, per cu. yd. mile | 15c |

- (5) What was the name of the contractor?

Answer: Evans Gravel Surfacing Co., Saskatoon, Sask.

Mr. Lopton, asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) How many employees are there on the staff of Beer Store No. 26, Regina?

Answer: Three.

- (2) What is the name, the date of appointment and age of each employee?

Answer: J. Zimmerman, appointed January 23, 1930. Age 56.

H. Pergamit, appointed January 20, 1930. Age 38.

M. H. Tallant, appointed February 3, 1930. Age 75.

- (3) How many were employed in this store prior to September 9, 1929?

Answer: Three.

The Order of the Day being called for the Question by Mr. Agar,

Ordered, That the said Question stand as an Order of the Assembly for a Return showing:—

How much has been spent in each constituency of the Province between the first day of May, 1929, and the 31st day of January, 1930, from both Capital and Revenue Account on:—

- (a) Provincial Highways;
- (b) Main Market Roads;
- (c) Local Roads;
- (d) Bridges;
- (e) Ferries.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the following Bills, which were reported without amendment, read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 01—An Act to confirm a certain Bylaw of the City of Saskatoon and a certain Agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and The City of Saskatoon of the other part and for other purposes.

Bill No. 07—An Act dealing with Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments:—

Bill No. 54—An Act respecting Embalmers.

Bill No. 55—An Act to incorporate the Ladies' Hairdressers Association of Saskatchewan.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 30—An Act for the Licensing of Book Agents.

Bill No. 41—An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Securities.

Bill No. 44—An Act to amend The Land Titles Act, 1929.

Bill No. 48—An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1928.

Bill No. 23—An Act to amend The Town Planning Act, 1928.

Bill No. 24—An Act to amend The Municipalities Relief Act, 1929.

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

The following Bills were reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:—

Bill No. 11—An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Bill No. 12—An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

Bill No. 43—An Act to amend The Infants Act.

Bill No. 42—An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Bill No. 53—An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.

The following Bill was reported without amendment, read the third time and passed:

Bill No. 18—An Act to amend The Brand Act.

On the following Bills progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again:

Bill No. 7—An Act to amend The Homesteads Act.

Bill No. 28—An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1927.

According to Order, Bill No. 56—An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1930, was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1930.

Mr. Hanbidge, from the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments, presented the first report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Hanbidge as its Chairman.

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same with amendment:—

Bill No. 54—An Act respecting Embalmers.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted; and the respective Ministers introducing the Bills having in each case 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 following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 65—An Act respecting the Public Service.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 66—An Act respecting the Superannuation of Teachers.

Hon. Mr. Anderson; Second Reading Friday next.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 67—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act, 1927.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 68—An Act to amend The Creditors Relief Act, 1923.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 69—An Act to amend The Parents Maintenance Act, 1923.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 70—An Act to amend The District Courts Act,

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

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

Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ended April 30, 1929.

(*Sessional Paper No. 40*)

The Hon. Mr. Stewart, a member of the Executive Council presented:—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated March 18, 1930, showing:—

How much has been spent in each constituency of the Province between the first day of May, 1929, and the 31st day of January, 1930, from both Capital and Revenue Account on:—

- (a) Provincial Highways;
- (b) Main Market Roads;
- (c) Local Roads;
- (d) Bridges;
- (e) Ferries.

(*Sessional Paper No. 39*)

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Were tenders called for "earth fill with power digger" in connection with retaining walls on Wascana Lake?

Answer: No. The work had to be completed before freeze up, and there was no time to waste in calling for tenders. The price of 50c per cubic yard is considered a very low one for this class of work.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) How many special investigators, detectives and efficiency experts have been employed by the Government between September 9, 1929 and the present date?

Answer: Four.

Mr. Ayre asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Has an appointment of a ferryman been made at the Borden Ferry?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, who?

Answer: Henry Garfield Harris, Borden, Sask.

- (3) What experience has he had at this work?

Answer: No previous experience in the operation of Saskatchewan Government Ferries, but has had twenty-five years with boats at Newfoundland.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is C. J. Watson in the employ of the Liquor Board?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) What position does he hold?

Answer: Assistant Vendor.

- (3) When was he engaged?

Answer: November 1st, 1929.

- (4) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: Commenced at \$160.00 per month, later increased to \$170.00 and now receiving \$175.00

- (5) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (6) Was he formerly President of the Saskatchewan Moderation League?

Answer: Have no information on this subject.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Beer Traffic Manager for the Liquor Board?

Answer: Mr. G. N. Main.

- (2) When was he engaged?

Answer: December 9th, 1929.

- (3) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: \$225.00 per month.

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 11—An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Bill No. 12—An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

Bill No. 43—An Act to amend The Infants Act.

Bill No. 42—An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Bill No. 53—An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.

The Order being read for the Assembly to again resolve itself into the Committee of Supply,

The Hon. Mr. McConnell moved,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

A debate arising, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Patterson, (Pipestone), adjourned.

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

The following Bills were reported without amendment, read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 56—An Act respecting The Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1930.

Bill No. 33—An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Permanent Cancer Commission.

The following Bill was reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:

Bill No. 7—An Act to amend The Homesteads Act.

According to Order, the Hon. Mr. Anderson moved,

That Bill No. 20—An Act to amend The School Act (No. 2) be now read the second time.

A debate arising, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Davis, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1930.

Mr. Eades, from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the sixth report of the said Committee which is as follows:

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same with amendment:—

Bill No. 010—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Your Committee also has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same without amendment:—

Bill No. 02—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.

Your Committee recommends that the fees paid for the following Private Bills be remitted, less cost of printing:—

Bill No. 03—An Act to incorporate The Sisters of The Order of Saint Dominic;

Bill No. 010—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

By leave of the Assembly,

On motion of Mr. Eades, seconded by Mr. Miller.

Ordered, That the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills be now concurred in.

Mr. Hanbidge, from the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments, presented the second report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bills:—

Bill No. 37—An Act respecting Barbers and Beauticians.

Bill No. 55—An Act to incorporate The Ladies' Hairdressers Association of Saskatchewan.

In view of the representations heard and of the apparent divergent opinions held by those interested in the said Bills, this Committee is of the opinion that legislative action in these matters be deferred.

The Committee is further of the opinion that the interested parties should, before next Session, endeavor to unite in submitting legislation in which all interested can concur and that, in the meantime, the regulations of the Department of Public Health which apply to this profession should be strictly observed.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends to the Assembly that the said Bills be not further proceeded with at this Session.

By leave of the Assembly:

On motion of Mr. Hanbidge, seconded by Mr. Horner,

Ordered, That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments be now concurred in.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 71—An Act to amend The Wild Lands Tax Act, 1928.
Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Monday next.

Bill No. 72—An Act to amend The School Assessment Act.
Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Monday next.

Bill No. 73—An Act to amend The Arrears of Taxes Act, 1926.
Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Monday next.

Mr. Parker asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is Eugene Andrichowicz, otherwise E. A. Andrews, in the employ of the Government and, if so, in what capacity and at what salary?

Answer: Eugene Andrichowicz, otherwise E. A. Andrews, who worked for the Liberal Government of this Province for nine years and three months is not in the employ of the present Government.

Mr. Strath asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) Is J. S. Maneer in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) What position does he hold?

Answer: Game Guardian.

- (3) What are his qualifications?

Answer: High School education, experienced fur buyer and general knowledge of game.

- (4) When was he appointed?

Answer: November 19th, 1929.

- (5) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: \$140.00 per month.

- (6) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is manager of the Beer Store at Shamrock?

Answer: John Barry.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: December 6th, 1929.

- (3) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (4) Did the Attorney General receive a largely signed petition asking that the former manager be retained?

Answer: The Liquor Board received a petition after arrangements had been completed for the appointment of the new Vendor.

Mr. Lilly asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) What changes were authorized by the Department of Education in Public and High School text-books in 1927, 1928, and 1929?

Answer: 1927. No change in authorized books. Longmans' Modern French Course, Part 1, Bertenshaw, published by Longmans, Green & Co. Price 60 cents, was authorized for the first time for the use of pupils taking French as an option in grade VIII. 1928. No changes in text-books for either Public or High Schools.

1929. (1) As an alternative text: An English Grammar for Public Schools, revised edition, Jones, published by J. M. Dent & Sons. Price 35 cents. The other text is introductory English Grammar, Lang, price 40 cents..

(2) As an alternative text: The Bailey Writing Course, Books I and II, published by The Educational Book Co. Price 15 cents each book (total 30 cents). The other series of Copy Books costs 75 cents for the set of six books.

(3) The History of Canada for High Schools, McArthur, published by the W. J. Gage & Co. Price \$1.00. The old text (The Public School History of Canada, Wrong) costs 85 cents.

(4) The English Composition for High Schools, Irwin and Van Every, published by The Copp Clark Co. Price 50 cents. The former text, "Elementary Composition" by Alexander and Mowat, cost 50 cents.

- (2) What was the retail price of the book originally authorized and the book substituted in each case?

Answer: Answered in Question (1).

- (3) What text books are supplied free to School Boards by the Government?

Answer:

The Canadian Readers, Books I to V for all schools.

The Canadian Catholic Readers, Part I, Part II, and Books 2, 3, and 4, optional in Roman Catholic Separate Schools.

French Readers for grades I to VIII for schools giving instruction in French under the provisions of section 178 of The School Act.

- (4) When was the last change made in such free text-books?

Answer: The Canadian Readers were authorized in 1923 to replace the Alexandra Readers.

The French Readers were authorized in August 1928.

- (5) In view of the frequent and costly changes of text-books in both Public and High Schools, what steps are the Government taking to provide against such changes?

Answer: Steps are now being taken towards securing more uniformity in text-books among the various provinces with a view to lessening costs and for securing more permanence in the texts selected.

Mr. Finlayson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) Is W. J. McKissock in the employ of the Government?

Answer: One W. J. MacKessock is employed by the Government.

- (2) What position does he hold and what salary is he being paid?

Answer: Game Guardian at \$125.00 per month.

- (3) When was he appointed?

Answer: November 19th, 1929?

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

The following Orders of the Assembly were issued to the proper officers:—

By Mr. Johnson, for a Return showing:—

Copies of all reports received to date from all temporary Inspectors employed in the Bureau of Child Protection.

By Mr. Gordon, for a Return showing:

The names of all employees of the Government who have been engaged since September 9, 1929, the position held by each and the salary being paid.

The Order of the Day being called for the Resolution of Mr. McIntosh,

That this Assembly request the Government to urge upon the Federal Government the necessity for continued reduction of the protective element of the Customs Tariff until it is entirely removed particularly on the implements of production and the necessities of life; and, as a means to this end, that the British Preference should be increased with the object of establishing free trade with Great Britain within five years.

By leave of the Assembly, the said Resolution was withdrawn.

By leave of the Assembly, the following Resolution, to be moved by Mr. McIntosh, was substituted without notice.

That, in the opinion of this Assembly, every handicap placed on the free operation of the British Preference, as contained in our tariff schedules, be removed; and further, that the time has come when the British Preference should be progressively increased so as to have complete free trade with the Mother Country within a period of five years.

Moved by Mr. Arthur, seconded by Mr. Whatley,

That this Assembly is of the opinion that in all hospitals nurses-in-training should not be required to be on duty for more than eight hours in the twenty-four.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 54—An Act respecting Embalmers, which was reported without amendment, read the third time and passed.

According to Order, Bill No. 7—An Act to amend The Homesteads Act, was read the third time and passed.

The Order of the Day being called for the second reading of Bill No. 21—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, 1925,

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Bryant,

Ordered, That the Order for the second reading of the said Bill No. 21 be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

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

Bill No. 74—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, 1925.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second Reading Monday next.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting:

Bill No. 58—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act, 1922.

Bill No. 59—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.

Bill No. 60—An Act to amend The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act, 1929.

Bill No. 61—An Act to amend The Masters and Servants Act.

Bill No. 63—An Act to amend The Game Act, 1924.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Anderson,

That Bill No. 20—An Act to amend The School Act (No. 2), be now read the second time.

The debate continuing, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr. Spence,

That all the words of the question after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"further consideration of this Bill be deferred until there has been deleted therefrom the principle of giving rights not already provided for in the Constitution of the Province and until the Bill discloses the true intent of the Government with respect to certain sections thereof which it has intimated will be changed."

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

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|--------|---------|
| Parker | Clinch | Johnson |
| (Touchwood) | Grant | Strath |

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| Finlayson | Therres | Parker |
| Gordon | McGregor | (Pelly) |
| Spence | Hogan | Dunn |
| Davis | McIntosh | Garner |
| Gardiner | Cockburn | Ayre |
| Uhrich | Huck | Morken—25 |
| Patterson | Hall | |
| (Pipestone) | Marion | |

NAYS.

Messieurs

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

The debate continuing, and the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Warren | Horner |
| Whatley | Given | Patterson |
| Buckle | Gryde | (Milestone) |
| MacPherson | Cobban | McLean |
| Anderson | Grassick | Huston |
| McConnell | Merkley | Greaves |
| Bryant | Munroe | Lilly |
| Stewart | Whittaker | McLeod |
| Smith | Arthur | Eades |
| (Swift Current) | Benson | Miller—29 |
| Bennett | | |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------|----------|---------|
| Finlayson | Therres | Johnson |
| Gordon | Hogan | Strath |
| Davis | Cockburn | Parker |
| Gardiner | McGregor | (Pelly) |

| | | |
|-------------|---------|-----------|
| Uhrich | Huck | Dunn |
| Patterson | Hall | Garner |
| (Pipestone) | Marion | Ayre |
| Clinch | Loptson | Morken—23 |
| Grant | | |

The said Bill No. 20 was accordingly read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The Assembly to go into the Committee of Supply).

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Patterson, (Pipestone), adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11.35 o'clock p.m.

REGINA FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 75—An Act to amend The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act, 1927.

Hon. Mr. Buckle, Second Reading Tuesday next.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

Auditor's Report, made by O. J. Godfrey and Company, on the Department of Telephones, and Financial Statements as at December 31, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No.41)

Also, Report of G. B. Munnoch and Company on investigation of the Administration of the Department of Telephones.

(Sessional Paper No. 42)

Mr. Cockburn, asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Munroe:—

- (1) Has F. J. S. Ivay of Moose Jaw been appointed by the Department of Public Health to represent it at the Convention of the Actino-Light Therapy Laboratories in Chicago?

Answer: Mr. F. J. S. Ivay has not been appointed by the Department of Public Health to represent it at any convention.

- (2) Has the Department agreed to publish the reports of this Convention?

Answer: The Department has not agreed to publish the reports of any convention attended by Mr. Ivay.

- (3) Is the said F. J. S. Ivay a registered Physician?

Answer: No.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) What salary is being paid to R. S. Banbury, recently appointed a member of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Answer: \$4,000.00 per annum.

MARCH 21, 1930

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What was the estimated amount of "yard mileage?"
 (a) On the Humboldt- Bruno gravelling contract?

Answer: 97,462 Cubic Yard Miles.

- (b) On the Wolseley-Indian Head gravelling contract?

Answer: 227,163 Cubic Yard Miles.

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Why were nine Beer Store Inspectors employed during the month of January 1930 when five had been sufficient in September 1929?

Answer: Because they were exceedingly busy in January, the number being reduced to 7 in February.

- (2) Were these additional inspectors required because of the inefficiency of many of the recently appointed Vendors and extra work involved in the numerous changes being made?

Answer: No; See answer to question 1.

Mr. Greaves asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Did the Government buy any lumber or bridge timber from Pearse & Edworthy of Pesane during the years 1926, 1927, 1928 and 1929?

Answer: In the years 1926 and 1928 the Government bought culvert timber from Pearse & Edworthy of Pesane but no purchases were made from this company during the years 1927 and 1929.

- (2) What quantities of each did they buy?

Answer:

| | Shipped to | |
|---|---------------|----------|
| On July 5, 1926, 2509 Ft. B.M. Tamarac | Prairie River | \$ 82.80 |
| On July 7, 1926, 960 Ft. B.M. Tamarac | Prairie River | 31.68 |
| On July 7, 1926, 427 Ft. B.M. Spruce | Prairie River | 14.09 |
| On Sept. 21, 1928, 2000 Ft. B.M. Rough Lumber | Pesane | 60.00 |
| On Oct. 29, 1928, 512 Ft. B.M. Rough Lumber | Bannock | 15.35 |

- (3) Where was each carload shipped to?

Answer: See information given in answer to Question (2)

MARCH 21, 1930

147

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The Assembly to go into the Committee of Supply).

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Merkley, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11.15 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1930.

Mr. Harbidge, from the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments, presented the third report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bills and has agreed to report the same with amendments:—

Bill No. 40—An Act respecting the Engineering Profession.

Bill No. 52—An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 76—An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 77—An Act to amend The Village Act.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 78—An Act to amend The Town Act, 1927.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 79—An Act to amend The City Act, 1926.

Hon. Mr. McConnell, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 80—An Act to amend The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act, 1926.

Hon. Mr. Buckle, Second Reading Wednesday next.

Bill No. 81—An Act to amend The Local Government Board Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Wednesday next.

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return to an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, dated February 11, 1930, showing:—

Copies of certain Orders in Council passed since September 8, 1929.

(Sessional Paper No. 43)

Also, Return to an Order of the Assembly dated February 20, 1930, showing:—

(1) Copies of all questionnaires sent out to School Inspectors from September 9, 1929, to the present date.

(2) Copies of all replies received to such questionnaires.

(Sessional Paper No. 44)

Mr. Parker, (Touchwood) asked the Government the following which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is Pat McCabe employed by the Government?

Answer: Pat McCabe who was employed by the Liberal Government from August 18, 1925, discharged July 4, 1926, re-employed from August 2, 1926 and appointment cancelled February 7, 1928, is not in the employ of the present Government.

- (2) If so, in what capacity is he employed?

Answer: See answer to question (1) .

Mr. Smith, (Moose Jaw City) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Was A. M. Taisey, Estevan, in the employ of the Government during the season of 1929?

Answer: Mr. A. M. Taisey was employed during the year 1929 with Hitchcock Brothers to do draying for the Liquor Board at Estevan. The draying was done under contract and the total amount paid was \$922.09.

- (2) If so, what were his duties and what amount of money was paid him per month during the season as salary and expenses?

Answer: See answer to question 1.

Mr. Johnson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is one Gallon in the employ of the Liquor Board?

Answer: Yes, W. J. Gallon is employed by the Liquor Board.

- (2) What position does he hold?

Answer: Utility man.

- (3) When was he engaged?

Answer: January 1st, 1930.

- (4) What salary is he being paid?

Answer: \$225.00 per month.

- (5) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (6) Is this the Gallon who was formerly a Conservative Organizer?

Answer: The Liquor Board has no knowledge of this.

Mr. Eades asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

(1) Was the S. W. ¼ 17-19-6 w. 3rd. ever foreclosed by the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board.

Answer: No.

(2) If so, when and for what amount?

Answer: See answer to question (1).

(3) Does the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board now hold a mortgage against above land for loan issued subsequent to foreclosure?

Answer: See answer to question (1).

(4) If so, when was subsequent loan issued, and for what amount?

Answer: See answer to question (1).

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The Assembly to again go into the Committee of Supply).

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. McIntosh, adjourned.

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

Bill No. 62—An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, 1927.

Bill No. 68—An Act to amend The Creditors Relief Act, 1923.

Bill No. 69—An Act to amend The Parents Maintenance Act, 1923.

Bill No. 70—An Act to amend The District Courts Act.

Bill No. 67—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act, 1927.

Bill No. 71—An Act to amend The Wild Lands Tax Act, 1928.

Bill No. 72—An Act to amend The School Assessment Act.

Bill No. 73—An Act to amend The Arrears of Taxes Act, 1926.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10.30 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 82—An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Thursday next.

Bill No. 83—An Act to amend The Telephone and Telegraph Department Act.

Hon. Mr. Bryant, Second Reading Thursday next.

The following Question, which was asked by Mr. Smith (Moose Jaw City) on the twenty-fourth instant, and partially answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson, was further replied to by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Was A. M. Taisey, Estevan, in the employ of the Government during the season of 1929?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what were his duties and what amount of money was paid him per month during the season as salary and expenses?

Answer: A. M. Taisey was employed as Road Supervisor of Maintenance at a rate of 60c per hour and 12c per mile for use of his car when engaged on Government business. He was paid:—

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| for the month of April | \$ 44.52 |
| for the month of May | 61.32 |
| for the month of June | 53.16 |
| for the month of July | 61.92 |
| for the month of August | 50.82 |
| for the month of September | 44.28 |
| and | |
| for the month of October | 55.44 |

By leave of the Assembly,

The Question on the Orders of the Day, to be asked by Mr. Loftson, with regard to A. E. Etter, Chief Game Guardian, was withdrawn.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Is Barney Sewell in the employ of the Government?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, in what Department is he employed and what is the nature of his duties?

Answer: Mr. Sewell, having had extensive experience on highway maintenance work as an engineer with the State Highway Commission of Minnesota, has been employed temporarily in the Department of Highways for the past six weeks assisting the Maintenance Engineer. The term of Mr Sewell's employment is estimated at two months.

Mr. Smith (Moose Jaw City) asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Were the following men in the employ of the Government during the season of 1929 as maintenance men on the highways:—

W. La Coste, Bienfait,
W. Matte, Estevan,
Ed. Venne, Estevan,
L. C. Hall, Estevan.

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what moneys were paid per month to each?

| | | |
|--|--------|----------|
| <i>Answer:</i> W. La Coste, for month of | April | \$ 76.25 |
| | May | 53.65 |
| | June | 67.20 |
| | July | Nil |
| | August | 14.30 |
| | Sept. | 50.60 |
| | Oct. | 23.40 |

| | | |
|------------------------|--------|----------|
| W. Matte, for month of | April | \$ 30.40 |
| | May | 73.00 |
| | June | 55.70 |
| | July | Nil |
| | August | 4.60 |
| | Sept. | 24.00 |
| | Oct. | 39.80 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|----------|
| Ed. Venne, for month of | March | \$ 42.90 |
| | April | 73.10 |
| | May | 94.50 |
| | June | 156.90 |
| | July | 36.60 |
| | August | 53.20 |
| | Sept. | 44.20 |
| | Oct. | 80.65 |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------|----------|
| L. C. Hall, for month of | March | \$ 33.60 |
| | April | 34.80 |
| | May | 43.20 |
| | June | 58.70 |
| | July | 19.90 |
| | August | 34.25 |
| | Sept. | Nil |
| | Oct. | 28.60 |

Mr. Huck asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Was any complaint received by the Department of Highways regarding the kind of gravel used on the McLean-Qu'Appelle Highway?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, was this complaint investigated and what was the result of such investigation?

Answer: Yes. Complaint was investigated and gravel was found to be satisfactory.

- (3) Is the Department satisfied that the contractor complied with the conditions and specifications of his contract?

Answer: Yes.

Mr. Ayre asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Who was the ferryman at the Borden Ferry in 1929?

Answer: S. B. Forsey of Borden, Sask.

- (2) How many years previously did he operate said Ferry?

Answer: Fourteen seasons.

- (2) Were his services satisfactory?

Answer: Formerly his services were satisfactory, but during the last two seasons he has not quite met the requirements of this ferry crossing.

- (4) How many applicants were there for this position?

Answer: Fourteen.

- (5) Were any of the applicants ex-service men?

Answer: Yes. Two of the fourteen applicants were ex-service men, but neither of these could have given satisfactory service at this crossing.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) How many Game Guardians were in the employ of the Government on September 9th, 1929?

Answer: 16.

- (2) How many are now employed?

Answer: 16.

- (3) What are their names, addresses and date of employment?

Answer: Patrick J. Ives, Tisdale, November 19th, 1929.

Frank Jervis, Etoimami, November 19th, 1929.

John S. Maneer, 1443 Retallack St., Regina, November 19th, 1929.

S. D. McLachlan, Archydale, November 19th, 1929.

W. J. MacKessock, Lanigan, November 19th, 1929.

Geo. C. Nadon, Meadow Lake, November 19th, 1929.

F. Pankoski, Yorkton, November 19th, 1929.

E. W. Roach, Paddockwood, November 19th, 1929.

Wm. A. Wood, 1505 Fifteenth Ave., Regina November 19, 1929.

A. J. Balfour, Balcarres, December 9th, 1929.

Jos. McAuley, Cumberland House, October 1st, 1927.

Andrew Webster, 419 29th St. W., Saskatoon, November 1st, 1921.

J. A. D. Frechette, Nipawin, November 1st, 1922.

I. O. Newton, Big River, September 1st, 1921.

Geo. H. Revell, Hudson Bay Junction, October 22nd, 1921.

R. D. Symonds, Carruthers, December 15th, 1928.

Mr. Grant asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) How many inspectors are employed in connection with Factory Inspection and the Minimum Wage Board?

Answer: Ten.

- (2) What are their names and what salary is each being paid?

Answer: Minimum Wage Staff:—

Mrs. A. M. McGachen, temporary, \$1200.00 per annum.

Miss M. G. Halbert, permanent, \$1440.00 per annum.

Factory Inspection of Steam Boilers:—

W. H. Mayhew, \$2400.00 per annum.

Lewis McEown, \$2400.00 per annum.

Donald McDonald, \$2400.00 per annum.

John Merchant, \$2400.00 per annum.

Chas. T. Jones, \$2400.00 per annum.

John M. Ross, \$2100.00 per annum.
 Fred Hayes, \$2100.00, per annum.
 M. J. McGrath, \$2100.00 per annum.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Merkley:—

- (1) How many Inspectors are employed as Motor License and Public Vehicles Inspectors?

Answer: Six.

- (2) What are their names and when were they appointed?

Answer:

H. J. Lewis, Swift Current, appointed Nov. 4, 1929.
 M. Sinclair, Saskatoon, appointed Nov. 20, 1929.
 J. N. Hall, Regina, appointed Nov. 25, 1929.
 L. McKeown, Moose Jaw, appointed Nov. 27, 1929.
 J. W. Whitley, North Battleford, appointed Dec. 3, 1929.
 Wm. Donaldson, Prince Albert, appointed Dec. 26, 1929.

Mr. Eades asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What was the total cost of the Bridge over the Wood River at East of Section 6-14-2 w. 3rd.

Answer: \$23,995.47.

- (2) When was it constructed?

Answer: In the year 1918.

- (3) What was the total cost of the Bridge over Wood River at North of Section 23-13-3 w. 3rd?

Answer: \$23,648.41.

- (4) When was it constructed?

Answer: In the year 1928.

- (5) What was the total cost of Bridge over Wood River at East of Section 8-13-3 w. 3rd?

Answer: \$20,299.76.

- (6) When was it constructed?

Answer: In the year 1912.

- (7) What was the total cost of Bridge over Wood River at East of Section 1-13-4 w. 3rd?

Answer: There is no Government Bridge at this location.

(8) When was it constructed?

Answer: See answer to Question No. 7.

The Assembly, according to Order resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the following Bills, which were reported without amendment, read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 010—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Bill No. 02—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the Assembly to go again into the Committee of Supply.)

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Patterson (Milestone), adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6.15 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1930.

Mr. Hanbidge, from the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments, presented the fourth report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill, and has agreed to report the same with amendment:—

Bill No. 45—An Act to provide for a Weekly Half-Holiday for Shop employees in Certain Cities.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bills were severally received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 84—An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 85—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between His Majesty the King, in the right of the Province of Saskatchewan, acting and represented by the Provincial Treasurer, of the first part, and Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited, of the second part.

Hon. Mr. Anderson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 86—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between the Government of the Dominion of Canada, represented therein by the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and the Honourable Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, of the first part, and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, represented therein by the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson, Premier and Minister of Education of the Province, and the Honourable Murdock Alexander MacPherson, Attorney General, of the second part.

Hon. Mr. Anderson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 89—An Act to amend The Distress Act.
Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 90—An Act to amend The Municipal Public Works Act.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 91—An Act to amend The Electrical Licensing Act, 1929.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 93—An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.

Hon. Mr. Munroe, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 94—An Act to amend The Public Health Act, 1924.
Hon. Mr. Munroe, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 95—An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act, 1928.
Hon. Mr. Munroe, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 96—An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1925.
Hon. Mr. Munroe, Second Reading Friday next.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted; and the respective Ministers introducing the Bills having in each case 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 following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 87—An Act to provide for the Administration of the Provincial Natural Resources.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 88—An Act to establish a Research Council.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson. Second Reading Friday next.

Bill No. 92—An Act to make further provision for the Care of Certain Mentally Defective Persons.

Hon. Mr. Munroe, Second Reading Friday next.

The Hon. Mr. Stewart, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return to an Order of the Assembly dated March 14, 1930, showing:—

- (1) The amount authorized by the Department of Highways during each fiscal year from May 1, 1921 to May 1, 1929, and during 1929 from May 1 to September 1 for expenditure upon roads, ferries and bridges, from both Capital and Revenue Account.
- (2) The amount expended by the said Department during each of the said fiscal years and during the period from May 1, 1929, to September 1, 1929, upon roads, ferries and bridges, from both Capital and Revenue Account.
- (3) How much of the amount authorized during each of the above periods was cancelled before the end of the period.
- (4) How much of the amount authorized during each of the above periods was carried over into the succeeding year for construction.

(*Sessional Paper No. 45*)

Mr. Lilly asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Buckle:—

- (1) How many men were employed as Counsel on the Royal Grain Commission 1929?

Answer: Three.

- (2) What are their names, the respective salaries paid to these Counsel, also the amount paid to each as expenses?

| <i>Answer:</i> | Salary | Expenses |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| H. F. Thomson, K.C., | \$14,400.00 | \$2,797.32 |
| A. T. Proctor, K.C., | 6,600.00 | 2,254.40 |
| W. B. Francis, | 1,360.00 | 722.45 |

- (3) Did either or any of these Counsel contest as candidate or candidates in the Saskatchewan Provincial Election 1929. If so, where and with what success?

Answer: A. T. Proctor, K.C., was a candidate in the Saskatchewan Provincial Election 1929 in the Moosomin electoral division, but was less successful than he had hoped.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the Assembly to again go into the Committee of Supply.)

The debate continued, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Spence, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.45 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1930.

Mr Hanbidge, from the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments, presented the fifth report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration

Bill No. 46—An Act to amend The Drugless Practitioners Act, 1929,

and having heard representations from those interested in the said Bill, recommends to the Assembly that, in view of the fact that there has been no real effort on the part of unlicensed drugless practitioners, as a whole, to try examinations as set pursuant to present legislation, the Bill be not further proceeded with at this Session.

By leave of the Assembly.

On motion of Mr. Hanbidge, seconded by Mr. Lilly,

Ordered, That the fifth report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments be now concurred in.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 97—An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928 (No. 2).

Hon. Mr. Stewart, Second Reading Monday next.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who was the previous Vendor of Beer Store at Shamrock?

Answer: M. W. Glascock.

- (2) Why was he dismissed?

Answer: At the discretion of the Board.

- (3) Did the Attorney General receive a largely signed petition asking that this man be retained in that position?

Answer: The Liquor Board received a petition after arrangements had been completed for the appointment of the new Vendor.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Has William Denton been in the employ of the Government or any of the Investigators employed by the Government?

Answer: To the first part of the question the answer is "No." As to whether he has been in the employ of the Investigators employed by the Government, the Government has no knowledge.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Strath, for a Return showing:—

Copies of all communications received from E. B. Haffner of Saskatoon in connection with W. J. Weston, by the Government or any member thereof, and copies of all replies sent thereto.

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

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

Bill No. 40—An Act respecting the Engineering Profession.

Bill No. 52—An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.

The following Bill was reported without amendment:

Bill No. 45—An Act to provide for a Weekly Half-holiday for Shop Employees in Certain Cities.

Moved by Mr. Given,

That the said Bill No. 45 be now read the third time.

In amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Whatley seconded by Mr. Benson,

That the said Bill No. 45 be not now read the third time but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

The question being put, on the amendment it was agreed to.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the Assembly to again go into the Committee of Supply.)

The debate continuing, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Spence, adjourned.

5.20 o'clock p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the chamber and taken 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 to amend The School Act (No. 1).

An Act to provide for the Registration of Corporation Securities.

An Act to amend The Marriage Act, 1924.

An Act to amend The Homesteads Act.

An Act to amend The Executions Act.

An Act to amend The School Grants Act, 1920.

An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act,

An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

An Act to amend The Corporations Taxation Act.

An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Northern Saskatchewan Co-operative Stock Yards, Limited.

An Act to amend The Horticultural Societies Act, 1928.

An Act to amend The Brand Act.

An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

An Act respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.

An Act to amend The Town Planning Act, 1928.

An Act to amend The Municipalities Relief Act, 1929.

An Act to amend The Treasury Department Act.

An Act to amend The Liquor Act, 1925.

An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.

An Act for the Licensing of Book Agents.

An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1929.

An Act to amend The Prairie and Forest Fires Act.

An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Permanent Cancer Commission.

An Act to amend The Companies Act, 1929.

An Act respecting the Amalgamation of Lloydminster.

An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

An Act for the Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Securities.

An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

An Act to amend The Infants Act.

An Act to amend the Land Titles Act, 1929.

An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1928.

An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928.

An Act to amend The Timber Taxation Act, 1923.

An Act to amend The Steam Boilers Act.

An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.

An Act respecting Embalmers.

An Act respecting The Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1930.

An Act to confirm a certain Bylaw of the City of Saskatoon and a certain Agreement entered into between Canadian Northern Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company of the one part and The City of Saskatoon of the other part and for other purposes.

An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited.

An Act dealing with Certain Bylaws of the City of Moose Jaw.

An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

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 the Lieutenant Governor then retired from the Chamber.

According to Order, Bill No. 66—An Act respecting the Superannuation of Teachers, was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

The Assembly then adjourned at 6.30 o’clock p.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1930.

Mr. Hanbidge, from the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments, presented the sixth report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee has had under consideration the following Bill and has agreed to report the same with amendment:—

Bill No. 47—An Act to provide for One Day of Rest in Seven for Certain Employees.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted; and the respective Ministers introducing the Bills having in each case 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 following Bills were severally received, read the first time, and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 98—An Act to amend The Highways Act.

Hon. Mr. Stewart, Second Reading Tuesday next.

Bill No. 99—An Act to establish an Athletic Commission.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Second Reading Tuesday next.

Mr. Cockburn asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Has the publication of the Saskatchewan Public Service Monthly been discontinued?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, when was it discontinued?

Answer: Publication was discontinued with the October 1929 issue.

- (3) Is the Government providing news items for the Weekly Press of the Province reporting the doings of the Legislature?

Answer: Yes.

A weekly summary of proceedings in the Legislature is furnished through the Bureau of Publications. This is being done at the request of the Executive of the Saskatchewan Branch of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association and continues an arrangement made by that Executive with the late Government, two years ago.

The weekly items are furnished under conditions as to length, news value, and non-partisanship laid down by the Executive of the Saskatchewan Branch.

That the articles in question are being widely used is indicative of the fact that these conditions are being observed.

- (4) If so, who is editing such material?

Answer: The news summary furnished is edited in the first place by the Commissioner of Publications, and, in the second place, by the Editors of the Weekly Newspapers using the service. There being no obligation imposed upon the publishers of the Weekly Newspapers to publish the articles in question, in full, in part or at all, Editors of such Weekly Newspapers have full discretion in the matter.

- (5) Is any payment being made to such press for publication of such material?

Answer: No. See answer to Question 3.

Mr. Garner asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Is a man by the name of Munroe from Wadena engaged in the Bureau of Publications?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, when was he engaged, what are his duties and what salary is he being paid?

Answer: Wednesday, March 26, 1930. His duties include the writing of publicity articles and the preparation of advertising copy. The salary he will be paid is not yet determined and will depend upon his ability and usefulness as displayed during his probationary period.

- (3) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (4) Who recommended him for his appointment?

Answer: Mr. Munroe made personal application in the regular way through the Civil Service Commissioner, and was engaged upon his own recommendation.

- (5) What are his qualifications for the position he holds?

Answer: His educational attainments and newspaper experience indicate that he is qualified to render valuable service to the Bureau.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Anderson:—

- (1) Is one Frederick Percival Henwood a school inspector of the Province?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, when was he appointed and what salary is he receiving?

Answer: Began duties February 1, 1930 at an initial salary of \$2700.

- (3) What are his qualifications for the position?

Answer: He received part of his education in England. He is a Bachelor of Arts, with honours, Queen's University and it is understood has practically completed the requirements for the M. A. degree. He is a graduate of the Provincial Normal School, Saskatoon, and holds permanent first class and high school certificates. He taught on a provisional certificate in rural schools in Saskatchewan during all or portions of the years 1916, 1917, 1920, 1921 and 1922. He attended the Normal School during the session January to April 1923 and has been teaching since in village and town schools. At the time of his appointment he was Principal of the Public and High School at Wadena.

- (4) What complaints are on record in the Department of Education with respect to him as a teacher in the Province?

Answer: None.

- (5) How many times was he inspected as a teacher by the School Inspectors of the Province and of such inspections how many are adverse?

Answer: In all he would appear to have had fifteen inspectoral visits from nine inspectors of schools. Prior to his Normal School training certain weaknesses in teaching and management were noted by two of the inspectors. Since his Normal School training he has had eight visits from inspectors and the reports are all favourable. Such expressions as "fairly good", "good", "satisfactory progress", "excellent", "a particularly strong teacher", "a teacher of outstanding ability", "has good teaching ability and good disciplinary power", "has the loyalty and co-operation of his staff", etc., appear in these reports.

Mr. Johnson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Vendor of the Liquor Store at Battleford?

Answer: H. W. Fisher.

- (2) When was he appointed to the position and what salary is he receiving?

Answer: Appointed as Vendor January 23rd 1930. Now receiving \$175.00 per month.

- (3) Was he formerly in the employ of the Government and, if so, when was he appointed and what positions did he fill?

Answer: Was formerly Clerk in the Battleford Liquor Store, appointed to that position on August 6th, 1925.

- (4) How many applicants were there for the position of Vendor in said store?

Answer: When Mr. Fisher was appointed he was the only applicant.

Mr. Therres asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Who has been appointed to the position of Provincial Architect lately vacated through the superannuation of Morris Sharon?

Answer: H. Dawson.

- (2) When was he appointed and what salary is he being paid?

Answer: Appointed February 1st, 1930, at a salary of \$3400.00 per annum.

- (3) How long has he resided in Saskatchewan?

Answer: Over 19 years.

- (4) For how long did he reside without Saskatchewan, immediately prior to his appointment?

Answer: Was in Saskatchewan from first week in September and has been continuously a tax payer in the Province since 1904.

- (5) Did he return to Saskatchewan for the purpose of this appointment and when did he return?

Answer: No, returned to Saskatchewan first week in September, 1929.

- (6) Was the Government unable to secure the services of an architect resident in Saskatchewan?

Answer: Mr. Dawson was a resident of Saskatchewan and, as he was formerly employed in the Architect's Department of the Saskatchewan Government for a period of six years, he was deemed eminently fitted by training and experience for the position.

(7) Was the position advertised?

Answer: No.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the Assembly to again go into the Committee of Supply.)

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

YEAS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----------|
| Whatley | Bennett | Whittaker |
| Buckle | Fraser | Arthur |
| MacPherson | Warren | Benson |
| Anderson | Given | Horner |
| McConnell | Gryde | Huston |
| Bryant | Cobban | Taylor |
| Stewart | Grassick | Greaves |
| Smith | Merkley | Lilly |
| (Swift Current) | Munroe | McLeod |
| | | Eades —27 |

NAYS.

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Parker | Patterson | Cockburn |
| (Touchwood) | (Pipestone) | Paulson |
| Finlayson | Clinch | Agar |
| Gordon | Grant | Huck |
| Spence | Therres | Hall |
| Davis | McGregor | Strath |
| Gardiner | Hogan | Dunn |
| Uhrich | McIntosh | Ayre |
| | | Morken—23 |

The Assembly, accordingly again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

Saturday, March 29, 1930.

Progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

The Assembly then adjourned at 12.15 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1930.

Leave to introduce the same having been granted, the following Bill was received, read the first time and second reading ordered:—

Bill No. 100—An Act respecting Noxious Weeds.
Hon. Mr. Buckle, Second Reading Wednesday next.

The Hon. Mr. Merkley, a member of the Executive Council, laid before the Assembly:—

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into certain matters regarding the disposition of property under The United Church of Canada Act.

(*Sessional Paper No. 46*)

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) Is Barney Sewell temporarily employed in the Department of Highways the same Barney Sewell who was Superintendent in 1929 for Stevens Bros. of St. Paul on their contracts in Saskatchewan?

Answer: Mr. Bernard Sewell was not superintendent in 1929 for Stevens Bros. of St. Paul. He was superintendent in 1929 for Stevens Brothers (Saskatchewan), Limited, Head Office Regina, who had contracts with the Saskatchewan Government. Mr. Sewell formerly worked as Civil Engineer for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in Western Canada and then held a position for eight years with the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota, specializing on highway maintenance works. It was on account of his wide experience in organizing maintenance works that the Government secured his services temporarily to assist the Maintenance Engineer of the Department of Highways in reorganizing the Government maintenance force.

- (2) Is he under contract or agreement with Stevens Brothers for the coming season?

Answer: The Government has no knowledge.

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is William Rogers in the employ of the Liquor Board?

Answer: No.

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

- Bill No. 74—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, 1925.
- Bill No. 83—An Act to amend The Telephone and Telegraph Department Act.
- Bill No. 75—An Act to amend The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act, 1927.
- Bill No. 80—An Act to amend The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act, 1926.
- Bill No. 76—An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1929.
- Bill No. 77—An Act to amend The Village Act, 1928.
- Bill No. 78—An Act to amend The Town Act, 1927.
- Bill No. 79—An Act to amend The City Act, 1926.
- Bill No. 84—An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.
- Bill No. 89—An Act to amend The Distress Act.
- Bill No. 91—An Act to amend The Electrical Licensing Act.
- Bill No. 92—An Act to make further provision for the Care of Certain Mentally Defective Persons.
- Bill No. 93—An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.
- Bill No. 94—An Act to amend The Public Health Act, 1924.
- Bill No. 95—An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act, 1928.
- Bill No. 96—An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1925.

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

The following Bills were severally reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:—

- Bill No. 2—An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.
- Bill No. 62—An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, 1927.
- Bill No. 68—An Act to amend The Creditors Relief Act, 1923.
- Bill No. 72—An Act to amend The School Assessment Act.
- Bill No. 58—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act, 1922.
- Bill No. 63—An Act to amend The Game Act, 1924.

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

Bill No. 61—An Act to amend The Masters and Servants Act.

Bill No. 69—An Act to amend The Parents Maintenance Act, 1923.

Bill No. 70—An Act to amend The District Courts Act.

Bill No. 67—An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act, 1927.

Bill No. 59—An Act to amend The Local Improvements Districts Relief Act.

The Assembly, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

Tuesday, April 1, 1930

Progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

The Assembly then adjourned at 12.55 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1930.

The Hon. Mr. MacPherson, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated March 13, 1930, showing:—

Copies of all petitions, telegrams and correspondence passing between the Liquor Board, the Government and H. W. Fisher, and Jacob G. Wahl of Hague and Henry H. Doerksen of Rosthern, in reference to the Beer Store at Hague and the appointment of a Vendor for the said store.

(Sessional Paper No. 47)

And also,—Return to an Order of the Assembly dated March 13, 1930, showing:—

- (1) In the case of retirement from the services of the Liquor Board by dismissal or otherwise, in how many cases retiring officials have been given one month's pay in lieu of one month's notice.
- (2) The total amount paid by the Board to date from September 1, 1929, to retiring officials by way of salary in lieu of notice.
- (3) The total amount paid to persons replacing said retiring officials for their services during the period for which said salary in lieu of notice was paid.
- (4) The number of changes of premises for liquor or beer stores made since September 1, 1929, to this date.
- (5) Where the said changes have been made.
- (6) From whom premises were rented prior to changes and from whom they are now rented.
- (7) The amount of rent paid per month in respect of premises prior to change and what is being paid now in each case.
- (8) If in any case a month's rent was paid in lieu of one month's notice of termination of lease and, if so, in what case or cases.
- (9) The total amount paid during said period by way of rent in lieu of notice.
- (10) The total amount paid during said period for new premises in those cases where new premises were occupied as a result of cancellation of tenancy in which rent was paid in lieu of notice.

(Sessional Paper No. 48)

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, a member of the Executive Council, presented,—

Return to an Order of the Assembly dated March 20, 1930, showing:—

The names of all employecs of the Government who have been engaged since September 9, 1929, the position held by each and the salary being paid.

(*Sessional Paper No. 49*)

The Hon. Mr. McConnell, a member of the Executive Council, presented,—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated March 27, 1930, showing:—

Copies of all communications received from E. B. Haffner of Saskatoon in connection with W. J. Weston, by the Government or any member thereof, and copies of all replies sent thereto.

(*Sessional Paper No. 50*)

The Minister having stated that the Tabling of the under-mentioned Return would not be in the public interest,

Ordered, That the Order of the Assembly, by Mr. Johnson, passed on March 20, 1930, for a Return showing:

Copies of all reports received to date from all temporary Inspectors employed in the Bureau of Child Protection. be discharged.

Moved by Mr. McIntosh, seconded by Mr. Benson,

That, in the opinion of this Assembly, every handicap placed on the free operation of the British Preference, as contained in the Tariff schedules, be removed; and further, that the time has come when the British Preference should be progressively increased so as to have complete free trade with the Mother Country within a period of five years.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|------------|-------------|----------|
| Hutcheon | Benson | Clinch |
| Whatley | Horner | Grant |
| Stipe | Patterson | Therres |
| Buckle | (Milestone) | McGregor |
| MacPherson | McLean | Hogan |
| Anderson | Huston | McIntosh |
| McConnell | Taylor | Cockburn |

| | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Bryant | Greaves | Paulson |
| Stewart | Hanbidge | Agar |
| Smith | Lilly | Huck |
| (Swift Current) | McLeod | Hall |
| Bennett | Eades | Marion |
| Fraser | Miller | Loptson |
| Smith | Parker | Johnson |
| (Moose Jaw City) | (Touchwood) | Strath |
| Warren | Finlayson | Parker |
| Given | Gordon | (Pelly) |
| Gryde | Spence | Dunn |
| Cobban | Davis | Garner |
| Grassick | Gardiner | Ayre |
| Merkley | Uhrich | Morken—61 |
| Munroe | Patterson | |
| Whittaker | (Pipestone) | |

NAYS.

Mr. Arthur—1

Moved by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Miller,

That, in the opinion of this Assembly, legislation should be enacted making provision for compulsory insurance by vehicle owners against collision damage, personal liability and property damage.

A debate arising, by leave of the Assembly, the said Resolution was withdrawn.

Moved by Mr. Fraser, seconded by Mr. Warren:—

That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Federal Government should be requested by the Government of Saskatchewan to enact amending legislation whereby a greater measure of relief by way of pension and treatment will be accorded those citizens of Canada who enlisted and served in the Great War.

And, further, this Assembly is of the opinion that greater encouragement and support be given by the Federal Government to those ex-service men who are soldier settlers under the Soldier Settlement Board.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

Moved by Mr. Patterson (Pipestone), seconded by Mr. Clinch,

That all matters regarding the Department of Telephones referred to in the reports of O. J. Godfrey and Company and G. B. Munnoch and Company of Calgary be referred to the Royal Commission which this Legislature has humbly petitioned His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to appoint.

APRIL 1, 1930

175

A debate arising, said debate was, on motion of Mr. Horner, adjourned.

The Assembly, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

Wednesday, April 2, 1930

Progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.05 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1930.

Mr Bennett asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) What was the total male staff of the Liquor Board on September 9, 1929?

Answer: 398.

- (2) How many of these were returned soldiers?

Answer: 113.

- (3) What was the total male staff of the Liquor Board on March 31, 1930?

Answer: 406.

- (4) How many of these were returned soldiers?

Answer: 219.

- (5) What was the total number of Beer Vendors on September 9, 1929?

Answer: 181.

- (6) How many of these were returned soldiers?

Answer: 38.

- (7) What was the total number of Beer Vendors on March 31, 1930?

Answer: 182.

- (8) How many of these were returned soldiers?

Answer: 101.

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

Ordered, That Standing Order 5 (2) be suspended and that today's sitting be continued at 8.30 o'clock p.m.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 2—An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Bill No. 62—An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, 1927.

Bill No. 68—An Act to amend The Creditors Relief Act, 1923.

Bill No. 72—An Act to amend The School Assessment Act.

Bill No. 58—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act, 1922.

Bill No. 63—An Act to amend The Game Act, 1924.

According to Order, the Hon. Mr. Anderson moved,

That Bill No. 86—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between the Government of the Dominion of Canada, represented therein by the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and the Honourable Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, of the first part, and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, represented therein by the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson, Premier and Minister of Education of the Province, and the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson, Attorney General, of the second part, be now read the second time.

A debate arising, it was moved by the Hon. Mr. Bryant, That the debate be now adjourned.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Fraser | Horner |
| Whatley | Smith | Patterson |
| Stipe | (Moose Jaw City) | (Milestone) |
| Buckle | Given | McLean |
| MacPherson | Gryde | Huston |
| Anderson | Cobban | Taylor |
| McConnell | Grassick | Greaves |
| Bryant | Merkley | Lilly |
| Stewart | Munroe | McLeod |
| Smith | Whittaker | Eades |
| (Swift Current) | Arthur | Miller—32 |
| Bennett | Benson | |

NAYS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| Parker | Clinch | Hall |
| (Touchwood) | Grant | Marion |
| Finlayson | Therres | Loptson |
| Spence | McGregor | Johnson |
| Davis | Hogan | Strath |
| Gardiner | McIntosh | Parker |
| Uhrich | Cockburn | (Pelly) |
| Patterson | Paulson | Dunn |
| (Pipestone) | Agar | Ayre |
| | Huck | Morken—26 |

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. 84—An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.
- Bill No. 74—An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, 1925.
- Bill No. 83—An Act to amend The Telephone and Telegraph Department Act.
- Bill No. 75—An Act to amend The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act, 1927.
- Bill No. 80—An Act to amend The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act, 1926.
- Bill No. 93—An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.

The following Bill was reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:—

Bill No. 91—An Act to amend The Electrical Licensing Act.

On the following Bills progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again:—

Bill No. 78—An Act to amend The Town Act, 1927.

Bill No. 79—An Act to amend The City Act, 1926.

Bill No. 94—An Act to amend The Public Health Act, 1924.

Bill No. 95—An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act, 1928.

The Assembly according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

Thursday, April 3, 1930.

Progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

The Assembly then adjourned at 12.10 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1930.

The Hon. Mr. McConnell, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated February 17, 1930, showing:—

Copies of all correspondence between the King's Printer and Western Printers' Association, Limited, during the period from September 9 to December 31, 1929.

(*Sessional Paper No. 51*)

Mr. Morken asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is W. F. Goulden a Justice of the Peace?

Answer: No.

- (2) If not, when was his appointment cancelled?

Answer: 24th December, 1929.

- (3) How long had he held the appointment?

Answer: Since April 16th, 1914.

- (4) Was he appointed a Justice of the Peace prior to the formation of the Province?

Answer: Not according to the records of the Department of the Attorney-General.

- (5) Why was he dismissed?

Answer: Because the Lieutenant Governor in Council in the exercise of his discretion saw fit to remove his name from the Commission of the Peace.

Mr. Loptson asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Is Andrew Sutherland a Justice of the Peace for the Province and, if so when was he appointed?

Answer: No, but Andrew Soderlund of Sturgis is a Justice of the Peace and was appointed 6th March 1930.

- (2) Has this man ever been convicted of an offence against any law in force in the Province and, if so, for what, when, and what was the penalty imposed?

Answer: No.

Mr. McLeod asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Was one Daniel Stephen Sheriff of the Judicial District of Yorkton?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) Was he dismissed, and, if so, when?

Answer: His appointment was cancelled on the 1st day of November 1929.

- (3) Was an audit made of his office by the Provincial Auditor or his assistants?

Answer: Yes.

- (4) Were certain amounts collected by the said Sheriff and found by the said auditors not to have been placed on the records of the said office? If so, give particulars.

Answer: Yes.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| February 1926 Excelsior Life Insurance Company v. A. & M. Cymbaliski | \$ 23.25 |
| February 1926 Great West Life Assurance Company v. J. Kattermer | 24.85 |
| January 1928 Netherlands Trust Company Limited v. M. Monka | 18.00 |
| April 1928 Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation v. Swerhim | 16.60 |
| June 1928 Commercial Securities Corporation v. Simpson | 10.00 |
| June 1928 Commercial Securities Corporation v. G. Goetz | 20.50 |
| August 1928 Reliance Lumber Company v. Sauser..... | 32.00 |
| November 1928 Netherlands Trust Company Limited v. M. Monka | 9.25 |
| Netherlands Trust Company Limited v. A. J. Morrison | 11.25 |
| Netherlands Trust Company Limited v. B. Locken | 16.75 |
| August 1929 General Motors Acceptance v. W. Krasniuk | 25.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$ 207.45 |

- (5) Did the said Auditors make a demand on the said Sheriff for restitution and, if so, did he make restitution and when?

Answer: Yes, restitution made in September and October 1929.

According to Order Bill No. 91—An Act to amend The Electrical Licensing Act, was read the third time and passed.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Anderson,

That Bill No. 86—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between the Government of the Dominion of Canada, represented therein by the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and the Honourable Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, of the first part, and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, represented therein by the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson, Premier and Minister of Education of the Province, and the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson, Attorney General, of the second part, be now read the second time.

The debate continuing, and the question being put, it was agreed to.

The said Bill No. 86 was accordingly read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

By leave of the Assembly, the Order "Motions" was reverted to.

Moved by Mr. Whatley, seconded by Mr. Patterson (Milestone),

That this Assembly is opposed to the advertising of intoxicating liquor in any form whatsoever in this Province and is in favour of this Government taking steps for its elimination.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Given, seconded by Mr. Miller,

That there be added to the said Resolution the following words:—

‘and that to accomplish this end the Government of Saskatchewan be requested to seek the co-operation of the Governments of Alberta and Manitoba in a combined decision to eliminate such advertising.’

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

YEAS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Gryde | McLeod |
| Whatley | Cobban | Eades |
| Buckle | Grassick | Miller |
| MacPherson | Merkley | Parker |
| Anderson | Munroe | (Touchwood) |
| McConnell | Whittaker | Finlayson |
| Bryant | Arthur | Gordon |
| Stewart | Benson | Therres |
| Smith | Horner | McIntosh |
| (Swift Current) | Patterson | Johnson |

| | | |
|---------|-------------|-----------|
| Bennett | (Milestone) | Strath |
| Fraser | McLean | Dunn |
| Warren | Huston | Ayre |
| Given | Greaves | Morken—39 |

NAYS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|--------|-------------|----------|
| Spence | Patterson | McGregor |
| Uhrich | (Pipestone) | Hogan |
| | | Huck—6 |

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

On motion of Mr. Whittaker, seconded by Mr. Lilly,

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Federal Government should be requested to make definite arrangements to encourage foreign settlers to become Canadian citizens as soon as they have completed the required residence period and that ceremonies be arranged, when practicable, on July 1, of each year to welcome these new citizens.

On motion of Mr. Benson, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Stewart,

Ordered, That a Select Special Committee consisting of Messrs. Anderson, Gardiner, Davis, and the mover and seconder be now appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in revising the Standing Orders of this Legislative Assembly.

On motion of Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Arthur,

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the function of parenthood should be denied to mental defectives. To this end strict regulations for the issuance of marriage licenses should be combined with social supervision of the mentally incompetent, together with sterilization in the interest of eugenics.

Friday, April 4, 1930.

On motion of Mr. Benson, seconded by Mr. Strath,

Resolved, That this Assembly is of the opinion that every effort should be made to acquaint the farmers of this Province with the importance of using high quality pure seed grain as one of the important factors in maintaining good yields and in preserving the excellent reputation which Western Canadian grain, and especially hard spring wheat, has earned in the World's export market.

The Assembly then adjourned at 12.10 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1930.

Ordered, That the Hon. McMcConnell have leave to introduce Bill No. 101—An Act respecting Certain Advances to purchase Seed Grain.

The Hon. Mr. McConnell, 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 on Monday next.

Mr. Speaker,

I have not allowed the Notice of Motion by Mr. Parker (Touchwood), which is as follows:—

“That this Assembly request the Government to urge upon the Federal Government the necessity for continued reduction of the protective element of the Customs Tariff until it is entirely removed, particularly on the implements of production and the necessities of life.”

to appear on the Order Paper for the reason that it refers to the same question and is practically identical in terms with the proposed Motion of Mr. McIntosh on March 20, last:—

“That this Assembly request the Government to urge upon the Federal Government the necessity for continued reduction of the protective element of the Customs Tariff until it is entirely removed, particularly on the implements of production and the necessities of life; and, as a means to this end, that the British Preference should be increased with the object of establishing Free Trade with Great Britain within five years.”

By leave of the Assembly, this Resolution of Mr. McIntosh was withdrawn and the following Resolution, on the same question but differently worded, was substituted without notice, debated and passed:—

“That, in the opinion of this Assembly, every handicap placed on the free operation of the British Preference, as contained in our Tariff Schedules, be removed; and further, that the time has come when the British Preference should be progressively increased so as to have complete Free Trade with the Mother Country within a period of five years.”

Therefore, the House has definitely dealt with this matter and it can not be introduced again for discussion at this Session.

See Beauschene: Page 124—Paragraph 383
Page 124—Paragraph 384
Page 124—Paragraph 386
Page 140—Paragraph 456

It might be argued that the substituted Motion dealt only with the latter part of Mr. McInosh's original Motion and, that, therefore, the former part of the Motion, which is identical with that of which Mr. Parker has given notice, might now be re-introduced for discussion. I am of the opinion, however, that, in allowing the original motion of Mr. McIntosh to be withdrawn and the substituted motion to be discussed and carried, the House expressed its opinion of this whole question and, therefore, the present Motion of which Mr. Parker has given Notice, is out of Order for discussion again during this Session.

After discussion the Ruling of Mr. Speaker was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Hutcheon | Fraser | Horner |
| Whatley | Smith | Patterson |
| Buckle | (Moose Jaw City) | (Milestone) |
| MacPherson | Warren | McLean |
| Anderson | Given | Huston |
| McConnell | Gryde | Taylor |
| Bryant | Grassick | Greaves |
| Stewart | Merkley | Hanbidge |
| Smith | Munroe | Lilly |
| (Swift Current) | Whittaker | McLeod |
| Bennett | Benson | Eades |
| | | Miller—31 |

NAYS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| Parker | Clinch | Marion |
| (Touchwood) | Grant | Loftson |
| Finlayson | Therres | Johnson |
| Gordon | McGregor | Strath |
| Spence | Hogan | Parker |
| Davis | McIntosh | (Pelly) |
| Gardiner | Cockburn | Dunn |
| Uhrich | Paulson | Garner |
| Patterson | Agar | Ayre—26 |
| (Pipestone) | Huck | |

Mr. Speaker read a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, as follows:—

H. W. NEWLANDS,
Lieutenant Governor,

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

I have received with much pleasure the Address that you have voted in reply to my Speech at the Opening of the present Session of the Legislature and thank you for it sincerely.

(*Sessional Paper No. 52*)

Mr. McLeod asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart:—

- (1) What was the amount authorized by the Department of Highways under the previous Administration during the period from April 30, to September 6, 1929 for:

(a) Main market roads and bridges?

Answer:

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| Main market roads | \$630,230.66 |
| Bridges | 133,405.26 |

(b) Highways, ferries and capital bridges?

Answer:

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Highways | \$4,000,016.04 |
| Ferries | 134,470.00 |
| Capital Bridges | 330,194.60 |

Total \$5,228,316.56

- (2) What tenders for highway construction and gravelling were called for and opened during the said period?

Answer:

Highway Construction: Earth

| Location | Mileage |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Wolseley to Sintaluta | 8 |
| Candiac to Montmartre | 9½ |
| Milestone to Corinne | 5 |
| Wilcox Northwest | 6 |
| Wadena to Hendon | 10 |
| Moosomin North Extension | 6 |
| Spalding North | 10½ |
| Edam to Vawn | 10 |
| North Battleford South-east | 8 |
| Theodore West | 6 |
| Prince Albert North | 16 |
| Hughton East | 3 |
| Kennedy to Kipling | 19 |
| Shackleton to Abbey | 9 |
| Parkbeg to Caron | 18 |
| Fielding to Maymont | 10 |
| Biggar South | 10½ |
| Cote to Kamsack | 7 |
| Bengough South Extension | 6½ |
| Vonda to Aberdeen | 11 |
| Major to Fusilier | 8 |
| Nokomis to Drake | 16 |
| Woodrow to Meyronne | 5½ |
| Success East | 12 |
| Unity West Extension | 12 |
| Radville North | 4 |

APRIL 4, 1930

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Torquay South | 10 |
| Kincaid to Hazenmore | 7 |
| Hodgeville North Extension | 6 |
| Weyburn to McTaggart | 7½ |
| Parkside to Leask | 18 |
| Domremy to St. Louis | 12 |
| Maple Creek West | 18 |
| Lloydminster East | 8 |
| Duff to Fenwood | 11 |

Highway Construction: Gravel

| Location | Mileage |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Regina South | 12 |
| Pense to Moose Jaw | 24 |
| Tonkin to Saltcoats | 15½ |
| Clair East | 13 |
| Borden to Fielding | 20 |
| Saskatoon to Grandora | 9½ |
| Man. Boundary to Moosomin | 14½ |
| Ebenezer to Canora | 18 |
| Southey to Raymore | 16 |
| Bethune to Dilke | 12 |
| Prudhomme to Dana | 20½ |
| Lisieux North & South | 22 |
| Melville North | 18 |
| Vanguard East and West | 17 |
| Gravelbourg West | 10 |
| Humboldt East and West | 14 |
| Saskatoon to Dundurn | 18 |
| Ernfold to Herbert | 16 |
| Abernethy East | 11 |
| Perdue to Asquith | 18 |
| Melville West | 9 |
| Beverley to Antelope | 20 |
| Esterhazy to Dubuc | 18.3 |
| Dubuc to Neudorf | 25 |
| Tomkins to Piapot | 21.4 |
| Moose Jaw South) | |
| Moose Jaw to Caron) | 26 |
| Torquay West | 23½ |
| Moose Jaw South | 8 |
| Ogema to Horizon | 18½ |
| McLean to Indian Head | 17½ |
| Marchwell to Bredenbury | 30½ |
| Dysart East and West | 14 |

- (3) How many of said contracts were opened on September 4, and how many of these were in constituencies represented by Liberal members?

Answer: Tenders for five contracts were opened on September 4; two of these contracts were in constituencies represented by Liberal members and one contract was in two constituencies—one of which is represented by a Liberal member and one by a Government member.

Mr. Uhrich asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Did the Government install the sewage disposal system at the Prince Albert Sanitorium?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, what was the cost to the Government of such works?

Answer: \$12,215.85.

- (3) Was the Government aware that the City of Prince Albert was responsible for the cost of the installation and maintenance of such system according to contract between said City and Anti-Tuberculosis League?

Answer: The Government was aware that an Agreement dated October 1st, 1928 and made between the Corporation of the City of Prince Albert and The Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League, contained the following covenant on the part of the City of Prince Albert:

“To construct and maintain now, and at all times hereafter, during the operation of the said Sanitorium and Hospital, all necessary and adequate works and facilities for the effective and proper disposal of sewage from the said Sanitorium and Hospital from a point to be designated by the League. The construction necessary to supply present adequate sewerage facilities and works shall be completed by the date commencement of operation of the said Sanitorium and Hospital.”

No such facilities having been provided by the City of Prince Albert, and no provision having been made at any time for the sedimentation and chlorination of the said sewage in accordance with best sanitation practice, which was considered necessary by our Director of the Division of Sanitation, in view of the comparatively small body of water into which the effluent discharges on the North side of the island opposite the point of outlet, and in view of the nature of the institution and the necessity that the effluent should be rendered free from all pathogenic organisms, and the City of Prince Albert being unwilling to make any expenditure beyond an agreed amount which had already been expended, the Government did the necessary work in the interest of the Public Health.

Mr. Ayre asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) What is the name of the Insurance Agent through whom the Fire Insurance was placed on the existing policy on the Edam Beer Store?

Answer: Messrs. Reed & Reed, Turtleford, Saskatchewan.

- (2) Is this the same agent who previously placed the insurance?

Answer: No.

- (3) If a change of agent has been made, why and on whose recommendation?

Answer: The Liquor Board made the change, being of the opinion that as the same Agent had the opportunity of handling the business for some time another Agent should be given a similar opportunity.

- (4) Were the dealings with the previous Agent and the Company which he represented satisfactory?

Answer: Yes.

- (5) What is the name of the Company issuing the Policy?

Answer: London and Lancashire Fire Insurance Company.

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) What was the value of Brewery Products purchased from each Brewery by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board between October 1, 1929 and February 28, 1930, inclusive?

Answer:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Adanac Brewing Company Limited | \$53,443.72 |
| American Brewing Company Limited | 98,559.13 |
| The Hub City Brewing Company Limited | 55,899.78 |
| Prince Albert Breweries, Limited | 214,064.01 |
| Red Wing Brewing Company Limited | 33,181.98 |
| The Regina Brewing Company Limited | 117,608.93 |
| The Saskatoon Brewing Company Limited | 262,677.73 |
| The Souris Breweries, Limited | 20,730.48 |
| Star Brewing Company Limited | 23,538.05 |
| Calgary Brewing & Malting Company Limited | 332,652.35 |
| The Drewry's Limited | 256,763.86 |
| The Lethbridge Breweries, Limited | 183,691.39 |
| Pelissier's Limited | 41,974.37 |
| Sheas' Winnipeg Brewery, Limited | 223,461.34 |

\$ 1,918,247.12

Mr. Hogan asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Bryant:—

- (1) Who is the Warden of Regina Jail?

Answer: Charles Gleadow.

- (2) Was the said Warden ever a member of the Regina City Police Force?

Answer: Yes.

- (3) If so, was he dismissed from said force and, in such event, for what reason was he dismissed?

Answer: Was not dismissed, he resigned.

- (4) Are former inmates of this institution permitted to attend at the Jail and interview present inmates thereof?

Answer: Rule 109 of the Rules and Regulations for the government of the common Jails permits prisoners to see and converse with persons on such hours and on such days as the Warden may fix and such visits and conversation must take place in the presence of a Jail officer.

- (5) Is the said Warden able to personally keep the records of said Institution or such records that fall to his care as part of his duties?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) If not, who keeps such records for him?

Answer: See Answer to Question (5).

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 86—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between the Government of the Dominion of Canada, represented therein by the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and the Honourable Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, of the first part, and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, represented therein by the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson, Premier and Minister of Education of the Province, and the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson, Attorney General, of the second part, which was reported without amendment, read the third time and passed.

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

Bill No. 65—An Act respecting the Public Service.

Bill No. 64—An Act to regulate the Speed and Operation of Vehicles on Highways.

Bill No. 81—An Act to amend The Local Government Board Act.

Bill No. 82—An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, 1929.

Bill No. 87—An Act to provide for the Administration of the Provincial Natural Resources.

Bill No. 88—An Act to establish a Research Council.

Bill No. 90—An Act to amend The Municipal Public Works Act.

Bill No. 99—An Act to establish an Athletic Commission.

Bill No. 97—An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928 (No. 2.)

Bill No. 98—An Act to amend The Highways Act.

Bill No. 100—An Act respecting Noxious Weeds.

The following Order of the Assembly was issued to the proper officer:—

By Mr. Urich, for a Return showing:—

Copies of all reports made by the Director of Sanitation, Department of Public Health, since September 9, 1929, in reference to sewage disposal system at the Provincial Industrial School.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11.25 o'clock p.m.

REGINA, MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1930.

Mr. Arthur, from the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, presented the first report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee met for organisation and appointed Mr. Arthur as its Chairman;

Your Committee has investigated, as fully as possible in the time at its disposal, the Auditor's report in connection with The Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board which was referred to it:

Your Committee is of the opinion that a service has been rendered to the Province of Saskatchewan in the investigation so made;

Your Committee is further of the opinion that the losses, which must be taken as a result of past operations of the Board, are what might have been expected when all the circumstances are taken into consideration;

The experiences of the Board, as disclosed by the investigation, should be taken into careful consideration in order to avoid any unreasonable losses in the future.

Your Committee has had under consideration the question of the printing of any of the Sessional Papers and Debates of this Session and has agreed to recommend to the Assembly:—

- (1) That the following Sessional Papers be printed:—
 - (a) Synopsis of the Annual Report of The Local Government Board for the year 1929 (Sessional Paper No. 3);
 - (b) Synopses of the Annual Reports of The Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board for the years 1928 and 1929 (Sessional Papers No. 26 and 33);
 - (c) Report of the Trustees of The Saskatchewan Agricultural Research Foundation (Sessional Paper No. 28);
- (2) That the following be published with the Sessional Papers:—
 - (a) Speeches of Mr. Eades, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Gardiner, Hon. Mr. Anderson, Hon. Mr. McConnell, Mr. Uhrich, Hon. Mr. Stipe, Hon. Mr. Smith, Mr. Patterson (Pipestone), Mr. Garner, Hon. Mr. Buckle, Hon. Mr. Stewart, Mr. Benson, Hon. Mr. MacPherson, and Mr. Parker (Pelly), on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne;
 - (b) Speeches of Hon. Mr. Anderson, Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Given, Mr. Uhrich, and Hon. Mr. Anderson (in closing), on the Second Reading of Bill No. 1—An Act to amend The School Act (No. 1);

- (c) Speeches of Mr. Horner, Mr. McIntosh, Mr. Dunn, and Hon. Mr. Stewart, on Resolution re Immigration;
 - (d) Speech of Hon. Mr. Munroe, on the Second Reading of Bill No. 33—An Act to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Cancer Commission;
 - (e) Speeches of Hon. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Davis, on the Second Reading of Bill No. 20—An Act to amend The School Act (No. 2);
 - (f) Budget Speech of Hon. Mr. McConnell, and Speeches in Budget Debate of Hon. Mr. Bryant, Hon. Mr. Merkley, Hon. Mr. Stewart, Mr. Hall, Mr. Spence, Mr. Whatley, Mr. Gardiner and Hon. Mr. McConnell (in closing);
 - (g) Speech of Mr. Patterson (Pipestone) in moving that Reports re Telephone Department be referred to Royal Commission;
 - (h) Speeches of Hon. Mr. Anderson, Mr. Davis, Hon. Mr. MacPherson, Mr. Gardiner, on the Second Reading of Bill No. 86—re Natural Resources Agreement.
 - (i) Statements of Mr. Whatley and Mr. Stewart, and Speeches of Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Patterson (Pipestone) and Mr. Davis during Special Session (September, 1929);
- (3) That 500 copies of the Journals and 2,000 copies of the Sessional Papers be printed;

Your Committee also has considered the question of the free distribution, during the Session, of Bills, Votes and Proceedings and Orders of the Day and now recommends that, in future, a nominal charge sufficient to cover the cost of printing be made for these Legislative Papers and for the Journals and Sessional Papers after prorogation, to individuals or companies desiring same but that no charge be made for distribution of said printed matter to Departments or Officials of this and other Governments, to Municipalities or to the Press; the amount of the charge to be made and the free mailing list above referred to, to be subject to the approval of the President of Council.

Your Committee also decided to recommend that the Government take into consideration the question of the payment of fees of Counsel appearing in behalf of witnesses summoned before the Committee for examination.

By leave of the Assembly,

On motion of Mr. Arthur, seconded by Mr. Patterson, (Pipestone).

Ordered, That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be now concurred in.

The Hon. Mr. Munroe, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated March 14, 1930, showing:—

Copies of all reports made by the Director of Sanitation, Department of Public Health, since September 9, 1929, in reference to sewage disposal system at the Provincial Industrial School.

(Sessional Paper No. 53)

The Hon. Mr. Anderson, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated March 14, 1930, showing:—

The names of all employees of the Government who have been dismissed since September 9, 1929, the position held by each, the salary being paid at the time of dismissal, the date of dismissal and the length of service in each case.

(Sessional Paper No. 54)

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. 99—An Act to establish an Athletic Commission.

Bill No. 88—An Act to establish a Research Council.

Bill No. 71—An Act to amend The Wild Lands Tax Act, 1928.

Bill No. 73—An Act to amend The Arrears of Taxes Act, 1926.

The following Bills were severally reported with amendment, considered as amended, and ordered for third reading at next sitting:—

Bill No. 82—An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, 1929.

Bill No. 87—An Act to provide for the Administration of the Provincial Natural Resources.

Bill No. 78—An Act to amend The Town Act, 1927.

Bill No. 79—An Act to amend The City Act, 1926.

Bill No. 66—An Act respecting the Superannuation of Teachers.

Bill No. 94—An Act to amend The Public Health Act, 1924.

Bill No. 95—An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act, 1928.

Bill No. 100—An Act respecting Noxious Weeds.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

The Assembly, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

Tuesday, April 8, 1930.

Progress was reported and the Committee given leave to sit again.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Anderson, seconded by the Hon. Mr. McConnell,

That on and after today, when the Assembly adjourns it do stand adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow (Tuesday, April 8,) and so on from day to day, including Saturdays; and if the business of the Assembly be not concluded at 1 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair until 3 o'clock p.m.

The unanimous consent of the Assembly to dispense with the usual notice being refused, the motion was by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Anderson, seconded by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson,

That Standing Order 31 be suspended and that the motion, of which notice was this day given by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition for Wednesday next, be placed at the foot of the Order Paper for Tuesday, April 8, 1930.

The unanimous consent of the Assembly waiving notice of motion being obtained, and the question being put, it was agreed to.

The Assembly then adjourned at 1.45 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1930.

Mr. Eades asked the Government the following question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. McConnell:—

- (1) Was R. C. Spice, of Yorkton, employed as Inspector for the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board?

Answer: Yes.

- (2) If so, for what period of time, and what was he paid?

Answer: He was appointed on 15th November, 1917, as a temporary Inspector on a per diem allowance of \$6.00 per day for inspection fee, \$2.50 per day for subsistence and 12c per mile when using his own auto; otherwise \$6.00 per day for inspection fee, \$2.50 per day for subsistence and travelling expenses including railroad fare and livery bills. He made only one inspection, namely, on 29th November, 1917, for which he was paid the sum of \$11.20 on 7th December, 1917.

- (3) Was he during the said period of time one of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace in and for the said Province?

Answer: No, but he is now.

- (4) Was he during the said period of time a returning officer or other electoral officer in and for the Yorkton Provincial or Federal Constituencies?

Answer: No, not for any Provincial Election. Have no record about the Federal Election.

- (5) Was he during the said period of time a member of the Liberal Executive of Yorkton?

Answer: Yes.

- (6) Did he during the said period of time receive certain insurance business from the Liberal Government of this Province covering Governmental property?

Answer: The Government has no record of any such business.

Mr. Lilly asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) How much did Bram Thompson receive in connection with his legal work on the Natural Resources from:—

(a) The previous Liberal Government of Saskatchewan?

(b) The Co-operative Government of Saskatchewan?

Answer: (a) \$7,432.40.

(b) \$1,000.00 advance to be accounted for.

(2) How much does the Government still owe him?

Answer: See answer to Question 1.

(3) Did he agree on the questions to be submitted to the Supreme Court when acting as Consulting Counsel to the Government of this Province on its last trip to Ottawa?

Answer: He agreed with other counsel for the Province and counsel for the Dominion on appropriate questions on the occasion of the visit of counsel to Ottawa.

Moved by Mr. Warren, seconded by Mr. Strath,

That, in the opinion of this Assembly, at all Class "A" Fairs and Exhibitions in this Province there should be the same number of days of racing and the same privileges for harness horses as for running horses.

Further, that this Legislature recommends to the Government of Canada the withdrawal of Pari-Mutuel Betting Machine rights from this Province.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Agar, seconded by Mr. Huck,

That all the words after "running horses" be deleted.

The question being put on the said amendment, it was agreed to.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Patterson (Pipestone),

That all matters regarding the Department of Telephones referred to in the reports of O. J. Godfrey and Company and G. B. Munnoch and Company of Calgary be referred to the Royal Commission which this Legislature has humbly petitioned His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to appoint.

The debate continuing, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Greaves,

That all the words after the second "referred" be struck out and that there be substituted therefor the following words: "to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Telephones and Telegraphs."

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

YEAS

Messrs.

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
| Hutcheon | Warren | McLean |
| Buckle | Given | Louston |
| MacPherson | Gryde | Taylor |
| Anderson | Grassick | Greaves |
| McConnell | Merkley | Har |
| Bryant | Munroe | Lilly |
| Stewart | Whittaker | Leod |
| Smith | Arthur | Eades |
| (Swift Current) | Horner | Miller—29 |
| Bennett | Patterson | |
| Fraser | (Milestone) | |

NAYS

Messrs.

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Benson | Patterson | Agar |
| Parker | (Pipestone) | Black |
| (Touchwood) | Clinch | Epston |
| Finlayson | Therres | Johnson |
| Gordon | McGregor | Strath |
| Spence | Hogan | Parker |
| Davis | McIntosh | (Pelly) |
| Gardiner | Cockburn | Dunn |
| Uhrich | Paulson | Ayre |
| | | Morken—25 |

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

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 45—An Act to provide for a Weekly Half-holiday for Shop Employees in Certain Cities, and after some time spent therein Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Assembly, according to Order, again resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 47—An Act to provide for One Day of Rest in Seven for Certain Employees, which was reported without amendment, read the third time and passed.

According to Order, the Hon. Mr. MacPherson moved,

That Bill No. 82—An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, 1929, be now read the third time.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Spence, seconded by Mr. Parker (Touchwood),

That the said Bill No. 82 be not now read the third time but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that it have power to amend the said Bill by eliminating all such provisions as tend to limit the powers of the Power Commission with regard to expropriation of plants.

The Question being put on the said amendment, it was agreed to.

According to Order, the following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 87—An Act to provide for the Administration of the Provincial Natural Resources.

Bill No. 78—An Act to amend The Town Act, 1927.

Bill No. 79—An Act to amend The City Act, 1926.

Bill No. 66—An Act respecting the Superannuation of Teachers.

Bill No. 94—An Act to amend The Public Health Act, 1924.

Bill No. 95—An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act, 1928.

Bill No. 100—An Act respecting Noxious Weeds.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Anderson the Assembly proceeded to the Order "Special Order."

Moved by Mr. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. Spence,

That, in view of the fact that the Minister of Public Works was unable to substantiate before a Judge and Jury his charges made on the Floor of the House against Dr. Mitchell of Weyburn; and, that the Provincial Treasurer was unable before the Committee on Public Accounts and Printing to substantiate the statements made by Walter Weston, C.A., in his Report on the Farm Loan Board and afterwards repeated by the Provincial Treasurer in his speech on the Address. the Government, as at present constituted, does not hold the confidence of this House.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Warren, seconded by Mr. Hanbidge,

That all the words after the first word "That" in the first line be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

"the evidence given in the case of Rex versus Mitchell by A. P. McNab, former Minister of Public Works, and now a member of the Local Government Board, establishes that he is unfit to serve as a member of the said Board and that this Assembly ask for his immediate dismissal; and that the evidence given before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, when investigating the Report by the special Auditor covering the operations of the Farm Loan Board, has established:

*Expunged
See Journals
1934-35.
Nov. 27, 19*

1. That the audit conducted by Walter J. Weston, C.A., has been justified;

2. That the losses which must be taken by the Board as a result of its past operations can be more fully determined by a future inspection and valuation of the properties given the Board as security for its advances."

Objection was taken by the Leader of the Opposition and others to the admission of this amendment on the grounds, firstly, that it was not an amendment but introduced new matter; secondly, that the action to give effect to the first portion of the amendment is already covered by statute; thirdly, that the last paragraph of the amendment, if carried, would be practically a reversal of the Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing adopted by the Assembly yesterday in regard to the Weston audit of the Farm Loan Board.

Further, in support of this, it was submitted that if this amendment carried it would not negative the original motion of "no confidence" in the Government.

Mr. Speaker ruled that the amendment was in order and quoted as his authority Beauchesne, Page 131, paragraph 422.

Appeal from this decision was made and the ruling was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messrs.

Hutcheon
Buckle
MacPherson
Anderson
McConnell
Bryant

Warren
Given
Gryde
Grassick
Merkley
Munroe

McLean
Huston
Taylor
Greaves
Hanbidge
Lilly

*Expunged
See Journals
1934-35.
Nov. 27, 1934*

Stewart
Smith
(Swift Current)
Bennett
Fraser

Arthur
Benson
Horner
Patterson
(Milestone)

McLeod
Eades
Miller—29

NAYS.

Messrs.

Parker
(Touchwood)
Finlayson
Gordon
Spence
Davis
Gardiner
Uhrich
Patterson
(Pipestone)

Therres
McGregor
Hogan
McIntosh
Cockburn
Paulson
Agar
Huck
Loptson
Johnson

Strath
Parker
(Pelly)
Dunn
Ayre
Morken—23

Wednesday, April 9, 1930.

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

YEAS

Messrs.

Hutcheon
MacPherson
Anderson
McConnell
Bryant
Stewart
Smith
(Swift Current)
Bennett
Fraser
Warren

Given
Gryde
Grassick
Merkley
Munroe
Arthur
Benson
Horner
Patterson
(Milestone)

McLean
Huston
Taylor
Greaves
Hanbidge
Lilly
McLeod
Eades
Miller—28

NAYS

Messrs.

Parker
(Touchwood)
Finlayson
Gordon
Spence
Davis
Gardiner
Uhrich
Patterson
(Pipestone)

Therres
McGregor
Hogan
McIntosh
Cockburn
Paulson
Agar
Huck
Loptson
Johnson

Strath
Parker
(Pelly)
Dunn
Ayre
Morken—23

*Expunged
see Journals
1934-35.
Nov. 27, 1934.*

The debate continuing, and the question being put on the main motion as amended, it was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|
| Hutcheon | Given | Huston |
| Buckle | Gryde | Taylor |
| MacPherson | Grassick | Greaves |
| Anderson | Merkley | Hanbidge |
| McConnell | Munroe | Lilly |
| Bryant | Arthur | McLeod |
| Stewart | Benson | Eades |
| Smith | Horner | Miller—29 |
| (Swift Current) | Patterson | |
| Bennett | (Milestones) | |
| Fraser | McLean | |
| Warren | | |

NAYS.

Messrs.

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Parker | Patterson | Huck |
| (Touchwood) | (Pipestone) | Loptson |
| Finlayson | Therres | Johnson |
| Gordon | McGregor | Strath |
| Spence | Hogan | Parker |
| Davis | McIntosh | (Pelly) |
| Gardiner | Cockburn | Dunn |
| Uhrich | Paulson | Ayre |
| | Agar | Morken—23 |

*Expunged
See Journals
1934-35.
Nov. 27, 1934.*

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Anderson, seconded by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson,

That on and after today, when the Assembly adjourns it do stand adjourned until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow (Wednesday, April 9), and so on from day to day, including Saturdays; and if the business of the Assembly be not concluded at 1 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair until 3 o'clock p.m.

The unanimous consent of the Assembly to dispense with the usual notice being refused, the motion was by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

The Assembly then adjourned at 1.10 o'clock a.m.

REGINA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1930.

By leave of the Assembly,

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

Ordered, That Standing Order 5 (2) be suspended and that today's sitting be continued at 8 o'clock p.m.

The Hon. Mr. McConnell, a member of the Executive Council, presented:—

Return, to an Order of the Assembly dated March 17, 1930, showing:—

Copies of all letters relating to the Weston Farm Loan Board Report received from any Bond Dealers, Financial agents or Investment Bankers.

(*Sessional Paper No. 55*)

Mr. McGregor asked the Government the following Question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. MacPherson:—

- (1) Who is the Vendor in the Government Beer Store at Mossbank?

Answer: G. K. Inglis.

- (2) When was he appointed?

Answer: August 1st, 1925.

- (3) Who recommended his appointment to the Liquor Board?

Answer: The Liquor Board assumed responsibility for the appointment.

- (4) Is he a returned soldier?

Answer: No.

- (5) Has he ever been convicted of any offence against any law in force in the Province of Saskatchewan?

Answer: Yes, on the 10th of November 1923 for a violation of The Saskatchewan Temperance Act and fined \$25.00 and costs.

- (6) Has he been an active political worker in support of the present Government?

Answer: The Liquor Board has no knowledge of such activity.

- (7) Is he a Notary Public and, if so, when was he appointed?

Answer: Yes, appointed 8th April 1922.

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

Bill No. 85—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between His Majesty the King, in the right of the Province of Saskatchewan, acting and represented by the Provincial Treasurer, of the first part, and Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited, of the Second Part.

Bill No. 101—An Act respecting Certain Advances to purchase Seed Grain.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the following Bills, which were reported with amendment, considered as amended, read the third time and passed:—

Bill No. 65—An Act respecting the Public Service.

Bill No. 60—An Act to amend The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act, 1929.

Bill No. 64—An Act to regulate the Speed and Operation of Vehicles on Highways.

The Assembly, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

That there be granted to His Majesty for the twelve months ending April 30, 1931, the following sums:

Vote No.

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. For Legislation | \$ 272,370.00 |
| 2. For Executive Council | 87,100.00 |
| 3. For Attorney-General — Administration | 69,270.00 |
| 4. For Attorney-General — Courts and Judicial Districts | 281,520.00 |
| 5. For Attorney-General—Criminal Investigations | 159,000.00 |
| 6. For Attorney-General—Police and Prisoners..... | 225,000.00 |
| 7. For Attorney-General — Registration of Land Titles | 280,010.00 |
| 8. For Attorney-General — Miscellaneous Services | 19,000.00 |
| 9. For Provincial Secretary | 35,830.00 |
| 10. For Treasury — Administration | 97,590.00 |
| 11. For Treasury — Audit | 54,760.00 |
| 12. For Treasury — Public Debt | 3,605,952.00 |
| 13. For Treasury — Farm Loans | 698,090.00 |
| 14. For Treasury — Miscellaneous (Chargeable to Revenue) | 261,500.00 |
| 15. For Treasury — Miscellaneous (Chargeable to Capital) | 4,615,000.00 |

being:

To provide for advances
to the Saskatchewan
Farm Loan Board for
the purpose of making
Loans to agricultur-
ists \$1,500,000.00

To provide for advances
to The Saskatchewan
Power Commission for
the acquisition, pur-
chase and construction
of power plants \$3,000,000.00

To provide for the pur-
chase of Radium,
Equipment and Ap-
paratus for the Saskat-
chewan Cancer Com-
mission \$115,000.00

| | |
|--|--------------|
| 16. For Public Works (Chargeable to Revenue) — Administration | 19,310.00 |
| 17. For Public Works (Chargeable to Revenue)— Lieutenant Governor's Office | 8,163.00 |
| 18. For Public Works (Chargeable to Revenue)— Public Buildings and Institutions (Mainten- ance and administration) | 1,130,522.00 |
| 19. For Public Works (Chargeable to Revenue)— Miscellaneous Services | 27,180.00 |
| 20. For Public Works (Chargeable to Capital)— Public Buildings (Construction) | 505,000.00 |
| 21. For Highways — Administration and General Services | 164,780.00 |
| 22. For Highways—Public Improvements (Charge- able to Revenue) | 2,250,000.00 |
| 23. For Highways — Public Improvements (Chargeable to Capital) | 7,750,000.00 |
| 24. For Education | 3,940,700.00 |
| 25. For Agriculture — Administration | 60,000.00 |
| 26. For Agriculture — Assistance to General Agricultural Interests | 169,600.00 |
| 27. For Agriculture — Assistance to Live Stock Industry | 112,950.00 |
| 28. For Agriculture — Assistance to Dairy In- dustry | 78,200.00 |
| 29. For Agriculture — Publicity and Statistical Work | 27,500.00 |
| 30. For Agriculture — Improvement and Protection | |

| | |
|--|------------|
| of Field Crops | 121,500.00 |
| 31. For Agriculture — Co-operation and Markets.. | 32,000.00 |
| 32. For Agriculture — Debt Adjustment Bureau | 11,900.00 |
| 33. For Agriculture — Administration of The Agricultural Aids Act | 107,500.00 |

being:

To provide for the purchase and sale of live stock \$ 75,000.00

To provide for assistance to agricultural enterprises generally as authorized by the Lieutenant Governor in Council 25,000.00

Estimated amount required for interest charges (to be reimbursed) 7,500.00

| | |
|---|--------------|
| 34. For Municipal | 123,820.00 |
| 35. For Local Government Board | 34,500.00 |
| 36. For Public Health | 1,185,345.00 |
| 37. For Railways, Labour and Industries — Administration | 21,050.00 |
| 38. For Railways, Labour and Industries — Railways and Industrial Inspections | 44,840.00 |
| 39. For Railways, Labour and Industries — Natural Resources Development | 26,790.00 |
| 40. For Railways, Labour and Industries — Game Protection | 48,700.00 |
| 41. For Railways, Labour and Industries — Labour and Employment Offices | 64,830.00 |
| 42. For Railways, Labour and Industries — Power | 73,600.00 |
| 43. For Bureau of Child Protection | 655,290.00 |
| 44. For Insurance | 14,040.00 |
| 45. For King's Printer | 30,540.00 |
| 46. For Bureau of Publications | 81,700.00 |
| 47. For Civil Service Commissioner's Office | 7,260.00 |
| 48. For Telephones (Chargeable to Capital) | 800,000.00 |
| 49. For Telephones (Chargeable to Telephone Revenue) | 3,250,000.00 |

The said Resolutions were reported and, by leave of the Assembly, read twice and agreed to, and the Committee given leave to sit again.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee)

No. 1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1931, the sum of thirty million four hundred and ninety one thousand one hundred and two dollars be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

No. 2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1931, the sum of three million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars be granted out of the Telephone Revenue of the Province.

The said Resolutions were reported, read twice and agreed to, and the Committee given leave to sit again.

Leave having been granted, the Hon. Mr. McConnell presented Bill No. 102—An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service of the Fiscal Year ending the Thirtieth day of April, 1931.

The said Bill was received and read the first time.

By leave of the Assembly, and under standing Order 55, the said Bill was then read the second and third time and passed.

Thursday, April 10, 1930

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

The following Bills were severally reported with amendment, considered as amended, read the third time and passed:

Bill No. 82—An Act to amend the Power Commission Act, 1929.

Bill No. 28—An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1927.

Bill No. 89—An Act to amend The Distress Act.

Bill No. 81—An Act to amend The Local Government Board Act.

Bill No. 76—An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1929.

Bill No. 77—An Act to amend The Village Act, 1928.

Bill No. 20—An Act to amend The School Act. (No. 2.)

Bill No. 92—An Act to make further provision for the Care of Certain Mentally Defective Persons.

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

Bill No. 90—An Act to amend The Municipal Public Works Act.

Bill No. 96—An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1925.

Bill No. 97—An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928. (No. 2.)

Bill No. 98—An Act to amend The Highways Act.

Bill No. 85—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between His Majesty the King, in the right of the Province of Saskatchewan, acting and represented by the Provincial Treasurer, of the first part, and Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited, of the second part.

Bill No. 101—An Act respecting Certain Advances to purchase Seed Grain.

The Assembly, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 34—An Act respecting Agreements for Payments to Vendors, Lessors and Others by Shares of Crops, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

3 o'clock a.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, as follows:—

An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

An Act to amend The School Act, (No. 2)

An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1927.

An Act respecting the Engineering Profession.

An Act to provide for One Day of Rest in Seven for Certain Employees.

An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.

An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act, 1922.

- An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act.
- An Act to amend The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act, 1929.
- An Act to amend The Masters and Servants Act.
- An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, 1927.
- An Act to amend The Game Act, 1924.
- An Act to regulate the Speed and Operation of Vehicles on Highways.
- An Act respecting the Public Service.
- An Act respecting the Superannuation of Teachers.
- An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act, 1927.
- An Act to amend The Creditors' Relief Act, 1923.
- An Act to amend The Parents Maintenance Act, 1923.
- An Act to amend The District Courts Act.
- An Act to amend The Wild Lands Tax Act, 1928.
- An Act to amend The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act, 1927.
- An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1929.
- An Act to amend The School Assessment Act.
- An Act to amend The Arrears of Taxes Act, 1926.
- An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, 1925.
- An Act to amend The Village Act, 1928.
- An Act to amend The Town Act, 1927.
- An Act to amend The City Act, 1926.
- An Act to amend The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act, 1926.
- An Act to amend The Local Government Board Act.
- An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, 1929.
- An Act to amend The Telephone and Telegraph Department Act.
- An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.
- An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between His Majesty the King, in the right of the Province of Saskatchewan, acting and represented by the Provincial Treasurer, of the first part, and Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited, of the second part.

An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between the Government of the Dominion of Canada, represented therein by the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and the Honourable Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, of the first part, and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, represented therein by the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson, Premier and Minister of Education, of the Province, and the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson, Attorney General, of the second part.

An Act to provide for the Administration of the Provincial Natural Resources.

An Act to establish a Research Council.

An Act to amend The Distress Act.

An Act to amend The Municipal Public Works Act.

An Act to amend The Electrical Licensing Act, 1929.

An Act to make further provision for the Care of Certain Mentally Defective Persons.

An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.

An Act to amend The Public Health Act, 1924.

An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act, 1928.

An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1925.

An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act, 1928, (No. 2)

An Act to amend The Highways Act.

An Act to establish an Athletic Commission.

An Act respecting Noxious Weeds.

An Act respecting Certain Advances to purchase Seed Grain.

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.”

Mr. Speaker then said:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,

This Legislative Assembly has voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service. In the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour the following Bill:—

“An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service of the Fiscal Year ending the Thirtieth day of April, 1931,” to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour’s Assent.

The Royal Assent to this Bill was announced by the Clerk:

“In His Majesty’s name, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor doth thank the Legislative Assembly, accepts their benevolence and Assents to this Bill.”

His Honour then delivered the following Speech:—

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

Having concluded the work of the Second Session of the Seventh Legislature, it is my duty to relieve you from further attendance and to congratulate you upon the work you have accomplished. I desire to express the hope that the results of your labours will be beneficial to the Province.

Many important questions have come before you for discussion and decision and I have observed with much satisfaction that your careful attention has been given to all of these to the end that the best public interest may be served.

My Ministers are confident that the approval of the citizens of Saskatchewan will be given to your action in passing legislation that will, I trust, improve conditions in the matter of Education, Highways and Public Health in our province.

The provision you have made for a Public Service Commission will I believe meet with general approval.

The ratification of the agreement with the federal Government relating to the return to the Province of its Natural Resources will, I believe, be a source of general satisfaction among our people.

The liberal provision you have made to meet all the needs of the public service is a matter for which I thank you and I assure you that the funds thus voted will be used economically and in accordance with the principles of sound administration.

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

The Honourable Mr. Merkley, the 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 dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

INDEX
TO
JOURNALS

SESSION 1930.

SECOND SESSION, SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

Province of Saskatchewan

ABBREVIATIONS

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

A

ADDRESSES:

TO HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR:

In reply to Speech from Throne; Debated and Ordered, 18, 22, 26, 33,
37, 47, 61, 63, 70, 72, 77.

Ordered engrossed, 78.

For Copies of Orders in Council passed since
September 8, 1929; 22, Tabled, 148.

For Copies of Orders in Council passed from
June 6 to September 9, 1929; 22.

For Copies of Correspondence re admission to Canada of
Lutherans and Mennonites from Russia; 26, Tabled, 38.

B

| | Bill No. | 1 R. | 2 R. | Com. | 3 R. & P. | A. |
|--|-------------|------|------|----------|--------------|-----|
| BILLS, PUBLIC: Respecting | | | | | | |
| Administration of Oaths (<i>pro forma</i>) | | 13 | | | | |
| Appropriation Act, (No. 1) 1930 | 57 | 119 | 119 | | 119 | 121 |
| Appropriation Act, (No. 2) 1930 | 102 | 206 | 206 | | 206 | 210 |
| Arrears of Taxes | 73 | 138 | 150 | 193 | 193 | 208 |
| Assessment Commission .. | 58 | 124 | 142 | 170 | 176 | 207 |
| Assignment of Book Debts .. | 8 | 21 | 79 | 82 | 82 | 91 |
| Athletic Commission | 99 | 164 | 190 | 193 | 193 | 209 |
| Barbers and Beauticians (<i>Dropped</i>) | 37 | 84 | 100 | 137 | | |
| Bills of Sale | 15 | 28 | 79 | 83 | 83 | 91 |
| Book Agents, Licensing of .. | 30 | 73 | 98 | 126 | 131 | 162 |
| Brands | 18 | 38 | 126 | 132 | 132 | 162 |
| Cancer Commission | 33 | 84 | 126 | 136 | 136 | 162 |
| Child Welfare | 62 | 129 | 150 | 170 | 176 | 208 |
| Cities | 79 | 148 | 170 | 178, 193 | 198 | 208 |
| Civil Service Superannua- tion | 28 | 62 | 123 | 132, 206 | 206 | 207 |
| Companies | 35 | 84 | 98 | 101 | 101 | 163 |
| Controverted Elections | 14 | 28 | 79 | 83 | 83 | 91 |
| Co-operative Marketing Associations | 80 | 148 | 170 | 178 | 178 | 208 |
| Co-operative Wheat Pro- ducers Ltd., Author- ising Guarantee of Advances to | 38 | 84 | 85 | 89 | 89 | 91 |
| Co-operative Wheat Pro- ducers Ltd., Ratify- ing Agreement with, <i>re</i> Advances | 85 | 157 | 203 | 207 | 207 | 208 |
| Corporation Securities Registration | 4 | 20 | 79 | 98, 101 | 105 | 162 |
| Corporations Taxation | 13 | 23 | 83 | 98 | 98 | 162 |
| Creditors' Relief | 68 | 133 | 150 | 170 | 176 | 208 |
| Crop Payments (<i>dropped</i>) .. | 34 | 84 | 123 | 207 | | |
| Distress | 89 | 157 | 170 | 206 | 206 | 209 |
| District Courts | 70 | 133 | 150 | 170 | 170 | 208 |
| Drugless Practitioners (<i>dropped</i>) | 46 | 99 | 122 | 160 | | |
| Electrical Licensing | 91 | 157 | 170 | 178 | 180 | 209 |
| Embalmers | 54 | 115 | 131 | 133, 141 | 141 | 163 |
| Engineering Profession | 40 | 95 | 122 | 148, 161 | 161 | 207 |
| Executions | 9 | 21 | 83 | 101 | 105 | 162 |
| Fire Prevention | 53 | 108 | 125 | 132 | 135 | 163 |
| Game | 63 | 139 | 142 | 170 | 176 | 208 |
| Gasoline Tax | 48 | 102 | 123 | 126 | 131 | 163 |
| Highways | 98 | 164 | 190 | 207 | 207 | 209 |
| Homesteads | 7 | 20 | 79 | 132, 136 | 141 | 162 |
| Horticultural Societies | 17 | 34 | 83 | 101 | 101 | 162 |
| Hospitals | 93 | 157 | 170 | 178 | 178 | 209 |
| Infants | 43 | 95 | 106 | 132 | 135 | 163 |
| Insurance (<i>withdrawn</i>) | 21 | 62 | 141 | | | |

| | Bill No. | 1 R. | 2 R. | Com. | 3 R. & P. | A. |
|--|-------------|------|---------------|----------|--------------|-----|
| BILLS, PUBLIC—Continued. | | | | | | |
| Insurance | 74 | 142 | 170 | 178 | 178 | 208 |
| Interpretation | 29 | 73 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 162 |
| Jury | 3 | 20 | 79 | 83 | 89 | 91 |
| Ladies' Hairdressers' Ass'n. (<i>dropped</i>) | 55 | 115 | 131 | 137 | | |
| Land Titles | 44 | 95 | 106 | 126 | 131 | 163 |
| Legislative Assembly | 2 | 20 | 98 | 126, 170 | 176 | 207 |
| Liquor | 27 | 62 | 98 | 126 | 126 | 162 |
| Local Government Board | 81 | 148 | 190 | 206 | 206 | 208 |
| Local Improvement Dis- tricts | 67 | 133 | 150 | 171 | 171 | 208 |
| Local Improvement Dis- tricts Relief | 59 | 124 | 142 | 171 | 171 | 208 |
| Lloydminster Municipal Amalgamation | 36 | 84 | 98 | 101 | 101 | 163 |
| Marriage | 5 | 20 | 83 | 98 | 100 | 162 |
| Masters and Servants | 61 | 129 | 142 | 171 | 171 | 208 |
| Mental Defectives | 92 | 158 | 170 | 206 | 206 | 209 |
| Minimum Wage | 52 | 102 | 122 | 148, 161 | 161 | 207 |
| Municipal Hail Insurance | 22 | 62 | 79 | 82, 101 | 105 | 162 |
| Municipalities Relief | 24 | 62 | 79 | 82, 126 | 131 | 162 |
| Municipalities Seed Grain | 25 | 62 | 79 | 83 | 83 | 91 |
| Municipal Public Works | 90 | 157 | 190 | 207 | 207 | 209 |
| Natural Resources Agree- ment, Ratification | 86 | 157 | 177, 181 | 189 | 189 | 209 |
| Natural Resources, Ad- ministration of | 87 | 158 | 190 | 193 | 198 | 209 |
| Northern Saskatchewan Co-op. Stock Yards | 16 | 29 | 83 | 101 | 101 | 162 |
| Noxious Weeds | 100 | 169 | 190 | 194 | 198 | 209 |
| One Day's Rest in Seven | 47 | 99 | 122 | 164, 198 | 198 | 207 |
| Parents Maintenance | 69 | 133 | 150 | 171 | 171 | 208 |
| Partnership | 6 | 20 | 79 | 83 | 89 | 91 |
| Power Commission | 82 | 151 | 190 | 193 | 198, 206 | 208 |
| Prairie and Forest Fires | 32 | 73 | 98 | 101 | 101 | 162 |
| Public Health | 94 | 157 | 170 | 178, 194 | 198 | 209 |
| Public Service | 65 | 133 | 189 | 203 | 203 | 208 |
| Public Vehicles | 49 | 102 | 123 | 126 | 126 | 163 |
| Public Vehicles (No. 2) | 97 | 160 | 190 | 207 | 207 | 209 |
| Public Works | 39 | 90 | 106 | 126 | 126 | 163 |
| Pure Bred Sire Areas | 75 | 145 | 170 | 178 | 178 | 208 |
| Research Council | 88 | 158 | 190 | 193 | 193 | 209 |
| Revised Statutes of Sas- katchewan, 1930 | 56 | 115 | 132 | 136 | 136 | 163 |
| Rural Municipalities | 76 | 148 | 170 | 206 | 206 | 208 |
| Schools (No. 1) | 1 | 20 | 89, 91, 94 | 100 | 100 | 162 |
| Schools (No. 2) | 20 | 48 | 136, 142, 144 | 206 | 206 | 207 |
| School Assessment | 72 | 138 | 150 | 170 | 176 | 208 |
| School Attendance | 19 | 48 | 97 | 126 | 126 | 162 |
| School Grants | 10 | 23 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 162 |
| Secondary Education | 11 | 23 | 97 | 126, 132 | 135 | 162 |
| Security Frauds Preven- tion | 41 | 95 | 106 | 126 | 131 | 163 |
| Seed Grain Advances | 101 | 183 | 203 | 207 | 207 | 209 |

| | Bill No. | 1 R. | 2 R. | Com. | 3 R. & P. | A. |
|--|-------------|------|------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| BILLS, PUBLIC—Continued | | | | | | |
| Steam Boilers | 51 | 102 | 123 | 126 | 126 | 163 |
| Succession Duty | 12 | 23 | 79 | 82, 101, 132 | 135 | 162 |
| Surrogate Courts | 84 | 157 | 170 | 178 | 178 | 208 |
| Teacher's Superannuation | 66 | 133 | 163 | 193 | 198 | 208 |
| Telephone and Telegraph Department | 83 | 151 | 170 | 178 | 178 | 208 |
| Timber Taxation | 50 | 102 | 123 | 126 | 126 | 163 |
| Towns | 78 | 148 | 170 | 178, 193 | 198 | 208 |
| Town Planning | 23 | 62 | 98 | 126 | 131 | 162 |
| Treasury Department | 26 | 62 | 83 | 101 | 101 | 162 |
| Trustees | 42 | 95 | 106 | 132 | 135 | 163 |
| Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals | 60 | 124 | 142 | 203 | 203 | 208 |
| Union Hospitals | 95 | 157 | 170 | 178, 194 | 198 | 209 |
| Vehicles, Speed and Op- eration of | 64 | 129 | 189 | 203 | 203 | 208 |
| Village | 77 | 148 | 170 | 206 | 206 | 208 |
| Vital Statistics | 96 | 157 | 170 | 207 | 207 | 209 |
| Weekly Half-holiday (dropped) | 45 | 95 | 122 | 157, 161, 197 | | |
| Wild Lands Tax | 71 | 138 | 150 | 193 | 193 | 208 |
| Workmen's Compensation | 31 | 73 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 162 |
| BILLS, PRIVATE: Respecting | | | | | | |
| Co-operative Wheat Pro- ducers Limited | 02 | 28 | 61 | 137, 156 | 156 | 163 |
| Grand Lodge of Sask. A. F. and A. Masons | 05 | 28 | 61 | 84, 90 | 90 | 92 |
| London and Western Trusts Company | 04 | 28 | 61 | 73, 89 | 89 | 92 |
| Moose Jaw City Bylaws <i>re</i> Debentures | 07 | 28 | 61 | 124, 131 | 131 | 163 |
| Moose Jaw City Agree- ment with Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware | 08 | 28 | 61 | 80, 89, 90 | 90 | 92 |
| Northern Fidelity Guar- anty Co. Ltd. | 09 | 28 | 70 | 84, 90 | 90 | 92 |
| Sask. General Trusts Corporation (Cap. 46 of 1910-11) | 06 | 28 | 61 | 84, 90 | 90 | 92 |
| Saskatoon City Agree- ment with C.N.R. <i>re</i> Hotel | 01 | 28 | 61 | 108, 131 | 131 | 163 |
| Sask. Society for Preven- tion of Cruelty to Animals | 010 | 28 | 61 | 137, 156 | 156 | 163 |
| Sisters of the Order of Saint Dominic | 03 | 28 | 61 | 84, 90 | 90 | 91 |

C

CLERK OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

Informs Assembly of receipt of notification of vacancies and elections, 7.
 Declares Speaker elected, 9.
 Reads titles of Bills to be assented to, 91, 162, 207.
 Announces assent to Bills, 92, 121, 163, 209, 210.

CLERK OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

Advise Election of new members, 7.
 Advise Vacancies in Representation, 7.

COMMITTEES, SELECT SPECIAL:

To nominate members for Select Standing Committees:
 Appointed, 13. Reported, 14. Concurrence, 17.

COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY AND WAYS AND MEANS:

See "Supply" and "Ways and Means."

COMMITTEES, SELECT STANDING:

I—STANDING ORDERS:

Appointed, 14. Petitions reported, 27.

II—PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS:

Appointed, 14.

III—PRIVATE BILLS:

Appointed, 14. References, 61, 70. Reported on Bills, 73, 80, 84,
 108, 124, 137, 164. Reported on Fees to be refunded, 137.

IV—PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND PRINTING:

Appointed, 14. Reference, 78. Reported, 191.

V—AGRICULTURE:

Appointed, 17.

VI—MUNICIPAL LAW:

Appointed, 15.

VII—EDUCATION:

Appointed, 16.

VIII—RAILWAYS, TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPH:

Appointed, 15.

IX—LAW AMENDMENTS:

Appointed, 16. References, 100, 122, 131, Reported, 133, 137,
 148, 157, 160.

X—LIBRARY:

Appointed, 16.

CROWN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Announced *re* Money Bills, 23, 48, 84, 85, 95, 102, 133, 158, 164.

D

DEBATES ON SECOND READINGS OF BILLS:

Bill No. 1—*Re* Amendment to School Act (No. 1), 89, 91.
 Bill No. 20—*Re* Amendment to School Act (No. 2), 136, 142.
 Bill No. 86—*Re* Ratification of Natural Resources Agreement, 177, 181.

DEBATES ON THIRD READINGS OF BILLS:

Bill No. 45—*Re* Weekly Half-holiday for Certain Employees, 161.
 Bill No. 82—*Re* Amendment to Power Commission Act, 198.

DIVISIONS:

ASSEMBLY DIVIDES:

On motion to adjourn debate on Resolution to refer matters in certain
 Declarations, etc., to Public Accounts Committee, 82.
 On amendment to Second Reading of Bill to amend School Act
 (No. 1), 92.
 On Second Reading of Bill to amend School Act (No. 1), 93.

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

- On amendment to Resolution to refer Auditor's Report *re* Farm Loan Board to Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, 97.
- On amendment to Resolution *re* Immigration, 121.
- On Resolution *re* Immigration, 122.
- On amendment to Second Reading of Bill to amend School Act (No. 2), 142.
- On Second Reading of Bill to amend School Act (No. 2), 142.
- On motion for Assembly to go into Committee of Supply, 168.
- On Resolution *re* British Preference, 173.
- On Motion to adjourn debate on Second Reading of Bill to ratify Agreement *re* Natural Resources, 177.
- On amendment to Resolution *re* elimination of Liquor Advertising, 181.
- On Speaker's Ruling *re* disallowance of Notice of Motion *re* the Customs Tariff, 184.
- On amendment to Resolution to refer Auditor's Reports *re* Department of Telephones to Royal Commission, 197.
- On Speaker's Ruling *re* amendment to motion of "No confidence", 199.
- On amendment to motion of "No confidence", 200.
- On motion of "No confidence", as amended, 201.

E

ESTIMATES:

- Transmission of, 99, 129. Referred to Committee of Supply, 99, 129.

H

HUTCHEON, D. SELBY:

- Elected Deputy Speaker, 78.

L

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

- Convened by Proclamation, page 5. Prorogued, page 210. Vacancies and Elections, page 8.

STATEMENT OF WORK OF SESSION:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Number of Sittings..... | 39 |
| Number of Evening Sittings..... | 25 |
| Number of Morning Sittings..... | 0 |
| Number of Saturday Sittings..... | 0 |
| Number of Questions by Members..... | 159 |
| Number of Addresses ordered..... | 4 |
| Number of Returns ordered..... | 18 |
| Number of Returns presented..... | 15 |
| Number of Sessional Papers tabled..... | 55 |
| Number of Petitions presented..... | 10 |
| Number of Public Bills introduced..... | 102 |
| Number of Public Bills passed..... | 96 |
| Number of Private Bills introduced..... | 10 |
| Number of Private Bills passed..... | 10 |
| Number of Divisions..... | 17 |
| Assembly in Committee of Supply, times..... | 7 |
| Assembly in Committee of Ways and Means, times..... | 2 |

LESLIE, HON. R. S.:

- Elected Speaker, 8.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR:

- Proclamation, 5.
- Speech from Throne at Opening of Session, 9.
- Messages transmitting Estimates, 99, 129.
- Gives Royal Assent to Bills, 92, 121, 162.
- Message acknowledging address in reply to Speech, 184.
- Speech from Throne at Close of Session, 210.
- Prorogues Legislature, 210.

P

| | Pre- sented | Received | S.O.C. Reported |
|--|----------------|----------|--------------------|
| PETITIONS: | | | |
| FOR PRIVATE BILLS: RESPECTING— | | | |
| Co-operative Wheat Producers, Ltd..... | 18 | 20 | 27 |
| Grand Lodge of Sask. A.F. and A. Masons..... | 14 | 18 | 27 |
| London and Western Trusts Company..... | 18 | 20 | 27 |
| Moose Jaw City Bylaws <i>re</i> Debentures..... | 18 | 20 | 27 |
| Moose Jaw City Agreement with Iowa Southern Utilities Company of Delaware.... | 20 | 23 | 27 |
| Northern Fidelity Guaranty Co., Ltd..... | 20 | 23 | 27 |
| Sask. General Trusts Corporation..... | 14 | 18 | 27 |
| Saskatoon City Agreement with C.N.R. <i>re</i> Hotel | 14 | 18 | 27 |
| Sask. Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals | 18 | 20 | 27 |
| Sisters of the Order of Saint Dominic..... | 18 | 20 | 27 |

PRIVATE BILLS:

See "Bills, Private."

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY:

Announces that His Honour desires a Speaker elected, 7.

Announces that words and actions of Mr. Speaker will receive His Honour's most favourable construction, 9.

Announces Prorogation, 210.

PROCLAMATION:

Convening Legislature, 5.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:

For Fiscal Year ended April 30, 1929.

Presented, 78, Sessional Paper No. 29. Referred to Committee, 78.

Q

| | Member | Page |
|---|--------------|------|
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS: Respecting— | | |
| AGRICULTURE: | | |
| Debt Adjustment Bureau, Appointments to staff of..... | Mr. Morken | 125 |
| Payments to R.M. Johnson <i>re</i> purchase of Seed Oats..... | Mr. Cockburn | 103 |
| Royal Grain Inquiry Commission, Cost of | Mr. Huston | 99 |
| Royal Grain Inquiry Commission Coun- sel, Names and salaries of..... | Mr. Lilly | 159 |
| Seed Oats purchased for distribution to farmers | Mr. Hogan | 45 |
| Wardinsky, Harry | Mr. Davis | 105 |
| William Balfour's trip East <i>re</i> market- ing horses | Mr. Strath | 32 |
| ATTORNEY GENERAL: | | |
| Allen, Wm., Conviction of..... | Mr. Hogan | 75 |
| Agent of Attorney General at Prince Albert | Mr. Davis | 58 |
| Agent of Attorney General at Kerrobert | Mr. Hogan | 62 |
| Beale, A. W., Convictions of..... | Mr. Dunn | 96 |
| Coglan, R. O., Cancellation of appoint- ment of as Coroner..... | Mr. Strath | 118 |

| | Member | Page |
|---|---------------------------|------|
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS—Continued. | | |
| Crown Prosecutor of Melville..... | Mr. Loptson | 56 |
| Drs. Valens and Des Rosiers, Cancellation of appointments of as Coroners | Mr. Davis | 104 |
| Fleming, Dr. H. R., Cancellation of appoint of as Coroner..... | Mr. Therres | 86 |
| Goulden, W. F., Cancellation of appointment of as J.P..... | Mr. Morken | 179 |
| Mathews, E. A., Registrar Security Frauds Prevention Act..... | Mr. Grant | 86 |
| Moose Jaw Police Magistrate..... | Mr. McGregor | 32 |
| Ostensky, Russell, Recommendation of as Commissioner for Oaths..... | Mr. Dunn | 32 |
| Pachell, M., Conviction of..... | Mr. Hanbidge | 103 |
| Police Magistrate Tourney, Political activities of..... | Mr. Cockburn | 80 |
| Registrar under Security Frauds Prevention Act..... | Mr. Grant | 68 |
| Shatsky, Conviction of (<i>withdrawn</i>)..... | Mr. Horner | 108 |
| Sheriff of Saskatoon Judicial District..... | Mr. Davis | 35 |
| Sheriff at Swift Current..... | Mr. Strath | 95 |
| Soderlund, Andrew, J.P. of Sturgis..... | Mr. Loptson | 179 |
| Stephen, Daniel, Ex-Sheriff of Yorkton. | Mr. McLeod | 180 |
| Thomson, Bram, Payments made to for legal work <i>re</i> Natural Resources..... | Mr. Lilly | 195 |
| CHILD PROTECTION: | | |
| Ewing and Rogers, Salaries, expenses and duties of..... | Mr. Davis | 25 |
| Ewing and Rogers, Expense allowances for..... | Mr. Davis | 59 |
| Inspectors, Number of employed by Bureau..... | Mr. Loptson | 44 |
| Temporary Inspectors' Expenses..... | Mr. Johnson | 66 |
| CIVIL SERVICE: | | |
| Andrichowicz, Eugene, Employment of..... | Mr. Parker (Touchwood) | 138 |
| Cameron, Jim, Employment of..... | Mr. Benson | 36 |
| Civil Servants employed in Prince Albert Constituency..... | Mr. Horner | 43 |
| Denton, Wm., Employment of..... | Mr. Morken | 160 |
| Johnson, R. M., Employment of..... | Mr. Strath | 67 |
| McCabe, Pat, Employment of..... | Mr. Parker (Touchwood) | 149 |
| McKennitt, J. L., Employment of..... | Mr. Ayre | 75 |
| Rink, Cornelius, Employment of..... | Mr. Cockburn | 73 |
| Wilkinson, John, Employment of..... | Mr. Parker (Touchwood) | 88 |
| Williamson, Snort, Employment of..... | Mr. Parker (Touchwood) | 43 |
| EDUCATION: | | |
| Henwood, F. B., School Inspector..... | Mr. Morken | 165 |
| Public and High School Text Books, Changes authorised in..... | Mr. Lilly | 139 |
| EXECUTIVE COUNCIL: | | |
| Duckworth & Nut, Services of retained by Government..... | Mr. Agar | 72 |
| Investigators, detectives, etc., employed by Government since taking office, Name, salary and expenses of (<i>withdrawn</i>)..... | Mr. Cockburn | 115 |

| | Member | Page |
|--|------------------------------|------|
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS— <i>Continued.</i> | | |
| Investigators, detectives, etc., employed by Government since September 9, 1929, Number of | Mr. Cockburn | 134 |
| FARM LOAN BOARD: | | |
| Amount loaned to farmers in 1929 | Mr. McLeod | 39 |
| Investigation Inspectors, Names, period employed and expenses of | Mr. Davis | 34 |
| Loans in excess of \$5000 in 1929 | Mr. Cobban | 40 |
| Solicitors for Farm Loan Board during 1929 | Mr. Patterson (Milestone) | 39 |
| S.W. ¼ 17-19-6, Foreclosure of | Mr. Eades | 150 |
| Spice, R. C., of Yorkton, Inspector | Mr. Eades | 195 |
| HIGHWAYS: | | |
| Amount authorised for roads, bridges and ferries from April 30 to Sept. 6, 1929 | Mr. McLeod | 185 |
| Construction cost of highway east of Wilkie | Mr. McLeod | 102 |
| Contract for gravelling 9 miles east of Biggar | Mr. Miller | 86 |
| Contract for gravelling 3 miles east of Biggar | Mr. Miller | 88 |
| Contracts for standard earth grades let after June 6, 1929 | Mr. Bennett | 116 |
| Cost of construction of Highway No. 8 from Rocanville south | Mr. Bennett | 117 |
| Cost of snow fences on Highway No. 1, Moose Jaw to Regina | Mr. Therres | 41 |
| Cost of snow-removing machinery on Highway No. 1, Moose Jaw to Regina | Mr. Gordon | 64 |
| Employment of La Coste, Matte and Venn as maintenance men in 1929 | Mr. Smith (M. Jaw City) | 152 |
| Ferryman at Borden in 1929 | Mr. Ayre | 153 |
| Ferryman at Borden, New appointee as Gravelling contracts let without tender after Sept. 9, 1929 | Mr. Ayre | 134 |
| Henderson, C. A., Ex-Road Supervisor | Mr. Gordon | 85 |
| Humboldt-Bruno Highway contract, Cancellation of | Mr. Hanbidge | 54 |
| Humboldt-Bruno and Wolseley-Indian Head gravelling contracts, Yard mileage of | Mr. Hogan | 130 |
| McLean-Qu'Appelle Highway, Complaints <i>re</i> gravel on | Mr. Hogan | 146 |
| Pearse & Edworthy, Lumber purchases from | Mr. Huck | 153 |
| Robinson, R. M. Inspector of Relief Work | Mr. Greaves | 146 |
| Sewell, Barney, Employment of | Mr. McGregor | 76 |
| Sewell, Barney, Connection with Stevens Bros. of St. Paul | Mr. Morken | 151 |
| Smith, C. C., Employment of | Mr. McGregor | 169 |
| Taisey, A. M., Employment of | Mr. Garner | 111 |
| | Mr. Smith (M. Jaw City) | 151 |
| Wood River Bridges, Cost of | Mr. Eades | 155 |
| KING'S PRINTER: | | |
| Grain Commission Report, Tenders for printing of | Mr. Hanbidge | 53 |
| Municipal Department Report, 1928, Cost of printing of | Mr. Eades | 67 |

| | Member | Page |
|--|------------------------------|------|
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS—Continued. | | |
| Regina Telephone Directory, June 1929 issue, Printers and cost of..... | Mr. Taylor | 68 |
| Regina Telephone Directory, January 1930 issue, Printers and cost of..... | Mr. Cockburn | 35 |
| Sask. Gazette, Printers of prior to September 1929 | Mr. Davis | 29 |
| Sessional Papers, Votes and Proceedings, etc., Printers of..... | Mr. Garner | 48 |
| Tenders for printing during Gardiner Government term | Mr. Hanbidge | 53 |
| LIQUOR BOARD: | | |
| Battleford, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Johnson | 166 |
| Beer Store Inspectors employed from Aug. to Dec. 1929 | Mr. McIntosh | 108 |
| Beer Store Inspectors employed in January, 1930 | Mr. Hogan | 146 |
| Beer Traffic Manager..... | Mr. Morken | 135 |
| Blanche, Joe, District Supervisor..... | Mr. Hanbidge | 69 |
| Bracken, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Finlayson | 36 |
| Brewery products purchased between Oct. 1, 1929, and Feb. 28, 1930, Value of | Mr. McGregor | 188 |
| Bruno, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Therres | 64 |
| Cost of Beer purchased within and without Sask. in 1929 | Mr. Gordon | 71 |
| Edam Beer Store insurance..... | Mr. Ayre | 188 |
| Fiske, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Given | 69 |
| Fusilier, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Given | 57 |
| Gallon, W. J., Employment of..... | Mr. Johnson | 149 |
| Grayson, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Dunn | 52 |
| Handel, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Huston | 51 |
| Kendall, A., Employment of..... | Mr. Ayre | 52 |
| Kerrobot, Supervisor of Beer Storage at | Mr. Hutcheon | 55 |
| Kipling, Liquor Store Manager at..... | Mr. Strath | 80 |
| McGinnis, B., Kayville Beer Vendor..... | Mr. Johnson | 112 |
| Meacham, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Patterson (Pipestone) | 76 |
| Mossbank, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. McGregor | 202 |
| Pleasantdale, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. Therres | 110 |
| Reese, F., Theodore Beer Vendor..... | Mr. Gordon | 81 |
| Reese, T. W., Convictions against..... | Mr. Gordon | 125 |
| Regina Beer Store No. 26, Number employed in | Mr. Loptson | 130 |
| Regina Liquor Store No. 1, Number employed in | Mr. Agar | 103 |
| Regina Liquor Store No. 2, Transfer of | Mr. Hogan | 109 |
| Rogers, Wm., Employment of..... | Mr. Morken | 169 |
| Shamrock Beer Store, Former Manager of | Mr. McGregor | 160 |
| Shamrock Beer Store, Present Manager of | Mr. McGregor | 139 |
| Taisey, A. M., Estevan..... | Mr. Smith (M. Jaw City) | 149 |
| Total male staff of Liquor Board..... | Mr. Bennett | 176 |
| Truax, Beer Vendor at..... | Mr. McGregor | 110 |
| Wahl, A. E., Tramping Lake Beer Vendor | Mr. Eades | 56 |
| Wallin, E. E., Employee of Biggar Liquor Store | Mr. Miller | 87 |
| Watson, C. J., Employment of..... | Mr. Grant | 135 |
| Willsie, C. A., Ex-Inspector of Beer Stores | Mr. Taylor | 55 |

| | Member | Page |
|---|------------------------------|------|
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS— <i>Continued.</i> | | |
| MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS: | | |
| Gibbins, W. J., Employment of | Mr. McIntosh | 30 |
| Gibbins, W. J., Expenses of | Mr. Grant | 72 |
| PUBLICATIONS: | | |
| Commissioner of Publications | Mr. Parker (Touchwood) | 31 |
| May, Victor, Employment of | Mr. Cockburn | 47 |
| McInnis, T. A., Writings of | Mr. Cockburn | 85 |
| Munroe of Wadena, Employment of | Mr. Garner | 165 |
| Public Service Monthly | Mr. Cockburn | 164 |
| PUBLIC HEALTH: | | |
| Grant to St. Margaret's Hospital at Biggar | Mr. Miller | 87 |
| Ivay, F. J. S., of Moose Jaw | Mr. Cockburn | 145 |
| PUBLIC WORKS: | | |
| Allen, Wm., Employment of | Mr. Loptson | 45 |
| Building Contracts let after June 6, 1929 | Mr. Patterson (Milestone) | 65 |
| Coal for Government Buildings at Moos- omin | Mr. Parker (Touchwood) | 74 |
| Coal for Prince Albert Court House and Jail | Mr. Davis | 60 |
| Cost of coal for Prince Albert Court House and Jail | Mr. Davis | 76 |
| Elliott, F., Employment of | Mr. McGrogor | 115 |
| Munnoch, Geo., Employment of | Mr. McIntosh | 73 |
| Prince Albert Sanatorium sewage dis- posal system | Mr. Uhrich | 187 |
| Provincial Architect | Mr. Therres | 167 |
| Solomon, F., Employment of | Mr. Parker (Pelly) | 118 |
| Tenders for hauling coal to Moose Jaw Normal School | Mr. McGregor | 43 |
| Warden at Regina Jail | Mr. Hogan | 189 |
| Wascana Lake, Cost of draining | Mr. Cockburn | 99 |
| Wascana Lake, Work on retaining walls of | Mr. Parker (Pelly) | 118 |
| Wascana Lake, Tenders for earth fill on retaining wall of | Mr. Cockburn | 134 |
| PROVINCIAL SECRETARY: | | |
| Motor License and Public Vehicle Inspectors, Number and names of | Mr. Cockburn | 155 |
| RAILWAYS, LABOUR AND INDUSTRIES: | | |
| Chief Game Commissioner | Mr. Dunn | 65 |
| Etter, A. E. (<i>withdrawn</i>) | Mr. Loptson | 151 |
| Factory Inspectors, Number of | Mr. Grant | 154 |
| Game Guardians, Number and names of | Mr. Morken | 154 |
| Hyatt, Mr., Dismissal of | Mr. Davis | 59 |
| Ives, P. J., Employment of | Mr. Davis | 24 |
| Maneer, J. S., Employment of | Mr. Strath | 138 |
| McManus, T. G., Employment of | Mr. Johnson | 125 |
| McKissock, W. J., Employment of | Mr. Finlayson | 140 |
| Pankoski, Fred, Employment of | Mr. Dunn | 42 |
| Swift Current Employment Office Mana- ger | Mr. Strath | 74 |

| | Member | Page |
|---|--------------|------|
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS— <i>Continued.</i> | | |
| TELEPHONES: | | |
| Beale, A. W., Employment of..... | Mr. Grant | 68 |
| Beale, A. W., Previous employment of with Government | Mr. Grant | 111 |
| Munnoch, Geo., Employment of..... | Mr. McIntosh | 73 |
| WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD: | | |
| Banbury, R. S., Salary of..... | Mr. Morken | 145 |

R

| | Member | Page |
|--|---------------|--|
| RESOLUTIONS: Respecting— | | |
| Address in Reply to Speech from Throne | Mr. Eades | 18, 22, 26, 33, 37, 47, 61, 63, 70, 72, 77 |
| Adjournment, Feb. 26, 1930..... | Mr. Anderson | 77 |
| Adjournment, Feb. 28 to Mar. 10, 1930.. | Mr. Anderson | 90 |
| British Preference, Increase of..... | Mr. McIntosh | 141, 173 |
| Committee to Nominate Standing Com- mittees | Mr. Anderson | 13 |
| Committee to Revise Standing Orders.... | Mr. Benson | 182 |
| Committee of Supply..... | Mr. McConnell | 78 |
| Committee of Supply on Estimates 1930-31 (Budget) | Mr. McConnell | 136, 144, 147, 150, 156, 159, 161, 168 |
| Committee of Ways and Means..... | Mr. McConnell | 78 |
| Compulsory Motor Accident Insurance (<i>withdrawn</i>) | Mr. Taylor | 174 |
| Customs Tariff Reduction and British Preference increase (<i>withdrawn</i>).... | Mr. McIntosh | 141 |
| Deputy Speaker, Appointment of..... | Mr. Anderson | 78 |
| Encouragement of Foreign Settlers to become Canadian citizens..... | Mr. Whittaker | 182 |
| Estimates referred to Committee of Supply | Mr. McConnell | 99, 129 |
| Engrossing Address in reply to Speech from Throne | Mr. Anderson | 78 |
| Federal Aid for Highways (<i>withdrawn</i>) | Mr. Given | 100, 119 |
| Horse-racing and withdrawal of Pari- Mutuel Betting Machine rights..... | Mr. Warren | 196 |
| Immigration | Mr. Horner | 113, 120 |
| Liquor Advertising, Elimination of..... | Mr. Whatley | 181 |
| Morning Sittings (<i>withdrawn</i>)..... | Mr. Anderson | 194, 201 |
| No Confidence in Government..... | Mr. Gardiner | 198 |
| Nurses-in-training, Eight hour day for. | Mr. Arthur | 141 |
| Parenthood of mental defectives..... | Mr. Horner | 182 |
| Pensions and treatment of returned sol- diers and further support for sol- dier settlers | Mr. Fraser | 174 |
| Placing of motion on Order Paper prior to date given in notice..... | Mr. Anderson | 194 |
| Public Accounts referred to Committee.. | Mr. McConnell | 78 |
| Pure Seed Grain, Use of by farmers..... | Mr. Benson | 182 |

| | Member | Page |
|--|------------------------------|----------|
| RESOLUTIONS— <i>Continued.</i> | | |
| Referring matters in certain Declarations and matters <i>re</i> administration of Liquor Commission, etc., to Public Accounts Committee (<i>withdrawn</i>) | Mr. Bryant | 81, 126 |
| Referring matters in Weston Report <i>re</i> Farm Loan Board to Public Accounts Committee | Mr. McConnell | 96 |
| Referring matters in Auditors' Reports <i>re</i> Telephone Department to Royal Commission | Mr. Patterson (Pipestone) | 174, 196 |
| Royal Commission to inquire into certain Declarations and the administration of the Liquor Commission, etc. | Mr. Davis | 127 |
| Speaker, Election of | Mr. Anderson | 8 |
| Speech from Throne, Consideration of | Mr. Anderson | 13 |
| Trans-Canada Highway | Mr. Given | 120 |
| Votes and Proceedings, Printing of | Mr. Anderson | 13 |
| Wednesday Evening Sitzings | Mr. Anderson | 176, 202 |

RETURNS:

See "Sessional Papers."

S

| | S.P. No. | Ordered | Pres'nt'd |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| SESSIONAL PAPERS: | | | |
| AGRICULTURE: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929 | 40 | | 133 |
| Annual Report of Agricultural Research Foundation, 1928-29 | 28 | | 64 |
| ATTORNEY GENERAL: | | | |
| Record of Convictions under Liquor Act, to Feb. 10, 1930 | 16 | | 29 |
| Statement of Remissions under Penalties and Forfeitures Act, Feb. 10, 1930 | 15 | | 29 |
| Return <i>re</i> Correspondence received from E. B. Haffner <i>re</i> W. J. Weston | 50 | 161 | 173 |
| CHILD PROTECTION: | | | |
| Annual Report, including Old Age Pensions Branch, April 30, 1929 | 12 | | 24 |
| Return <i>re</i> Reports of temporary Inspectors (<i>withdrawn</i>) | | 141 | 173 |
| CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929 | 2 | | 17 |
| CIVIL SERVICE: | | | |
| Return <i>re</i> Employees engaged since Sept. 9, 1929 | 49 | 141 | 173 |
| Return <i>re</i> Employees dismissed since Sept. 9, 1929 | 54 | 123 | 193 |
| EDUCATION: | | | |
| Annual Report, December 31, 1928 | 20 | | 34 |
| Return <i>re</i> Questionnaires sent to School Inspectors | 44 | 70 | 148 |

| | S.P. No. | Ordered | Presented |
|---|----------|---------|-----------|
| SESSIONAL PAPERS—Continued. | | | |
| EXECUTIVE COUNCIL: | | | |
| Notification of Vacancies and Elections..... | 1 | | 8 |
| Return <i>re</i> Correspondence between Provincial and Federal Governments <i>re</i> Lutheran and Mennonite immigrants from Russia..... | 21 | 26 | 38 |
| Return <i>re</i> Orders in Council passed since Sept. 8, 1929..... | 43 | 22 | 148 |
| Return <i>re</i> Orders-in-Council passed from June 6 to Sept. 9, 1929..... | | 22 | |
| FARM LOAN BOARD: | | | |
| Auditor Weston's Report and Financial Statement, Dec. 31, 1929..... | 6 | | 21 |
| Annual Report and Financial Statement, Dec. 31, 1928..... | 26 | | 38 |
| Annual Report and Financial Statement, Dec. 31, 1929..... | 33 | | 85 |
| Return <i>re</i> Letters relating to Weston F. L. B. Report received from Bond Dealers, etc. | 55 | 128 | 202 |
| HIGHWAYS: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929..... | 14 | | 24 |
| Return <i>re</i> Amount authorised for expenditures for gravelling, etc., in each constituency..... | 36 | 89 | 124 |
| Return <i>re</i> Cost per mile of Moose Jaw-Regina Highway No. 1..... | 38 | 116 | 129 |
| Return <i>re</i> Expenditure in each constituency between May, 1929, and Jan., 1930, from Capital and Revenue Account..... | 39 | 131 | 134 |
| Return <i>re</i> Amounts authorised and expended on roads, bridges and ferries from Capital and Revenue Account from May, 1921, to Sept. 1, 1929..... | 45 | 117 | 158 |
| INSURANCE: | | | |
| Annual Report, Dec. 31, 1928..... | 10 | | 23 |
| KING'S PRINTER: | | | |
| Return <i>re</i> Correspondence between K. P. and Western Printers' Association..... | 51 | 47 | 179 |
| LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY: | | | |
| Annual Report dated Feb. 10, 1930..... | 9 | | 21 |
| LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: | | | |
| Message—Transmitting Supplementary Estimates for 1929-30..... | 34 | | 99 |
| Message—Transmitting Estimates for 1930-31..... | 37 | | 129 |
| Message—Acknowledging Address in Reply to Speech from Throne..... | 52 | | 184 |
| LIQUOR BOARD: | | | |
| Annual Report and Financial Statement, March 31, 1929..... | 22 | | 38 |

| | S.P. No. | Ordered | Presented |
|---|----------|---------|-----------|
| SESSIONAL PAPERS—Continued. | | | |
| Return <i>re</i> Correspondence, etc., between Board, Government, <i>et al re</i> Beer Store at Hague | 47 | 113 | 172 |
| Return <i>re</i> Payments made to retired employees in lieu of notice, and changes in Liquor Store premises | 48 | 113 | 172 |
| LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD: | | | |
| Annual Report, Dec. 31, 1929 | 3 | | 17 |
| MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929 | 5 | | 21 |
| POWER COMMISSION: | | | |
| Annual Report and Financial Statement, Dec. 31, 1929 | 19 | | 29 |
| PUBLIC HEALTH: | | | |
| Annual Report, including Vital Statistics Report, 1928 | 11 | | 23 |
| Anti-Tuberculosis League Annual Report, 1928 | 13 | | 24 |
| Report of Commissioners <i>re</i> Provincial Mental Hospitals and Mental Hygiene conditions in the Province | 27 | | 62 |
| Return <i>re</i> Reports by Director of Sanitation on Provincial Industrial School sewage disposal system | 53 | 190 | 193 |
| PUBLIC SERVICE INQUIRY COMMISSION: | | | |
| Report dated March 17, 1930 | 35 | | 124 |
| PUBLIC WORKS: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929 | 4 | | 18 |
| PROVINCIAL SECRETARY: | | | |
| Annual Report, including report of Registrar of J.S. Co'ys., April 30, 1929 | 17 | | 29 |
| Statement of Licenses and Permits issued under Public Vehicles Act, Dec. 31, 1929 | 18 | | 29 |
| RAILWAYS, LABOUR AND INDUSTRIES: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929 | 25 | | 38 |
| TELEPHONES: | | | |
| Annual Report, April 30, 1929 | 8 | | 21 |
| Auditor's Report by O. J. Godfrey & Co., Dec. 31, 1929 | 41 | | 145 |
| Return <i>re</i> Reports of O. J. Godfrey and Geo. Munnoch & Co. <i>re</i> Telephones Department | | 72 | ... |
| Report of G. B. Munnoch & Co. <i>re</i> Investigation of administration of Department | 42 | | 145 |
| TREASURY: | | | |
| Annual Report on Administration of Agricultural Aids Act, 1928-29 | 31 | | 78 |
| Annual Report under Deferred Charges Act, 1928-29 | 23 | | 38 |

| | S.P. No. | Ordered | Presented |
|---|----------|---------|-----------|
| SESSIONAL PAPERS— <i>Continued.</i> | | | |
| Annual Report on Accounts of Administrator of Estates of Mentally Incompetent, 1928-29 | 32 | | 78 |
| Attorney General's Opinions, Treasury Board Decisions and Special Warrants, 1928-29 | 30 | | 78 |
| Public Accounts, April 30, 1929 | 29 | | 78 |
| Statement of Temporary Loans | 24 | | 38 |
| UNIVERSITY: | | | |
| President's Report and Financial Statements, June 30, 1929 | 7 | | 21 |
| UNITED CHURCH PROPERTY COMMISSION: | | | |
| Report of Royal Commission <i>re</i> Inquiry into disposition of property under The United Church of Canada Act | 46 | | 169 |

SPEAKER:

Election of Hon. R. S. Leslie, 9.
 Thanks Assembly for Election, 9.
 Announces his Election to His Honour, 9.
 Reports Speech from Throne, 13.
 Presents Bills to Lieutenant Governor for assent, 91, 120, 162, 207.
 Presents Appropriation Bills to Lieutenant Governor, 120, 209.
 Reads Messages from Lieutenant Governor, 99, 129, 184.
 Deputy Speaker, D. S. Hutcheon, appointed, 78.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS:

Re Interruption of Members during speeches, 63.
Re Discussion of principle of original Act in connection with Second Reading of amending Bill, 90.
Re Disallowance of Notice of Motion respecting Customs Tariff, 183.
Re Amendment to Motion of "No Confidence", 199.

SPEECH FROM THRONE:

At Opening of Session, 9.
 Address in Reply ordered, 78.
 At close of Session, 210.

SUPPLY:

Assembly agrees to resolve itself into a Committee of Supply, 78.
 Estimates referred, 99.
 Assembly in Committee of Supply, 106, 168, 171, 175, 178, 194, 203.
 Motion debated, 136, 144, 147, 150, 156, 159, 161, 168.
 Resolutions reported or received, 107, 119, 205.

V

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS:

Ordered printed, 13.

W**WAYS AND MEANS:**

Assembly agrees to resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, 78.

Assembly in Committee of Ways and Means, 119, 206.

Resolutions reported, 119, 206.

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 |

SESSION 1930

HELD FROM FEBRUARY 6 TO APRIL 10, 1930.

(Both days inclusive)

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 3

SYNOPSIS OF REPORT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD OF SASKATCHEWAN.
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1929.

REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, *January 21, 1930.*

HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D. PAED..

President of the Executive Council,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

SIR,—The last calendar year has shown marked progress throughout the province in the condition of capital loans incurred by Saskatchewan's cities, towns, villages, rural municipalities, school districts, rural telephone companies and hospital districts. Many of these local authorities have either freed themselves entirely of debenture indebtedness or so reduced the amount outstanding that the remaining load is carried with ease. Particulars of the various debenture loans applied for and those approved are set out in schedules attached. In each case an asset equal in value to the liability is created. The terms of the loans vary according to the probable lifetime of the proposed work, it being a well established rule that the period over which the repayment of borrowed money is spread should correspond as nearly as possible with the lifetime of the asset resulting from the loan. Sometimes the number of years may appear to be short, but within recent decades, when scientific research is constantly making new discoveries, obsolescence in equipment and structures generally comes so quickly that the long term is to be avoided where possible. In any case, it is now naturally the desire of the municipality or school district to rid itself of a loan so soon as practicable—an attitude which should not be discouraged.

ASSESSMENT BASIS.

A feature which has assisted in the scrutinizing of proposed debenture loans is the improved assessments of municipalities generally. A more equable and rational condition has been reached in so far as assessment values are concerned. This state of affairs means a better basis for capital loans, a surer foundation for the Local Government Board on which to work, and naturally inspires confidence in prospective purchasers of municipal and school securities.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

In previous reports mention has been made of the improved type of school buildings now being desired generally by trustee boards and ratepayers of both rural and urban school districts. These better structures provide comforts for children and protection for their eyesight and health generally, which safeguards were given, until a few years ago, little consideration.

The pioneering community erecting its first school is, as a matter of course, not financially able to erect so expensive a building or to spend so much money on equipment as is possible in the second school of a well settled and developed community, and naturally, regard for this fact is observed in dealing with applications for permission to borrow money by way of debenture for school building purposes.

No school district, no matter how new, is discouraged in securing adequate accommodation for teaching purposes, although in many cases the amount of the debenture is kept down to a minimum, on account of the limited financial ability of the borrower.

In connection with educational institutions, it may be noted that there is a very decided change in the economic requirements of our population, which has created both a desire and a necessity for technical schools. Apprentices in the various trades are

decidedly scarce, and the trend for tuition along these lines seems to be that young men who desire to take up masonry, carpentry, motor mechanics, or similar trades, must attend a school, instead of serving apprenticeship as a means of training and occupational education. During the past year the two largest cities in the province each secured authorization to borrow by way of debenture a sum sufficient to pay one half the cost of a technical school, the remaining half to be paid equally by the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government. The amounts thus authorized to be raised by the ratepayers of the cities concerned were, Regina \$212,500.00, Saskatoon \$250,000.00. Naturally, a large centre which has the opportunity of securing aid up to fifty per cent. of the cost of erecting the building feels like taking advantage of the grants obtainable from federal and provincial governments.

This alteration in the method of training the young in useful trades, however, means an additional tax burden on the ratepayers concerned. The annual cost to the community of repaying the debenture is not so heavy as that of maintaining the institution in the payment of current expenses.

During the year 1929 \$1,706,660.00 were authorized to be borrowed by way of debenture in the Province of Saskatchewan for the securing of rural and urban schools, particulars of which are given in the schedules attached.

TRANSPORTATION.

The onward march of time, with rapidly changing methods of transporting people and commodities from one point to another, has meant additional tax loads for our municipal authorities and for ratepayers generally. The increase in automobiles and heavy trucks created a demand for better roads, and this demand is being accelerated year by year. The effort to construct and maintain all-weather roads on which motor vehicles may travel at all times of the year means a new tax burden on the citizenry of the province. It is recognized, however, that in the development of our transportation systems good roads are an important feature which municipalities generally must recognize.

In another way, the desire to transport people and commodities from one point to another in the shortest possible space of time is creating a new burden on urban centers. Aeroplanes used for the carrying of mail and for ordinary commercial purposes now require municipal air harbours or landing grounds at points all over Canada. Construction of these is not a light task. One city alone applied for authorization to borrow by way of debenture the sum of \$100,000.00 for the purpose of establishing a municipal air harbour and, recognizing the probable importance of the aeroplane in future transportation methods, authorization was granted.

Should the average town attempt to undertake a costly air harbour prudence would dictate a refusal of the application on purely financial grounds. However, no Saskatchewan town is likely to attempt an expenditure so great for a purpose of the kind; although many of them would be inclined to encourage the calling of aeroplanes by providing, from current funds, a partially prepared landing place. It should be stated, however, that so far only cities are allowed by law to borrow money by way of debenture for providing air harbours or landing grounds.

A measure of relief is accorded urban centres in the establishing of air harbours by certain additional aid granted by the federal government. This assistance, however, does not include the initial purchase of the area of land required.

THE SASKATCHEWAN CO-OPERATIVE CREAMERIES, LIMITED.

The Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan Co-Operative Creameries, Limited, includes the following:

"10.—(1) The company shall not acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise any additional plant other than that in operation at the date of amalgamation, nor shall it make any capital expenditure, nor shall it make any purchase of finished products of any description in which the company deals without the consent of the Local Government Board:

Provided that the board may from time to time give general consents with respect to capital expenditures or the purchase of finished products, and may vary, alter or revoke the same."

Capital expenditures were examined from time to time as required by the company, and, where deemed advisable, authority for the disbursement of capital funds was issued.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Local Government Board Act provides for the creation of an Advisory Committee to the Local Government Board, to consist of a representative appointed by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and a representative appointed by the Union of Saskatchewan Municipalities. The former consists of reeves, councillors and secretary-treasurers of the rural municipalities of the province and the latter of mayors, aldermen, councillors, overseers, clerks, secretaries and treasurers of cities, town and villages. The rural section has selected as its representative the president, Mr. G. H. Hummel, who for many years has been a practical municipal man. The last mentioned is represented by Mr. Fraser Stewart, solicitor for the city of Regina. The advisory committee meets from time to time with the Local Government Board, when discussion on the work and duties of the latter is wide and informative.

Following are excerpts from minutes recorded in 1929:

May 27, 1929.

"The first topic discussed was the present unfavourable prices being offered for municipal and school securities throughout Canada. It was conceded that over-speculation is one cause for the scarcity of funds for the safer investments generally, which scarcity in turn has meant lowered prices for securities which otherwise would be commanding a yield rate advantageous to the issuing authority. It was pointed out that Government bonds, as, for instance, issues by the old Province of Ontario, were selling to yield 5%. The fact also that Ontario's largest city is about to put on the market issues totalling \$30,000,000.00 has a depressing effect. Too much attention to the stock market has caused the absorption of funds that would be invested otherwise in more secure and legitimate investments. The question arose as to why there should be such a spread in prices offered for the debentures of city school districts and those of rural school districts, particularly so when the security behind the latter is usually so substantial. A suggested reason for this spread was that debentures of the city school districts were probably better known and have better marketing facilities. Again, the lack of banking facilities for the rural school district and the want of experience on the part of its officials have sometimes resulted in failure to meet on the due date each maturing coupon. This has had a detrimental effect on the prices of the latter, notwithstanding the solid tax-paying ability behind the debentures concerned.

All-weather roads or streets were then discussed at some length, along with the proper term of the repayment debentures, if any, which might be issued in the securing of funds for such roads. Members of the committee spoke of their experiences on roads treated with oil and gravel and with gravel only. Mr. Hummell stated that he did not know of any rural municipality which had used oil, while Mr. Stewart intimated that where oil was used with gravel on streets in urban centres the combination was, in his opinion, a satisfactory one, but both members of the advisory committee agreed that gravel spread on gumbo roads is of little use, as it soon disappears from the surface, leaving the condition of the road much as it was before the gravel was spread. Mr. Hummell stated that in his experience he had seen a good road bed result from gravel spread on alkali. The combination made, in some cases, a surface like cement. Gravel on non-gumbo roads has proved beneficial, but the representative of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities claimed that gravel spread on a newly finished road often resulted in the waste of money and effort.

Both members of the advisory committee thought that urban and rural municipalities should approach with caution any proposal to borrow money by way of debenture for the purpose of gravelling roads or streets until further experience had been gained in road making generally.

The benefit of road and street making equipment in the ownership of the municipality was mentioned. Debentures might properly be issued for the purchase of such, but their term, it was agreed, should not extend beyond five years. Mr. Hummell mentioned that he had known some instances where proper grading equipment had paid for itself in two years.

Reverting to the question of oiling roads, there was unanimity of opinion that rural municipalities could not undertake at present, on account of the cost, a general

system of oiled roads, but that, from the many experiments being made for the benefit of highways generally, a good surface for traffic would soon be procurable at reasonable cost.

The erecting of halls or meeting places from municipal funds in villages and small towns was then discussed at length. It was pointed out that in many instances the small municipal centre willingly undertakes the payment of such buildings, although the latter serve an area much larger than the town or village itself. It was agreed that if a public meeting place is to be erected the whole community, irrespective of municipal boundaries, should be behind the scheme. In the course of the discussion the advisory committee was informed that where a small urban centre desired a municipal building, and had the ability to pay for it, the Local Government Board approved of the application, when it secured for the municipality a good office for the clerk or secretary-treasurer, a vault of good proportions, a meeting place for the council and for the average number of ratepayers who attend, shelter for the fire-fighting equipment, and other municipal requirements. These having been procured on the first floor, the Local Government Board has suggested to many applicants that the second floor for meetings, entertainments and the like could be built from funds raised by popular subscriptions from the general community at a comparatively low cost, as the roof of the structure would be necessary for the strictly municipal section of the building. The advisory committee agreed that this seemed to be a satisfactory solution where practicable.

As a matter of fact, there appears to be no direct provision in The Village Act or Town Act for the expenditure of municipal funds for public halls. It was intimated that some smaller urban municipalities had shown a disposition to exhaust their borrowing powers in the building of halls when their requirements for water, fire-fighting equipment, sidewalks and drainage had not been sufficiently considered. It was suggested by a member of the Local Government Board that rural municipalities might be empowered to make a cash donation for municipal and semi-municipal buildings, provided that a rest room were included in the structure. As the law now stands, a rural municipality may unite with a village in the construction of a joint office building.

The next topic discussed was the stage at which a town may install water and sewerage systems without danger of financial disaster. In this connection it was pointed out that of the small number of towns which about ten years ago had failed to meet the debenture coupons on the due date nearly all had encountered financial trouble as a result of the premature installation of water systems and sewerage systems. Incidentally, however, it was mentioned that at present every town in Saskatchewan is meeting with promptness the terms of its debenture obligations. The hazard confronting small urban centres in the expensive work of installing water and sewerage systems is always present. The committee agreed that it was very doubtful if a community of less than two thousand people should attempt either water or sewer systems, or both. Some economies had been practiced by the laying of water pipes of a diameter of 2 inches, but the development of the town might mean the abandoning of such pipes to lay larger ones for the increased population, whereas the cost of digging, which is not light, is about the same for a small pipe as a large one. Mr. Stewart thought that the problem is largely one for the engineering profession. It was mentioned generally that many towns in Canada had developed in a safe and healthy manner from small hamlets to large centres of population without the installation of water and sewer pipes. However, the desirability of this modern and sanitary method of serving centres of population was commended, but only where there is an ability to pay for it.

As an aid to towns desiring to install a sewerage system, section 515 of The Town Act was enacted to ensure financial aid. Subsections (1) and (2) read as follows:

"515.—(1) Where the work is the construction of a sewer the council may, notwithstanding that a portion of the cost is to be raised by special assessment, provide by a bylaw to be passed at any general or special meeting by a vote of two-thirds of all the members, that persons who own or occupy premises drained, or which are by bylaw required to be drained, into the sewer shall be charged a reasonable rent or service charge for the use of it.

(2) Such bylaw may regulate the times when and the manner in which the rent is to be paid, may classify the premises drained according to the size and character of the buildings comprised therein, the uses to which they are put or the nature of the business conducted upon the premises; and may fix different rates for different classes."

As will be noted, this portion of the statute provides that those buildings enjoying the privileges of a direct connection with a sewerage system may be required to pay a reasonable rental in addition to the local improvement taxes. This plan, which is peculiar to Saskatchewan so far as the prairie provinces are concerned, was agreed upon as being fair and brought to certain institutions and larger buildings a method of disposing of sewerage at a cost less than the individual septic tank. The Local Government Board stated that the plan is now adopted in three towns, with satisfaction to the owners of buildings enjoying it.

The duties of the Local Government Board under section 36 of The Municipal Public Works Act has been discussed at previous meetings of the advisory committee but was again mentioned, and the Local Government Board's policy in connection therewith once more approved.

Subsection (1) of the said section reads as follows:

"36.—(1) The corporation may, with the approval of the Local Government Board and upon such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe, sell any real or personal property acquired by it for the purposes of this Act when no longer needed and may, subject to the same approval, rent or lease the same until sold."

The Local Government Board when asked for approval of the disposal of electric light and power plants has invariably required that the debentures issued and outstanding for the municipal plant must be protected in full. Again, the Local Government Board insists that in case of every such sale to a franchise seeking company the purchase price shall be paid in cash. These requirements met with the approval of the advisory committee, who saw in them a definite safeguard for the municipal institution concerned.

The next subject discussed was the method of authorizing certain applications for debenture issues, the following being mentioned:

- (a) The approval of a lump sum with location and details of proposed local improvements to be selected by councils;
- (b) The approval of the actual amount for each proposed local improvement with location designated by the Local Government Board.

Members of the Local Government Board explained that there had been an expressed desire for the first method, but at this point reference was made to section 24 of The Local Government Board Act, which reads as follows:

"The board in conducting its inquiry and in arriving at its decision shall consider the nature of the work, undertaking or other object of the proposed loan, the necessity for or expediency of the same, the financial position of the local authority and all such other matters as in the opinion of the Board may call for consideration."

It was explained that for the current year's programme a plan was adopted in dealing with the larger cities, whereby the streets and locations of the proposed improvements would be selected by the council after the Local Government Board had inspected the entire programme and had fixed an amount which it considered sufficient to take care of the works which were actually necessary and expedient, while heretofore the second method had been adopted. The representatives of the Union of Saskatchewan Municipalities intimated that it might be a good idea to let this year's policy continue for a time until it is seen how it works out, for he recognized that in some instances a council might select for present work those streets which least needed improvements, although nothing so far as his knowledge went had been done to show an inclination not to perform the most reasonable works first.

In any case, the general attitude of both central and local authorities in the matter of extending needed improvements, including water, sewer, sidewalks and pavement, is to develop from the centre outward in logical order, so that residents of various parts of the city might have a fair idea as to when their claims for improvements could receive favourable consideration.

The last topic was the annual report issued by the Local Government Board. The advisory committee had no adverse criticism to make, any comment made indicating

that evidently the statements included in the report gave to the public salient information relative to the activities of the Local Government Board."

"November 29, 1929.

"The first topic discussed was municipal air harbours or landing grounds, as referred to in section 254 of The City Act. It was mentioned that in no other provincial statute is a similar reference made to this modern development in transportation. It was agreed, however, that many of the larger towns might desire to establish air harbours with a view to being named as ports of call by aeroplane companies. The burden of establishing a regular air harbour is, admittedly, too heavy for the average town and wholly beyond the reach of a village, while no rural municipality is likely to be asked for a station of the kind for some time to come. Mr. Stewart, the representative of the Union of Saskatchewan Municipalities, submitted much information on the requirements of air men, as he had been interviewed by representatives of flying clubs in his capacity as city solicitor. He stated that aeroplane companies desired emergency landing fields every ten miles. These fields are not expected to be so well equipped for landing as the regular air harbours established by cities and, as their name implies, are to be used only when very necessary. Mr. Hummel, representative of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, stated that, in his opinion, with which Mr. Stewart agreed, current funds only should be used for the emergency landing fields. The growth of air companies was exemplified by Mr. Stewart when he mentioned that at present there are four of them in Regina alone. He likewise stated that, while the small Moth plane may have little difficulty in landing on an unprepared part of the prairie, the larger mail planes require a smooth landing place to avoid accidents. It was mentioned during the discussion that towns might desire to establish landing fields to encourage aeroplanes to attend on sports days and, generally, to attract passing planes, in much the same way as the towns and smaller centres of earlier days desired railway stations to be established within their respective limits. It was generally agreed that the term of debentures issued for the establishment of air harbours should not exceed fifteen years, for obsolescence in this modern method of transportation comes quickly. Mr. Stewart also explained the meaning of beacons for the guidance of aeroplanes. These are not beacons of light but rather radio beacons to indicate to the flyer by understood signs whether or not he is far from his course. As additional applications may come from cities to incur capital loans for the purpose of creating or extending municipal air harbours, Mr. Stewart suggested that the next time an authority on landing places should call on him he would be asked to interview the Local Government Board to give information relative to probable requirements for any one of these new stations.

The case of Lloydminster United Municipal Hospital District introduced comment on proposed changes in The Union Hospital Act. In the particular instance mentioned, the rural areas contributing desire a revision of the amounts to be furnished by them at stated periods, the representatives of these rural areas having in mind the probability of the equalized assessment varying from time to time as a result of the possible growth of a town which may be a part of the district. The advisory committee recognized the proposal as being reasonable but thought that the basis of the contributions should not be disturbed too often. It was conceded that a revision every five years, based on the equalized assessment of the time, should be arranged for at the request of any one of the contributing areas or municipalities. All were of the opinion that the period should be fixed.

The popular subject of technical schools was next brought under discussion. The advisory committee had no hesitation in stating that these were undoubtedly beneficial where the population of the centres desiring them is sufficiently large to require and support a technical school. The conditions under which each of the two larger cities of Saskatchewan is securing a technical school are attractive, as the city itself pays only one-half of the capital cost, the balance being met equally by the federal and provincial governments. The success of technical schools in Saskatchewan will be watched with interest, as so far none has been established in the province. It was mentioned also that it might be too easy for a city to obligate itself beyond its powers to readily repay by undertaking to establish and maintain a technical school.

The meeting then dealt with the feasibility of the installation of water systems in small urban centres. Members of the Local Government Board pointed out that in more than one case throughout Saskatchewan a town involved itself in indebtedness which it could not meet without a readjustment of the terms of the liability as a direct result of going to the expense of putting in a water system. Too often the number of users installing this convenience is so small that the revenues have been almost negligible. The expense of laying water pipes below the frost line is heavy in our

western provinces, where an exceptional depth has to be reached in order to prevent freezing. Mr. Hummell stated that in his former home in Nebraska, which was a town with a population of about two thousand, water pipes giving general distribution had been municipally installed, and the receipts therefrom had met fixed and operating charges. He explained, however, that the cost of laying the pipes is not nearly so great in Nebraska as in Saskatchewan. All were of the opinion that where an urban centre can afford to pay for a water system it should be allowed to undertake the expenditure, as better fire protection results, and the health of the community, generally, has an additional safe-guard; but nearly all communities in Saskatchewan have recognized that in the smaller centres the distribution of water by means of pipes laid underground is financially impossible. The advisory committee thought the Local Government Board should proceed with caution in every case where a small town desired permission to issue debentures for the purpose of installing a water system. Before leaving this item the use of wooden water mains was referred to, and mention was made of the fact that one of our cities during the last few years had taken up all the wooden mains laid a number of years ago, as they were not giving satisfaction and were the cause of much cost to the city in repairs. It was stated, however, that a type of wooden pipe is now being offered which carries a guarantee of fifteen years and has been so constructed and protected that it is superior to the wooden pipe offered for sale fifteen or twenty years ago. Members of the advisory committee expressed their opinion that the local improvement scheme of paying for water mains is fair and equitable and provides additional revenue.

The advisability of allowing summer resort villages to issue debentures was then discussed at some length. This subject was brought up as a result of the increasing number of these more or less temporary communities built on water fronts, where many people congregate for the months of July and August, leaving such communities almost deserted for the rest of the year. The original and present legislation providing for the creation of these summer resort villages stipulated definitely that no one of them could issue debentures. This restriction was on account of its temporary nature, its fluctuating population and lack of supervision for a great part of the year. While all agreed that action should be taken in these temporary communities to protect the health of the men, women and children who may frequent them during the summer months, yet the issue of debentures is not the method for financing such communities' requirements. The use of utilities in a summer resort village is restricted to practically one-sixth of the year; hence the revenues therefrom cannot be expected to meet the annual payments on a debenture issue.

The ever popular topic of gravelling rural highways and urban streets then caused much comment, as the subject of improved roads and streets is ever to the fore in a new province. Mr. Hummell stressed the necessity of a prepared road before putting gravel on it. All agreed that, although this may take time, the results are long-lasting, whereas gravel placed on raw gumbo, as pointed out at previous meetings, soon disappears. It was mentioned by the advisory committee that the province is acquiring experience in road building, and time only will decide just what the term of the debentures should be where this method is adopted for securing funds for gravelling. Reference was made to the fact that only one city had borrowed money by way of debenture for gravelling its streets, and this city now prepares a crushed rockbed for the gravel. Rural municipalities, generally, had not adopted this method of securing funds for road building.

The desirability of each village securing for itself adequate fire fighting equipment was then mentioned. It was the consensus of opinion that the percentage of the borrowing powers allowed for fire protection should be generous. In case a conflagration visited one of our villages a large portion of the assessment might be wiped out in a few hours if the incipient blaze were not checked. As on various other occasions, the members of the advisory committee agreed that a good supply of water and fire fighting apparatus are two of the first essentials in any village.

Municipal skating rinks and their management came in for comment, and the attitude of the Local Government Board towards the expenditure of municipal funds for skating and curling rinks was reiterated. Members of the advisory committee agreed that, while there may be difficulty in having a rink so financed that it could pay fixed and operating charges, every effort should be made to secure from the enterprise all revenue possible.

Reference was made to the fortunate condition of the sinking funds of cities, towns and city school districts, and the solid securities in which monies standing at the credit of sinking funds are carefully invested."

SINKING FUNDS.

The sinking fund method of borrowing money is allowed by law only in cities and towns and in each of those school districts which has within its borders a city. The Local Government Board is not favourable to this plan of raising money in any but the larger centres, where the councils or trustees are in a better position to administer a sinking fund. In any case, it is preferable in the majority of local authorities that the creditor should be met at least once a year. The condition of its sinking fund is an indication of the general status and management of the municipality or school district itself.

At this time complete returns in respect of last year are not at hand, but the two larger cities have already reported a state of affairs which reveals a comfortable standing for their respective sinking funds. The secretary of Regina's sinking fund trustees, who is also the treasurer of the city, recently wrote as follows:

"I beg to advise that with approximately \$4,000,000.00 of investments, one-half of which is in Saskatchewan rural school and telephone debentures, the Sinking Fund Trustees of the City of Regina had no investments in arrears as at December 31, 1929.

"The record is a tribute to the soundness of financing and management in Saskatchewan rural centres."

From Saskatoon comes the pleasing official statement from the city commissioner:

"I beg to advise you that all interest and principal repayments have been fully met as at December 31, last.

The above results show the capable administration of these funds.

The City Act and Town Act provide that if a sinking fund has a surplus over and above the amount required to meet the debenture indebtedness on the thirty-first day of the year previous to the application such surplus may be devoted to current or other purposes, subject to the approval of the Local Government Board. These sections of the law are somewhat unusual and have to be applied with care. The Local Government Board, in the interests of the local authority, insists that there must be always a substantial reserve in each sinking fund. For 1929 the city of Regina was allowed to use from its excess sinking fund earnings \$70,000.00, Saskatoon \$50,000.00 and Moose Jaw \$35,000.00.

Before sinking funds of any local authority are invested in a security the Local Government Board must pass upon the proposal. The utmost caution is observed in scrutinising the securities thus submitted as an investment.

Following is a list of the municipalities and school districts in which sinking funds exist:

| <i>Cities—</i> | <i>Towns—</i> | <i>School Districts—</i> |
|------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Moose Jaw | Arcola | Regina |
| North Battleford | Biggar | Saskatoon |
| Regina | Davidson | |
| Saskatoon | Duck Lake | |
| Swift Current | Francis | |
| Prince Albert | Indian Head | |
| Weyburn | Melfort | |
| | Rosetown | |

ELECTRICAL ENERGY FRANCHISES.

Under The Municipal Public Works Act, as amended, a municipal corporation may, with the approval of the Local Government Board, and upon such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, sell any real or personal property acquired by it for the purposes of that Act when no longer needed and may, subject to the same approval, rent or lease the same until sold. The actual sale in a case of the kind is first proposed by the council, and if the terms of sale seem fair and reasonable the Local Government Board approves of it.

It should be noted, however, that the Local Government Board does not deal with any proposed franchise nor its terms. In due course the local authority or the franchise

holder may appeal to the Local Government Board for a variation of rates. Thus the Local Government Board does not attempt to pass upon rates or the details of any proposed franchise, leaving the decision wholly in the hands of the city, town or village concerned.

It may be repeated that in every instance the Local Government Board insists that any debentures still outstanding in connection with the plant must be protected.

The following schedule indicates the municipalities which have sold their electric lighting plants with the approval of the ratepayers, the names of the purchasers, the purchase price and the disposition of the proceeds:

| Local Authority | Date of Board's order approving sale, 1928 | To whom sold | Amount sold for | Date of Board's order for payment out, 1929 | Amount paid out | Purpose |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------------|---|-----------------|--|
| Town of Broadview.. | May 19 | The Northern Light & Power Co. Ltd. (Now Canadian Utilities Limited) | \$ 16,594.21 | | \$ 3,084.59 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Payment on electric light debentures. Payment on electric light debentures. Payment on electric light debentures. |
| | | | | Mar. 6 | 1,853.28 | |
| | | | | Sept. 25 | 516.02 | |
| | | | | Oct. 25 | 768.57 | |
| | | | | | \$ 6,222.46 | |
| Town of Melville | May 19 | Dominion Electric Power Ltd. | \$175,000.00 | | \$ 8,875.00 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Paid on water tower Water and sewerage system Paid on water tower Purch'. water & sewer debentures Purch'. water & sewer debentures |
| | | | | Jan. 7 | 575.00 | |
| | | | | Jan. 24 | 1,500.00 | |
| | | | | May 8 | 4,750.00 | |
| | | | | Oct. 7 | 20,000.00 | |
| | | | | Nov. 1 | 20,000.00 | |
| | | | | \$55,700.00 | | |
| Town of Davidson | June 14 | Dominion Electric Power Ltd. | \$ 35,000.00 | | \$16,200.31 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 |
| Town of Assiniboia. | June 14 | Dominion Electric Power Ltd. | \$120,000.00 | | \$52,812.27 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Prin. electric light deb. coupons Interest earnings |
| | | | | Sept. 17 | 2,086.29 | |
| | | | | Oct. 2 | 2,875.45 | |
| | | | | | \$57,774.01 | |
| Town of Estevan | May 22 | Dominion Electric Power Ltd. | \$220,000.00 | | \$ 68,318.75 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Prin. electric light deb. coupons Interest earnings Dom. of Canada 5½%, 1934 bonds Purchasing town debentures Prov. of B.C. 5% 1954 bonds Paid on water works Prin. electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | Jan. 23 | 1,147.58 | |
| | | | | Mar. 11 | 2,131.43 | |
| | | | | Apr. 18 | 68,948.00 | |
| | | | | May 1 | 5,196.64 | |
| | | | | May 9 | 25,000.00 | |
| | | | | June 13 | 3,929.38 | |
| | | | | June 14 | 1,045.46 | |

| Local Authority | Date of Board's order approving sale, 1928 | To whom sold | Amount sold for | Date of Board's order for payment out, 1929 | Amount paid out | Purpose |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | July 17 Sept. 30 Nov. 13 Nov. 13 Nov. 13 Nov. 15 | 28,000.00 20,000.00 905.50 502.20 1,000.00 2,698.90 | Purchasing town debentures Paid on water works Prin. electric light deb. coupons Prin. electric light deb. coupons Prin. electric light deb. coupons Purchasing town debentures |
| | | | | | \$228,823.84 | |
| Town of Fleming | Sept. 21 | The Northern Light & Power Co. Ltd. (Now Canadian Utilities Limited) | \$ 2,000.00 | | 2,000.00 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 |
| Town of Radville | June 15 | Dominion Electric Power Ltd. | \$ 35,000.00 | Oct. 28 | \$ 4,500.00 | Purchasing town debentures |
| Town of Govan | Nov. 13 | Canadian Utilities Limited | \$ 14,314.69 | | \$ 12,795.58 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 |
| Town of Nokomis | June 16 | Mid-West Utilities Ltd..... | \$17,000.00 | Oct. 18 | \$2,336.27 2,336.27 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Prin. electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | | \$4,672.54 | |
| Town of Oxbow | July 3 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | 13,000.00 | Jan. 18 Oct. 28 | \$1,047.33 840.07 237.18 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Prin. electric light deb. coupons Prin. electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | | \$2,124.58 | |
| Town of Wilkie | Aug. 10 | Canadian Utilities Ltd. | 26,000.00 | Jan. 4 Feb. 15 July 31 Dec. 31 | \$5,169.44 312.91 86.42 2,500.00 838.85 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 Prin. electric light deb. coupons, Interest earned Purchasing town debentures Interest earned |
| | | | | | \$8,907.62 | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|--|----------------|---------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| Town of Strasbourg.. | Sept. 13 | Canadian Utilities Ltd. | 12,000.00 | | \$4,737.43 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 |
| | | | | May 28 | 500.00 | Purchasing town debentures |
| | | | | Oct. 10 | 781.68 | Prin. electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | Dec. 11 | 310.66 | Interest earned |
| | | | | | \$6,329.77 | |
| Town of Wapella | Sept. 14 | The Northern Light & Power Co. Ltd. (Now Canadian Utilities Ltd.) | 4,000.00 | Sept. 9 | \$ 996.64 | Payment on account of debentures |
| Town of Saltcoats... | Oct. 6 | Canadian Utilities Ltd. | \$ 16,000.00 | | \$ 4,841.02 | Paid out previous to Jan. 1, 1929 |
| | | | | Nov. 5 | 1,163.17 | Retiring electric light debentures |
| | | | | Nov. 14 | 1,452.10 | Retiring electric light debentures |
| | | | | | \$ 7,456.29 | |
| | 1929 | | | | | |
| Town of Canora..... | May 3 | Canora Public Service Corporation.... | \$ 59,900.00 | | | Nothing paid out |
| Town of Lumsden ... | Apr. 12 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | \$ 2,500.00 | Nov. 26 | \$ 931.45 | Retiring electric light debentures |
| | | | | Nov. 26 | 8.71 | Interest earnings |
| | | | | | \$ 940.16 | |
| Town of Rouleau..... | Jan. 11 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | \$ 20,000.00 | Jan. 26 | \$ 5,000.00 | Retiring electric light debentures |
| | | | | Feb. 15 | 14,535.00 | Investment Prov. of Sask. bonds |
| | | | | | \$19,535.00 | |
| Town of Yellow Grass | Feb. 26 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | \$ 9,721.41 | Mar. 18 | \$ 943.93 | Prin. Electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | Nov. 10 | 1,352.61 | Prin. Electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | | \$ 2,296.54 | |
| Village of Avoulea... | Feb. 26 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | \$ 4,500.00 | Mar. 28 | \$ 725.00 | Invest. Sask. Rural Tel. Co. deb. |
| | | | | Oct. 9 | 900.00 | Invest. Sask. School Dis. deb. |
| | | | | Dec. 5 | 1,170.00 | Paying electric light deb. coupons |
| | | | | | \$ 2,795.00 | |
| Village of Wilcox | Mar. 6 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | \$ 5,700.00 | Apr. 12 | \$ 1,669.82 | Retiring electric light debentures |
| | | | | June 29 | 1,552.05 | Retiring electric light debentures |
| | | | | | \$ 3,221.87 | |
| Village of Fillmore.. | Feb. 26 | Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd..... | \$ 5,000.00 | Apr. 18 | \$ 5,000.00 | Redemption of electric light deb. |
| City of Moose Jaw... | Dec. 20 | Iowa Southern Utilities Company..... | \$2,875,500.00 | | | Nothing paid out |

AUTHORISATION OF THE ISSUE OF DEBENTURES.

In 1928 the total amount of authorisations of the issue of debentures by local authorities showed an increase as compared with the previous year (1927) of approximately \$960,000.00, and in 1929 there is an increase over the preceding year of \$1,879,360.25. All classes of local authority contribute to this condition, except union hospital districts, the expenditure in which was lower than in 1928.

The following table shows the number and amount of authorisations issued to each class of local authorities as compared with the previous year:

| Local authorities | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|---------------------------------|------|----------------|------|----------------|
| | No. | Amount | No. | Amount |
| Cities | 67 | \$3,671,434.16 | 64 | \$2,087,526.55 |
| Towns | 25 | 301,105.64 | 14 | 124,350.00 |
| Villages | 40 | 117,255.00 | 23 | 63,400.00 |
| Rural municipalities | 14 | 103,930.00 | 5 | 32,000.00 |
| School districts | 251 | 1,706,660.00 | 303 | 1,701,300.00 |
| Rural telephone companies | 119 | 401,719.00 | 122 | 374,667.00 |
| Union hospitals | 2 | 35,500.00 | 2 | 75,000.00 |
| | 518 | \$6,337,603.80 | 533 | \$4,458,243.55 |

Cities

In cities expenditure for practically all classes of public utility, streets, sidewalks, etc., was higher than in any previous year of which the Board has records. Buildings and structures for various purposes also contributed heavily to the authorisations granted by the Board in the year under review, which is characterized as one of marked municipal activity, incident no doubt to the expansion brought about by the prevailing condition of general prosperity.

The following table shows the authorisations granted for various classes of work, as compared with 1928:

| Purpose | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | No. of authorisations | Amount | No. of authorisations | Amount |
| Water mains | 15 | \$ 490,837.58 | 9 | \$ 292,161.67 |
| Water meters | 1 | 12,000.00 | 1 | 12,000.00 |
| Water house connections | 3 | 68,230.61 | 5 | 71,314.44 |
| Sewer house connections | 2 | 22,319.90 | 4 | 34,602.61 |
| Sewers | 9 | 181,864.35 | 8 | 65,442.56 |
| Sewage disposal plant | 1 | 60,000.00 | 1 | 55,000.00 |
| Storm sewers | 3 | 162,806.50 | 3 | 189,680.00 |
| Pavements | 3 | 355,920.00 | 4 | 275,099.26 |
| Concrete walks | 4 | 83,444.18 | 4 | 108,550.25 |
| Concrete walks, curbs and blvds | 1 | 55,350.00 | | |
| Boulevards | 1 | 20,000.00 | 4 | 35,565.97 |
| Curbs | | | 1 | 23,169.00 |

Cities—(Continued)

| Purpose | 1928 | | 1929 | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| | No. of authorisations | Amount | No. of authorisations | Amount |
| Gravelling streets | | | 1 | 4,704.16 |
| Semi-macadam streets | 1 | 257,000.00 | 1 | 96,776.50 |
| Asphalt surfacing | | | 1 | 48,108.00 |
| Plank walks..... | 3 | 37,657.69 | 5 | 35,082.13 |
| Widening and opening lanes..... | 2 | 3,631.50 | 2 | 6,700.00 |
| Retaining wall | | | 1 | 4,970.00 |
| Street railway | 4 | 296,302.35 | 2 | 234,600.00 |
| Fire protection | | | 1 | 80,000.00 |
| Electric light | 3 | 198,090.00 | 1 | 60,500.00 |
| Exhibition buildings | 2 | 68,500.00 | 1 | 125,000.00 |
| Hospitals | 3 | 410,000.00 | 3 | 53,500.00 |
| Collegiate Institute | | | 1 | 170,000.00 |
| Technical schools | 2 | 462,500.00 | | |
| Drainage | 1 | 20,069.50 | | |
| Air harbour | 1 | 100,000.00 | | |
| Bridge | 1 | 175,000.00 | | |
| Police Station | 1 | 130,000.00 | | |
| | 67 | \$3,671,434.16 | 64 | \$2,087,526.55 |

Schedule "A" hereto gives details of authorisations granted to each city.

Towns

Towns also show a substantial increase as compared with the previous year:

| Purpose | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | No. of authorisations | Amount | No. of authorisations | Amount |
| Water tower | | | 1 | \$ 14,750.00 |
| Water extensions | 5 | \$ 25,429.38 | 3 | 76,500.00 |
| Concrete walks | 6 | 106,212.49 | 2 | 8,800.00 |
| Plank walks | | | 2 | 4,500.00 |
| Street grading and drainage..... | 1 | 4,000.00 | 1 | 500.00 |
| Fire protection | 5 | 21,700.00 | 1 | 1,300.00 |
| Electric light | 1 | 25,000.00 | 1 | 8,000.00 |
| Skating and curling rinks | | | 3 | 10,000.00 |
| Municipal buildings | 1 | 7,500.00 | | |
| Sewer extensions | 4 | 45,064.87 | | |
| Sewer and water extensions..... | 2 | 66,198.90 | | |
| | 25 | \$ 301,105.64 | 14 | \$ 124,350.00 |

For particulars see Schedule "B."

Villages

Authorisations granted to village municipalities are listed below:

| Purpose | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | No. of authorisations | Amount | No. of authorisations | Amount |
| Concrete walks & water supply | 2 | \$ 6,700.00 | 5 | \$ 10,200.00 |
| Concrete walks | 17 | 49,025.00 | 1 | 10,500.00 |
| Concrete walks & street bldg..... | | | 1 | 1,000.00 |
| Street improvements | 2 | 2,000.00 | 1 | 1,000.00 |
| Plank walks | 1 | 1,800.00 | | |
| Recreation ground | | | 1 | 1,000.00 |
| Water supply | 2 | 4,800.00 | 3 | 4,250.00 |
| Fire protection | 3 | 11,930.00 | 3 | 5,750.00 |
| Electric light | | | 2 | 7,200.00 |
| Municipal buildings | 6 | 21,500.00 | 1 | 6,000.00 |
| Skating and curling rinks | 5 | 14,000.00 | 6 | 17,500.00 |
| Water supply and fire protection | 2 | 5,500.00 | | |
| | 40 | \$ 117,255.00 | 23 | \$ 63,400.00 |

See Schedule "C"

Rural Municipalities.

Rural municipalities as a rule obtain most of the funds expended on capital account from their current revenue. This year a greater number than usual have departed from this practice, principally for road machinery and municipal buildings.

Authorisations granted are detailed below:

| Purpose | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | No. of authorisations | Amount | No. of authorisations | Amount |
| Road machinery | 6 | \$ 50,430.00 | 1 | \$ 6,000.00 |
| Municipal buildings | 4 | 28,000.00 | 2 | 20,000.00 |
| Right-of-way for roads | 1 | 3,500.00 | 1 | 3,000.00 |
| Hospital Grant | | | 1 | 3,000.00 |
| Road construction | 3 | 22,000.00 | | |
| | 14 | \$ 103,930.00 | 5 | \$ 32,000.00 |

See Schedule "D"

Union Hospital Districts

Two authorisations of the issue of debentures by union hospital districts were granted during the year, aggregating \$35,500.00, as compared with two in 1928, \$75,000.00. Schedule "E"

School Districts

There was a falling off in number of authorisations granted to school districts as compared with 1928, though the aggregate amount was slightly greater.

This would indicate that conditions in this respect remain practically unchanged. A few new districts are being erected from time to time, which require new schools, while many districts have outgrown their original buildings and find it necessary to replace them by new ones, larger and more up to date.

Sixty-four districts, to meet the greater requirements occasioned by these conditions, have altered and added to their present schools. In all, 251 authorisations were granted, aggregating \$1,706,660.00, but the ratepayers voted down the bylaws in 27, leaving net authorisations 224, amounting to \$1,594,360.00, classified as set out below:

| Purpose | 1929 | | | | 1928 | | | |
|--|------|----------------|------------------------|--------------|------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | Defeated by Ratepayers | | | | Defeated by Ratepayers | |
| | No. | Amount | No. | Amount | No. | Amount | No. | Amount |
| New Schools, including sites, outbuildings and equipment.... | 166 | \$1,223,710.00 | 22 | \$103,900.00 | 180 | \$1,140,850.00 | 14 | \$69,000.00 |
| School sites | 1 | 45,000.00 | | | 4 | 141,500.00 | | |
| Teachers' residences | 20 | 20,150.00 | 1 | 1,200.00 | 25 | 25,050.00 | 2 | 2,500.00 |
| Alterations, repairs and additions to school buildings and equipment | 64 | 417,800.00 | 4 | 7,200.00 | 94 | 393,900.00 | 6 | 9,700.00 |
| | 251 | \$1,706,660.00 | 27 | \$112,300.00 | 303 | \$1,701,300.00 | 22 | \$81,200.00 |
| Less defeated by ratepayers | 27 | 112,300.00 | | | 22 | 81,200.00 | | |
| | 224 | \$1,594,360.00 | | | 281 | 1,620,100.00 | | |

For details see Schedule "F"

Rural Telephone Companies

The following table contains a list of authorisations issued to rural telephone companies and shows capital expenditure in this class of local authority to be slightly greater than in the preceding year:

| Purpose | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | No. of authorisations | Amount | No. of authorisations | Amount |
| New systems | 3 | \$ 50,915.00 | 13 | \$125,250.00 |
| Central offices | 6 | 4,540.00 | 7 | 6,602.00 |
| Extensions of existing systems, including reconstruction and alterations | 110 | 346,264.00 | 102 | 242,815.00 |
| | 119 | \$401,719.00 | 122 | \$374,667.00 |

For details see Schedule "G"

SALE OF DEBENTURES.

A comparison of interest rates on debentures sold by local authorities during 1929 with those of the previous year reveals a pronounced upward tendency, a condition which, while it prevailed in all classes, was particularly apparent in respect of urban municipalities.

Two principal reasons might be ascribed for these increased rates:

First, the fact that many of the institutions which in the past absorbed large amounts of municipal securities had made heavy commitments ahead of their usual investment dates, and,

Secondly, that large sums which otherwise would have been devoted to this class of investment appear to have been diverted into other channels.

Notwithstanding this, sales in 1929 far exceed those of the previous year, both in number of issues and amount, the 1929 sales being 439 issues totalling \$4,943,602.65 as against 392 totalling \$2,575,406.58 in 1928.

This increase is shared by all classes of local authority, excepting village and rural schools, in which there is a slight decrease.

Particulars of sales are set out in the following tables:

| | 1929 | | | 1928 | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | Highest Interest rate | Lowest Interest rate | Average for year | Highest Interest rate | Lowest Interest rate | Average for year |
| Cities | 6.163 | 4.865 | 5.406 | 5. | 4.580 | 4.692 |
| Towns | 6.607 | 5. | 6.029 | 6. | 5. | 5.464 |
| Villages | 7.428 | 5.945 | 6.520 | 6.275 | 5.686 | 5.891 |
| Rural municipalities | 6.808 | 5.50 | 5.917 | 5.250 | 5.250 | 5.250 |
| Rural telephone companies | 8. | 5. | 6.023 | 7. | 5.372 | 5.632 |
| Union hospitals | 6. | 5.389 | 5.601 | 5.176 | 5.176 | 5.176 |
| Village and rural schools | 7.375 | 5. | 6.160 | 7. | 5. | 5.536 |
| City and town schools | 7.097 | 5.113 | 5.402 | 6.50 | 4.819 | 5.085 |

Sales in each month of the year 1929 of the various classes of debentures, with the highest, lowest and average rates of interest are given in the following tables:

Sales in each month of the year 1929 of the various classes of debentures, with the highest, lowest and average rates of interest are given in the following tables:

| | 1929 | | | | | 1928 | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | Number of issues sold | Amount | Highest interest rate | Lowest interest rate | Average rate | Number of issues sold | Amount | Average rate |
| <i>Cities—</i> | | | | | | | | |
| March | 11 | \$ 480,150.00 | 5.250 | 5. | 5.213 | | | |
| April | 5 | 36,053.00 | 5.250 | 5.139 | 5.182 | | | |
| May | 12 | 620,200.00 | 6.163 | 5.20 | 5.743 | 6 | \$306,000.00 | 4.643 |
| June | 12 | 330,925.00 | 5.636 | 5.06 | 5.385 | 2 | 132,400.00 | 4.737 |
| July | | | | | | 13 | 483,300.00 | 4.710 |
| November | 12 | 1,312,200.00 | 5.57 | 4.865 | 5.329 | | | |
| December | 1 | 12,000.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | | | |
| | 53 | \$2,791,528.00 | Average for year | | 5.406 | 21 | \$921,700.00 | 4.692 Average for year |
| <i>Towns—</i> | | | | | | | | |
| January | 2 | \$ 18,250.00 | 6.163 | 5.972 | 6.002 | | | |
| February | 1 | 9,218.00 | 5.729 | 5.729 | 5.729 | | | |
| March | 1 | 8,000.00 | 5.862 | 5.862 | 5.862 | | | |
| April | | | | | | 3 | \$ 7,100.58 | 5.578 |
| May | 1 | 3,800.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | | | |
| June | 2 | 2,800.00 | 5.845 | 5. | 5.694 | 1 | 5,000.00 | 5.375 |
| July | 2 | 30,500.00 | 6. | 5.50 | 5.541 | | | |
| August | 1 | 6,737.52 | 6.25 | 6.25 | 6.25 | | | |
| October | 3 | 27,000.00 | 6.607 | 6. | 6.053 | 2 | 4,700.00 | 5.419 |
| November | 2 | 21,500.00 | 6.50 | 6. | 6.035 | 2 | 11,500.00 | 5.614 |
| December | 5 | 50,564.00 | 6.391 | 6. | 6.157 | 1 | 4,000.00 | 5. |
| | 20 | \$ 178,369.52 | Average for year | | 6.029 | 9 | \$ 32,300.58 | 5.464 Average for year |

| | 1929 | | | | | 1928 | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | Number of issues sold | Amount | Highest interest rate | Lowest interest rate | Average rate | Number of issues sold | Amount | Average rate |
| <i>Villages—</i> | | | | | | | | |
| January | 1 | \$ 2,750.00 | 6.189 | 6.189 | 6.189 | | | |
| February | 1 | 1,000.00 | 6.191 | 6.191 | 6.191 | 2 | \$ 2,800.00 | 5.750 |
| April | 1 | 3,500.00 | 6.150 | 6.150 | 6.150 | | | |
| May | | | | | | 1 | 2,500.00 | 5.686 |
| June | 2 | 7,200.00 | 6.302 | 6. | 6.077 | 1 | 1,000.00 | 5.886 |
| July | 7 | 17,350.00 | 7. | 5.945 | 6.282 | 1 | 1,200.00 | 5.886 |
| August | 3 | 12,500.00 | 7.328 | 6.50 | 6.901 | 2 | 4,000.00 | 5.783 |
| September | 5 | 19,675.00 | 6.974 | 6.428 | 6.764 | 6 | 25,750.00 | 5.873 |
| October | 3 | 5,900.00 | 7. | 6. | 6.305 | | | |
| November | 5 | 10,630.00 | 7.428 | 6.082 | 6.761 | 1 | 4,500.00 | 5.920 |
| December | | | | | | 3 | 6,000.00 | 6.169 |
| | 28 | \$ 80,505.00 | Average for year | | 6.520 | 17 | \$ 47,750.00 | 5.891 Average for year |
| <i>Rural Municipalities—</i> | | | | | | | | |
| April | 1 | \$ 10,000.00 | 5.90 | 5.90 | 5.90 | | | |
| May | 2 | 15,430.00 | 5.982 | 5.810 | 5.904 | | | |
| June | | | | | | 1 | \$ 4,000.00 | 5.250 |
| July | | | | | | 1 | 6,000.00 | 5.250 |
| August | 1 | 6,000.00 | 6.808 | 6.808 | 6.808 | 1 | 3,000.00 | 5.250 |
| September | 1 | 9,500.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | | | |
| November | | | | | | 1 | 5,000.00 | 5.250 |
| | 5 | \$ 40,930.00 | Average for year | | 5.917 | 4 | \$ 18,000.00 | 5.250 Average for year |

| | 1929 | | | | | 1928 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | Number of issues sold | Amount | Highest interest rate | Lowest interest rate | Average rate | Number of issues sold | Amount | Average rate |
| <i>Union Hospitals—</i> | | | | | | | | |
| April | 1 | \$ 60,000.00 | 5.639 | 5.639 | 5.639 | | | |
| June | | | | | | 1 | \$ 15,000.00 | 5.250 |
| September | 2 | 35,500.00 | 6. | 5.389 | 5.535 | | | |
| | 3 | \$ 95,500.00 | Average for year | | 5.601 | 1 | \$ 15,000.00 | 5.250 Average for year |
| <i>Village and Rural Schools—</i> | | | | | | | | |
| January | 4 | \$ 8,300.00 | 6. | 5.945 | 5.974 | 11 | \$ 35,800.00 | 5.534 |
| February | 2 | 5,500.00 | 7.375 | 5.75 | 6.634 | 4 | 9,600.00 | 5.473 |
| March | 5 | 9,900.00 | 6. | 5.50 | 5.769 | 6 | 20,900.00 | 5.521 |
| April | 12 | 52,600.00 | 6.224 | 5.656 | 5.809 | 22 | 72,450.00 | 5.413 |
| May | 10 | 36,900.00 | 6.726 | 5.50 | 6.081 | 32 | 112,300.00 | 5.411 |
| June | 20 | 80,550.00 | 7. | 5.50 | 6.181 | 33 | 107,600.00 | 5.401 |
| July | 25 | 101,400.00 | 7. | 5. | 6.126 | 28 | 96,500.00 | 5.491 |
| August | 34 | 150,390.00 | 7. | 5.50 | 6.311 | 24 | 127,900.00 | 5.455 |
| September | 32 | 117,850.00 | 7. | 5.895 | 6.566 | 21 | 86,500.00 | 5.591 |
| October | 15 | 39,750.00 | 7.293 | 5.950 | 6.452 | 16 | 56,000.00 | 5.681 |
| November | 16 | 42,670.00 | 7.202 | 6. | 6.939 | 24 | 77,600.00 | 5.912 |
| December | 9 | 58,800.00 | 7. | 6. | 6.382 | 10 | 18,050.00 | 6.169 |
| | 184 | \$ 704,610.00 | Average for year | | 6.160 | 231 | \$821,200.00 | 5.536 Average for year |

| | 1929 | | | | | 1928 | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | Number of issues sold | Amount | Highest interest rate | Lowest interest rate | Average rate | Number of issues sold | Amount | Average rate |
| <i>Rural Telephone Companies--</i> | | | | | | | | |
| January | 15 | \$ 37,592.00 | 7.250 | 5.50 | 5.912 | 8 | \$ 26,750.00 | 5.439 |
| February | 13 | 40,775.00 | 6.230 | 5.50 | 5.788 | 7 | 15,900.00 | 5.372 |
| March | 16 | 28,312.00 | 8. | 5.50 | 6.061 | 7 | 40,250.00 | 5.424 |
| April | 14 | 50,115.00 | 8. | 5.56 | 5.861 | 5 | 8,025.00 | 5.487 |
| May | 5 | 9,875.00 | 6.5 | 5. | 5.761 | 3 | 7,300.00 | 5.442 |
| June | 3 | 27,285.00 | 6.250 | 5.50 | 6.063 | 10 | 24,450.00 | 5.544 |
| July | 12 | 20,491.13 | 6.443 | 5.50 | 6.104 | 7 | 41,400.00 | 5.526 |
| August | 14 | 79,800.00 | 7. | 5.50 | 6.347 | 7 | 28,200.00 | 5.598 |
| September | 11 | 43,625.00 | 7.013 | 6.50 | 6.767 | 11 | 33,675.00 | 5.660 |
| October | 12 | 42,950.00 | 8. | 6.50 | 6.765 | 19 | 68,150.00 | 5.941 |
| November | 7 | 5,700.00 | 7.582 | 6.750 | 7.018 | 5 | 8,566.00 | 6.073 |
| December | 12 | 16,340.00 | 7. | 6.50 | 6.795 | 16 | 35,965.00 | 5.894 |
| | 134 | \$ 402,860.13 | Average for year | | 6.0236 | 105 | \$338,631.00 | 5.632 Average for year |
| <i>City and Town Schools--</i> | | | | | | | | |
| January | .. | | | | | 1 | \$ 10,625.00 | 6.50 |
| March | 1 | \$ 8,000.00 | 5.849 | 5.849 | 5.849 | | | |
| April | 2 | 317,500.00 | 5.815 | 5.113 | 5.151 | 1 | 2,000.00 | 5.425 |
| May | 2 | 197,000.00 | 5.826 | 5.50 | 5.614 | 2 | 190,000.00 | 4.819 |
| June | 1 | 20,000.00 | 5.875 | 5.875 | 5.875 | 2 | 31,200.00 | 5.953 |
| July | .. | | | | | 3 | 38,500.00 | 5.306 |
| August | 3 | 10,700.00 | 6. | 5.875 | 5.959 | 1 | 18,000.00 | 5.250 |
| September | 2 | 6,100.00 | 7.097 | 6.410 | 6.457 | 2 | 70,000.00 | 4.958 |
| October | 1 | 90,000.00 | 5.534 | 5.534 | 5.534 | 1 | 15,000.00 | 5.280 |
| November | .. | | | | | 1 | 5,500.00 | 5.500 |
| | 12 | \$ 649,300.00 | Average for year | | 5.402 | 14 | \$380,825.00 | 5.085 Average for year |

RECAPITULATION.

| | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| | Number sold | Amount | Number sold | Amount |
| Cities | 53 | \$2,791,528.00 | 21 | \$ 921,700.00 |
| Towns | 20 | 178,369.52 | 9 | 32,300.58 |
| Villages | 28 | 80,505.00 | 17 | 47,750.00 |
| Rural municipalities | 5 | 40,930.00 | 4 | 18,000.00 |
| Rural telephone companies | 134 | 402,860.13 | 95 | 338,631.00 |
| Union hospital districts | 3 | 95,500.00 | 1 | 15,000.00 |
| Village and rural schools | 184 | 704,610.00 | 231 | \$21,200.00 |
| City and town schools | 12 | 649,300.00 | 14 | 380,825.00 |
| | 439 | \$4,943,602.65 | 392 | \$2,575,406.58 |

Distribution of sales among various classes of purchasers:

| | 1929 | | 1928 | |
|---|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| | Number | Amount | Number | Amount |
| Saskatchewan dealers | 229 | \$1,215,218.52 | 222 | \$1,069,500.58 |
| Dealers outside Saskatchewan..... | 79 | 3,524,771.00 | 27 | 1,176,000.00 |
| Saskatchewan investors | 84 | 108,993.13 | 73 | 174,040.00 |
| Investors outside Saskatchewan.... | 6 | 25,400.00 | 5 | 10,900.00 |
| Sold direct to Saskatchewan sinking funds | 41 | 69,220.00 | 65 | 144,966.00 |
| | 439 | \$4,943,602.65 | 392 | \$2,575,406.58 |

SINKING FUNDS.

Under provisions of the city and town acts investments of monies from the sinking funds carried by cities and towns must have the approval of the Local Government Board.

In dealing with applications for its approval of such investments the Board keeps in mind:

(a) the safety of the securities invested in and the certainty that they may be readily convertible for meeting the legitimate obligations of the funds from time to time;

(b) that the funds shall obtain the highest possible interest yield which the condition of the markets at the time of investment will permit.

In 1928 sinking fund investments were made at rates slightly lower than those prevailing in the previous year. Last year, however, the rates for practically all classes of securities dealt in by sinking funds ruled higher than for some time past, and this change was reflected in the higher yields obtained by the funds as compared with the previous year.

This change is apparent in the following tables, which show:

- (a) the nature of the investments made by the various funds,
- (b) details of investments approved by the Board in respect of each fund,
- (c) comparisons of total investments and their average yields with the previous year.

Nature of securities in which sinking funds were invested, 1929.

| | 1929 | | | 1928 | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | No. of Approvals | Face value | Purchase value | No. of Approvals | Face value | Purchase value |
| Dominion of Canada bonds | 14 | \$ 160,900.00 | \$ 162,909.60 | 9 | \$ 206,500.00 | \$ 214,257.10 |
| Province of Saskatchewan bonds | 4 | 59,632.90 | 58,427.70 | 10 | 191,998.00 | 194,704.06 |
| Province of Alberta bonds | 5 | 164,500.00 | 174,373.30 | 3 | 20,000.00 | 19,858.50 |
| Province of British Columbia bonds | 3 | 102,000.00 | 111,137.50 | 12 | 101,500.00 | 104,495.50 |
| Province of Ontario bonds | 2 | 31,000.00 | 33,085.96 | 5 | 39,000.00 | 43,613.13 |
| Province of Nova Scotia bonds | | | | 1 | 21,000.00 | 21,317.10 |
| Province of New Brunswick bonds | 1 | 29,000.00 | 27,291.90 | | | |
| C.N.R. Dominion guaranteed bonds | 2 | 371,000.00 | 354,732.50 | 1 | 19,000.00 | 19,142.50 |
| Saskatchewan school district debentures | 51 | 155,496.35 | 158,344.92 | 90 | 254,550.00 | 256,495.42 |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone Co. debentures | 48 | 155,425.85 | 158,074.37 | 35 | 97,066.00 | 98,579.03 |
| Saskatchewan city debentures | 27 | 380,525.00 | 370,060.19 | 17 | 187,410.94 | 190,410.11 |
| Saskatchewan town debentures | | | | 3 | 3,985.72 | 4,123.29 |
| Saskatchewan rural municipality debentures | | | | 2 | 8,000.00 | 8,000.00 |
| Saskatchewan village debentures | 1 | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 1 | 2,000.00 | 2,048.24 |
| | 158 | \$1,610,480.10 | \$1,609,437.94 | 189 | \$1,152,010.66 | \$1,177,043.98 |

Details of investments by various sinking funds, showing face and purchase value and interest yield:

| Nature of Investments | No. of approvals | Face value | Purchase value | Interest yield % | Average interest yield 1928 |
|---|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>City of Regina—</i> | | | | | |
| C.N.R. guaranteed bonds, 4½, 1968.... | 1 | \$200,000.00 | 191,000.00 | 4.75 | |
| City of Regina debentures | 8 | 180,000.00 | 172,721.43 | 5.217 | |
| Saskatchewan school district debentures.... | 22 | 91,550.00 | 94,409.29 | 6.116 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debentures.... | 13 | 110,465.00 | 112,692.60 | 6.172 | |
| | 44 | \$582,015.00 | 570,823.32 | Average 5.50 | 4.837 |
| <i>City of Saskatoon—</i> | | | | | |
| Province of Alberta bonds | 5 | \$164,500.00 | 174,373.30 | 5.231 | |
| Province of Ontario bonds | 2 | 31,000.00 | 33,085.96 | 4.9 | |
| Province of British Columbia bonds.... | 3 | 102,000.00 | 111,137.50 | 5.152 | |
| Province of Saskatchewan bonds | 1 | 25,000.00 | 27,225.00 | 5. | |
| C.N.R. guaranteed bonds, 4½%, 1957. | 1 | 171,000.00 | 163,732.50 | 4.60 | |
| City of Saskatoon debentures | 1 | 1,025.00 | 975.39 | 5.5 | |
| | 13 | \$494,525.00 | \$510,529.65 | Average 4.976 | 4.762 |
| <i>City of Moose Jaw—</i> | | | | | |
| Dominion of Canada bonds | 10 | \$136,400.00 | \$138,037.00 | 5.197 | |
| City of Moose Jaw debentures | 14 | 150,500.00 | 149,747.85 | 5.229 | |
| | 24 | \$286,900.00 | \$287,784.85 | Average 5.213 | 4.719 |
| <i>City of Prince Albert—</i> | | | | | |
| City of Prince Albert debentures | 1 | \$ 12,000.00 | \$ 12,000.00 | 5.50 | |
| Saskatchewan school district debentures.... | 5 | 22,000.00 | 22,152.94 | 5.375 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debentures.... | 7 | 16,000.00 | 16,313.96 | 5.471 | |
| | 13 | \$ 50,000.00 | \$ 50,466.90 | Average 5.436 | 5.151 |
| <i>City of North Battleford—</i> | | | | | |
| City of Regina debentures | 2 | \$ 35,000.00 | \$ 32,627.00 | 5.05 | |
| Province of New Brunswick bonds | 1 | 29,000.00 | 27,291.90 | 5. | |
| | 3 | \$ 64,000.00 | \$ 59,918.90 | Average 5.029 | 4.42 |
| <i>City of Weyburn—</i> | | | | | |
| Dominion of Canada bonds | 3 | \$ 24,000.00 | \$ 24,367.60 | 5.152 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone Co. debentures | 1 | 5,900.00 | 6,006.96 | 5.60 | |
| City of Weyburn debentures | 1 | 2,000.00 | 1,988.52 | 5.75 | |
| | 5 | \$ 31,900.00 | \$ 32,363.08 | Average 5.272 | 5.059 |

| Nature of Investments | No. of approvals | Face value | Purchase value | Interest yield % | Average interest yield 1928 |
|---|------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Town of Melfort—</i> | | | | | |
| Saskatchewan school district debent. | 5 | \$5,212.35 | \$5,212.35 | 6.3 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debent. | 6 | 4,250.00 | 4,250.00 | 6.535 | |
| | 11 | \$9,462.35 | \$9,462.35 | Average 6.405 | 5.386 |
| <i>Town of Rosetown—</i> | | | | | |
| Saskatchewan school district debent.... | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500.00 | 6.75 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debent. | 3 | 1,235.00 | 1,235.00 | 6.635 | |
| | 4 | \$2,735.00 | \$2,735.00 | Average 6.697 | 5.420 |
| <i>Town of Biggar—</i> | | | | | |
| Saskatchewan school district debent.... | 3 | \$1,809.00 | \$1,788.34 | 6.435 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debent. | 7 | \$2,420.00 | \$2,420.00 | 6.751 | |
| | 10 | \$4,229.00 | \$4,208.34 | Average 6.617 | 5.420 |
| <i>Town of Francis—</i> | | | | | |
| Province of Saskatchewan bonds | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,049.42 | 5.15 | 5.171 |
| <i>Town of Duck Lake—</i> | | | | | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debent.. | 3 | \$1,325.00 | \$1,325.00 | 6.506 | |
| Saskatchewan village debentures | 1 | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 7. | |
| | 4 | \$2,325.00 | \$2,325.00 | Average 6.719 | 5.636 |
| <i>Town of Arcola—</i> | | | | | |
| Dominion of Canada bonds | 1 | \$ 500.00 | \$ 505.00 | 5.30 | |
| Saskatchewan Farm Loan debentures | 1 | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 4.30 | |
| | 2 | \$2,500.00 | \$2,505.00 | Average 4.662 | 4. |
| <i>Regina Public School District No. 4</i> | | | | | |
| Saskatchewan school district debent.... | 15 | \$33,425.00 | \$33,282.00 | 6.377 | |
| Saskatchewan rural telephone debent.. | 8 | 13,830.85 | 13,830.85 | 6.038 | |
| | 23 | \$47,255.85 | \$47,112.85 | Average 6.277 | 5.394 |
| <i>Saskatoon Public School District No. 13—</i> | | | | | |
| Province of Saskatchewan bonds | 1 | \$31,632.90 | \$28,153.28 | 4.82 | |

RECAPITULATION.

| Local Authority | 1929 | | | | 1928 | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| | No. of approvals | Face value | Purchase value | Average interest yield % | No. of approvals | Face value | Purchase value | Average interest yield % |
| City of Regina | 44 | \$582,015.00 | \$570,823.32 | 5.50 | 37 | \$411,548.00 | \$418,229.98 | 4.837 |
| City of Saskatoon | 13 | 494,525.00 | 510,529.65 | 4.976 | 23 | 170,510.94 | 178,266.72 | 4.762 |
| City of Moose Jaw | 24 | 286,900.00 | 287,784.85 | 5.213 | 22 | 284,500.00 | 293,121.45 | 4.719 |
| City of Prince Albert | 13 | 50,000.00 | 50,466.90 | 5.436 | 21 | 80,600.00 | 80,538.35 | 5.151 |
| City of Weyburn | 5 | 31,900.00 | 32,363.08 | 5.272 | 12 | 35,485.72 | 36,776.84 | 5.059 |
| City of North Battleford | 3 | 64,000.00 | 59,918.90 | 5.029 | 1 | 21,000.00 | 21,317.10 | 4.42 |
| *Town of Melfort | 11 | 9,462.35 | 9,462.35 | 6.405 | 8 | 16,494.00 | 16,525.00 | 5.386 |
| Town of Davidson | | | | | 5 | 4,500.00 | 4,515.80 | 5.047 |
| *Town of Rosetown | 4 | 2,735.00 | 2,735.00 | 6.697 | 2 | 2,200.00 | 2,207.00 | 5.420 |
| *Town of Biggar | 10 | 4,229.00 | 4,208.34 | 6.617 | 5 | 2,450.00 | 2,462.00 | 5.420 |
| Town of Francis | 1 | 1,000.00 | 1,049.42 | 5.15 | 1 | 4,000.00 | 4,000.00 | 5.171 |
| *Town of Duck Lake | 4 | 2,325.00 | 2,325.00 | 6.719 | 4 | 1,597.00 | 1,597.00 | 5.636 |
| Town of Indian Head | | | | | 2 | 7,500.00 | 7,590.00 | 5.489 |
| Town of Arcola | 2 | 2,500.00 | 2,505.00 | 4.662 | 1 | 1,500.00 | 1,500.00 | 4. |
| *Regina Public School District No. 4 | 23 | 47,255.85 | 47,112.85 | 6.277 | 45 | 108,175.00 | 108,396.74 | 5.394 |
| Saskatoon Public School District No. 13..... | 1 | 31,632.90 | 28,153.28 | 4.82 | | | | |
| | 158 | \$1,610,480.60 | \$1,609,437.94 | | 189 | \$1,152,010.66 | \$1,177,043.98 | |

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD

*Administered by the Local Government Board.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 373 of The City Act and 351 of The Town Act, the following local authorities were authorised to use surplus interest earnings by sinking funds for current or other expenses to the amounts set opposite each:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Feb. 19, City of Moose Jaw | \$35,000.00 |
| Mar. 14, City of Regina | 70,000.00 |
| Apr. 9, Town of Davidson | 5,000.00 |
| May 23, City of Prince Albert | 14,000.00 |
| May 30, Regina Public School District No. 4 | 5,000.00 |
| Dec. 24, City of Saskatoon | 50,000.00 |

Notwithstanding these withdrawals, substantial surpluses are retained in each fund over and above the amounts actually required to be in the fund, thus providing against possible losses or future reduction in earnings.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (SPECIAL POWERS) ACT, 1922.

All of the local authorities which have, pursuant to the provisions of The Local Government Board (Special Powers) Act, 1922, come under the direction of the Local Government Board are continuing to carry out the terms of their respective readjustment agreements satisfactorily.

During the year the Board made the following orders and recommendations in connection therewith:

January 31: Authorising the town of Canora to disburse a sum sufficient to pay all of its outstanding overdue debenture coupons, thus bringing its debenture payments up to date.

Revising and finally approving the estimates of the following local authorities and fixing their tax rates for 1929:

March 9: Town of Humboldt;
March 9: Humboldt School District No. 1529;
April 11: Town of Watrous,
April 11: Watrous School District No. 1334,
April 11: Town of Sutherland;
May 6: Town of Scott,
May 6: Scott School District No. 2255;
May 20: Town of Melville,
May 20: Melville School District No. 2187;
July 23: Town of Battleford.
July 23: Battleford School District No. 71.
July 23: St. Vital of Battleford School District No. 11.
July 27: Town of Canora,
July 27: Canora School District No. 1152;
December 31: Extending time for filing claims under the agreements made by the foregoing local authorities with their creditors.

Recommendations as listed below were made under sections 16 (1), 16 (2) and 22 of The Local Government Board (Special Powers) Act, 1922:

(a) Section 16 (1), providing for issue of tax sale titles to lands sold for arrears of taxes and purchased by the municipality without payment of school taxes:

March 26, Town of Humboldt;

(b) Section 16 (2), providing for remission of public revenue taxes in respect of lands sold for arrears of taxes by local authorities under the operation of the Act:

March 20, Town of Battleford,
 March 29, Town of Sutherland,

| | |
|--------------|---------------------|
| June 21, | Town of Sutherland, |
| July 27, | Town of Scott, |
| October 17, | Town of Sutherland, |
| December 17, | Town of Sutherland; |

- (c) Section 22, providing for issue of titles to lands sold for arrears of taxes and purchased by local authorities under the operation of the Act without payment of fees in land titles offices:

| | |
|--------------|---------------------|
| March 20, | Town of Battleford, |
| October 17, | Town of Sutherland, |
| October 28, | Town of Melville, |
| November 12, | Town of Watrous, |
| December 18, | Town of Humboldt. |

ASSESSMENT APPEALS.

Section 467 of The City Act provides that appeals from decisions of Courts of Revision shall be made to the Local Government Board.

Appeals were received in respect of four cities, which were heard on the dates set opposite each:

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| North Battleford, | April 4, |
| Regina, | April 9, |
| Weyburn, | May 21, |
| Prince Albert, | September 12. |

SALE OF SHARES ACT.

During the year 23 applications for certificates under The Sale of Shares Act were dealt with. Certificates were granted in respect of 19. One was refused, and 3 were under consideration on the 31st of December, following which date the Act was superseded by The Security Frauds Prevention Act, 1929.

The following tables show particulars of each application and the results of the Board's investigation:

Applications Disposed of:

| File No. | Name of Company | Head office | Authorised capital | Certificate granted | Certificate refused |
|----------|--|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| 9253 | Sterling Securities Corporation Ltd. | Regina | 1,000,000 | Jan. 11 | 570 @ 100—\$50 per share to holders of ord. shares—1 for ea. 4 previously held. |
| 9425 | The Empire Life Insurance Co. | Toronto | 5,000,000 | Oct. 15 | 869 @ \$135. |
| 9434 | Monarch Finance & Investments Ltd. (formerly Sterling Finance Ltd.) | Saskatoon | 50,000 | Feb. 14 | 500 @ \$105. |
| 9448 | Swift Current Rink Co. Ltd. | Swift Current .. | 25,000 | May 8 | 200 debentures @ 25. 10 yrs. 6% conditional. |
| 9457 | Briercrest Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd. | Briercrest | 12,500 | Feb. 21 | 200 cum. pref. @ 50, 1,000 com. @ \$1. |
| 9458 | Rouleau Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd. | Rouleau | 14,700 | Jan. 29 | 240 7% cum. pref. @ 50; 2,700 com. @ 1. |
| 9459 | Sceptre Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd. | Sceptre | 14,700 | Feb. 28 | 240 7% cum. pref. @ 50, 1,000 com. @ 1. |
| 9460 | Sterling Mining & Exploration Syndicate | Winnipeg .. | | | Jan. 28 |
| 9461 | City Apartments Ltd. | Regina | 100,000 | Feb. 1 | 1,000 @ 100. |
| 9464 | Investors Syndicate | Minneapolis, Minn. | 1,000,000 | Feb. 26 | 900,000 5½% cum. inst. certificates & 100,000 5% coupon certificates. |
| 9465 | The Canadian North-West Fur Farm Co. Ltd. | Regina | 40,000 | Mar. 13 | 3,000 pref. @ 10, 3,000 com. @ 1. for units of 11. |

| File No. | Name of Company | Head Office | Authorised Capital | Certificate granted | Certificate refused |
|----------|---|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| 9466 | Kewatin Apartments Ltd. | Saskatoon . | 50,000 | Apr. 15 | 500 @100. |
| 9467 | Saskatoon Apartments Ltd. | Saskatoon . | 50,000 | July 18 | 480 @ 100. |
| 9468 | The Morse Community and Memorial Hall Co. Ltd. | Morse | 20,000 | May 17 | 1,000 @ 10. |
| 9469 | The Western Savings & Loan Association | Winnipeg . | | Dec. 2 | 250,000 6% 1st mtge. sav- ings inst. certificates @ par. |
| 9471 | LaFleche Milling Ltd. | LaFleche .. | 60,000 | June 7 | 5,000 @ 10. |
| 9472 | Asquith District Memorial Hall Co. Ltd. | Asquith | 5,000 | Aug. 5 | 500 @ 10. |
| 9473 | Hardware Supply Co. Ltd. | Moose Jaw. | 150,000 | July 11 | 230 pref. @ 100. 230 com. @ 1. |
| 9475 | Nelson, Reid and Haagenon Ltd. | Kyle | 50,000 | Nov. 2 | 400 cum. pref. @ 50. 600 ord. @ 50. |
| 9477 | The Moose Jaw Electric Railway Co. | Moose Jaw. | | Dec. 13 | \$75,000 6% 1st mtge. debentures. |

The following certificates granted were not taken out:

9457 Briercrest Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd.

9459 Sceptre Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd.

The following applications received in 1929 were not disposed of at the end of the year:

| File No. | Name of Company | Head office | Authorised capital | Certificate granted | Certificate refused |
|----------|---|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 9463 | Securities Holding Corporation Ltd. ... | Toronto ... | | | |
| 9470 | Big Beaver Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd. | Big Beaver ... | 14,700 | | |
| 9474 | The Souris Valley Fur Co. Ltd. | Estevan | 50,000 | | |

The following certificates previously issued were revoked:

| File No. | Name of company | Date of revocation | Why revoked |
|----------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 9380 | Regina Hat Manufacturing Co. Ltd. | Sept. 10 | Failure to file annual statement. |
| 9406 | Eatonia Silver Fox Co. Ltd. | Mar. 7 | Failure to file annual statement. |

Following is a list of 78 companies holding the Board's certificate at December 31, 1929:

| File No. | Name of company | Head office | Authorised capital |
|----------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 9113 | International Loan Co. Ltd. | Winnipeg | \$20,000,000 |
| 9115 | The Agricultural Insurance Co. Ltd. | Regina | 500,000 |
| 9189 | United Grain Growers Ltd. | Winnipeg | 5,000,000 |
| 9212 | Northern Saskatchewan Co-operative Stock Yards, Ltd. | Prince Albert | 100,000 |
| 9216 | Regina Agricultural & Industrial Exhibition Association, Ltd. | Regina | |
| 9219 | Yorkton Curling & Skating Rink | Yorkton | 20,000 |
| 9221 | Regina Silver Black Fox Co. Ltd. | Regina | 200,000 |
| 9242 | Pelly Electric Light & Power Co. Ltd. | Pelly | 15,000 |
| 8244 | Scottish Provincial Investment Co. Ltd. | Regina | 100,000 |
| 9253 | Sterling Securities Corporation Ltd. | Regina | 1,000,000 |
| 9265 | W. E. Mason Discount Co. Ltd. | Regina | 100,000 |
| 9312 | The Cameron Securities Ltd. | Saskatoon | 50,000 |
| 9318 | Western Homes Ltd. | Winnipeg | 5,000,000 |
| 9321 | P. Burns & Co. Ltd. | Calgary | 10,000,000 |
| 9330 | Rosthern Creamery & Produce Ltd. | Rosthern | 25,000 |
| 9334 | Belgo Canadian Paper Co. | Montreal | |
| 9336 | Scandinavian Silver Fox Co. Ltd. | Prince Albert | 35,000 |
| 9340 | Guardian Investment Co. Ltd. | Regina | 20,000 |
| 8342 | Moose Jaw Co-operative Society Ltd. | Moose Jaw | 40,000 |
| 9347 | Big Lump Coal Co. Ltd. | Estevan | 50,000 |
| 9349 | Sunrise Milling Co. Ltd. | Biggar | 25,000 |
| 9351 | Citizens Rink Co. Ltd. | Swift Current | 20,000 |
| 9355 | Kelliher Silver Black Fox Co. Ltd. | Kelliher | 25,000 |
| 9360 | International Clay Products Ltd. | Estevan | 150,000 |
| 9364 | Retailers Trust Co. Ltd. | Saskatoon | 50,000 |
| 9366 | St. Maurice Valley Corporation | Shawinigan Falls, Quebec | 11,800,000 |
| 9372 | Kyle Hall Co. Ltd. | Kyle | 10,000 |
| 9374 | The Outlook Silver Fox Co. Ltd. | Outlook | 40,000 |
| 9375 | Riley & Hooker Ltd. | Regina | 100,000 |
| 9378 | Queen City Oil Co. Ltd. | Kevin, Montana ... | 500,000 |
| 9382 | Orpheum Theatre Co. Ltd. | Prince Albert | 75,000 |
| 9387 | Swift Current Oils & Gas Co. Ltd. | Swift Current | 20,000 |
| 9389 | The Standard General Investments Ltd. | Meyronne | 100,000 |
| 9396 | W. W. Cooper Co. Ltd. | Swift Current | 250,000 |
| 9400 | Neal Bros. Ltd. | Winnipeg | 40,000 |
| 9401 | Renards Argentes de Gravelbourg Ltd | Gravelbourg | 50,000 |
| 9402 | Canadian Fur Pool Ltd. | Regina | 50,000 |
| 9403 | Estevan Rinks Ltd. | Estevan | 20,000 |
| 9404 | Central Canadian Insurance Co. | Winnipeg | 500,000 |
| 9405 | The Maxim Valley Oil Co. Ltd. | Weyburn | 100,000 |
| 9407 | Engineers Oil & Gas Co. Ltd. | Biggar | 500,000 |
| 9411 | Davis Dairy Co. Ltd. | Saskatoon | 30,000 |
| 9414 | Lake St. John Power & Paper Co. | Toronto | 24,500,000 |
| 9415 | New Regina Trading Co. Ltd. | Regina | 500,000 |
| 9417 | Moose Jaw Community Hotel Co. Ltd. | Moose Jaw | 393,750 |

| File No. | Name of company | Head office | Authorised capital |
|----------|---|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 9418 | The United Merchants Ltd. | Saskatoon | 250,000 |
| 9419 | Canadian Western Natural Gas, Light, Heat & Power Co. Ltd. | Calgary | 8,000,000 |
| 9420 | Sterling Silver Black Fox Co. Ltd. | Regina | 50,000 |
| 9425 | The Empire Life Insurance Co. | Toronto | 5,000,000 |
| 9426 | Forward Land & Development Co. Ltd. | Swift Current | 75,000 |
| 9434 | Monarch Finance & Investments Ltd. (formerly Sterling Finance Ltd.) | Saskatoon | 50,000 |
| 9437 | Commercial Airways Ltd. | Regina | 20,000 |
| 9438 | Sovereign Theatre Co. Ltd. | Sovereign | 6,000 |
| 9439 | Diversified Standard Securities Ltd. | Montreal | 1,000,000 |
| 9440 | The White Bear Silver Black Fox Co. Ltd. | White Bear | 20,000 |
| 9442 | Western Hemp Products Ltd. | Rhein | 25,000 |
| 9443 | General Bond & Investment Co. Ltd. | Regina | 503,000 |
| 9445 | Consumer's Oil Co. Ltd. | Moose Jaw | 60,000 |
| 9447 | Regina City Homes Ltd. | Regina | 220,000 |
| 9448 | Swift Current Rink Co. Ltd. | Swift Current | 25,000 |
| 9449 | United Stockmen Ltd. | Winnipeg | 10,000 |
| 9450 | Manitou Lake Sanitarium & Mineral Products Manufacturing Co. Ltd. | Watrous | 510,000 |
| 9452 | The Battleford Skating Rink Co. Ltd. | Battleford | 5,000 |
| 9454 | The People's Investment Co. Ltd. | Saskatoon | 170,000 |
| 9455 | Leader Curling Club Ltd. | Leader | 2,500 |
| 9458 | Rouleau Consumers' Oil Co. Ltd. | Rouleau | 14,700 |
| 9461 | City Apartments Limited | Regina | 100,000 |
| 9464 | Investors Syndicate | Minneapolis, Minn. | 1,000,000 |
| 9465 | The Canadian North-West Fur Farm Co. Ltd. | Regina | 40,000 |
| 9466 | Kewatin Apartments Limited | Saskatoon | 50,000 |
| 9467 | Saskatoon Apartments Limited | Saskatoon | 50,000 |
| 9468 | The Morse Community & Memorial Hall Co. Ltd. | Morse | 20,000 |
| 9469 | Western Savings & Loan Association | Winnipeg | |
| 9471 | LaFleche Milling Ltd. | LaFleche | 60,000 |
| 9472 | Asquith District Memorial Hall Co. Ltd. | Asquith | 5,000 |
| 9473 | Hardware Supply Co. Ltd. | Moose Jaw | 150,000 |
| 9475 | Nelson, Reid & Haagenon Ltd. | Kyle | 50,000 |
| 9477 | The Moose Jaw Electric Railway Co. | Moose Jaw | |

THE UNION HOSPITAL ACT.

The following applications under section 6 of The Union Hospital Act were dealt with:

Eatonia Union Hospital: Extension to present hospital, \$12,000.00:

May 28—Order made fixing division of cost among various units, as follows:

| | |
|---|----------|
| Village of Eatonia | 2.669 % |
| Village of Mantario | .765 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Newcombe No. 260.... | 23.513 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Royal Canadian No. 261 | 52.537 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Mantario No. 262..... | 20,526 % |

Awaiting vote of ratepayers.

Davidson Union Hospital: Extension to present hospital, \$3,200.00:

May 28—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|---|------|
| Town of Davidson | 25 % |
| Rural Municipality of Arm River No. 252 | 25 % |
| Rural Municipality of Willner No. 253 | 25 % |
| Rural Municipality of McCraney No. 282 | 25 % |

Rejected by ratepayers.

Wadena Union Hospital: Building and equipping of nurses' home, \$9,000.00:

May 13—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|--|------|
| Town of Wadena | 4 % |
| Rural Municipality of Sasman No. 336 | 50 % |
| Rural Municipality of Lakeview No. 337 | 46 % |

Ratified by ratepayers.

Gull Lake Union Hospital: Acquiring a site, building and equipping a hospital and nurses' home, \$31,700.00:

July 12—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Town of Gull Lake | 11.6 % |
| Rural Municipality of Gull Lake No. 139 | 37.9 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Webb No. 138 | 29.6 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Carmichael No. 109 | 20.9 % |

Ratified by ratepayers.

Cabri Union Hospital: Purchasing a site, erecting and equipping a hospital, isolation hospital and nurses' home, \$28,000.00:

September 17—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Town of Cabri | 10.6 % |
| Village of Shackleton | 1.7 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Riverside No. 168 | 45.9 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Pittville No. 169 | 22.7 % |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Miry Creek No. 229 | 19.1 % |

Ratified by ratepayers.

Wynyard Union Hospital: Purchasing site, erecting and equipping hospital, nurses' home and isolation hospital. \$43,000.00:

September 30—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Town of Wynyard | 11.991% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Elfros No. 307 | 30.696% |
| Rural Municipality of Big Quill No. 308 | 52.751% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Emerald No. 277 | 4.562% |

Rejected by ratepayers.

Milden Union Hospital: Acquiring existing hospital:

October 7—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|--|--------|
| Village of Milden | 3.81% |
| Village of Bounty | 2.17% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Milden No. 286 | 63.58% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Fertile Valley No. 285 | 30.44% |

Rejected by ratepayers.

Maryfield Union Hospital: Acquiring a site, building and equipping a hospital, \$28,000.00:

October 21—Order made fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|--|-------|
| Village of Maryfield | 4.2% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Maryfield No. 91 | 40.5% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Walpole No. 92 | 55.3% |

Awaiting vote of ratepayers.

Abbey Union Hospital: Acquiring a site, building and equipping a hospital, \$28,000.00:

November 13—Board made an order fixing division of cost, as follows:

| | |
|--|-------|
| Village of Abbey | 3.1% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Pittville No. 169..... | 16.8% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Miry Creek No. 229.... | 60.5% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Clinworth No. 230 | 19.6% |

Rejected by ratepayers.

Oxbow Union Hospital: Acquiring an existing hospital:

November 15—Board made an order apportioning the cost, as follows:

| | |
|--|-------|
| Town of Oxbow | 7.7% |
| Rural Municipality of Enniskillen No. 3 | 60.5% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Moose Creek No. 33.... | 31.8% |

Rejected by ratepayers.

Wilkie Union Hospital: Adding additional territory:

October 31—Board made an order reapportioning cost, as follows:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Town of Wilkie | 11.344% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Reford No. 379 | 24.124% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Prairie No. 408 | 17.233% |
| Part of Rural Municipality of Buffalo No. 409 | 47.299% |

Rejected by ratepayers.

THE SUBDIVISIONS ACT.

Only one application for permission to enter upon and cultivate portions of subdivided areas was dealt with:

Arthur L. Davies, Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan.

Portion of north-east quarter of section 3, township 17, range 26, west of the second meridian, known as Silver Heights Subdivision, registered in the land titles office for Moose Jaw land registration district as Plan No. I.5045.

This application was filed on October 16, 1928. Hearing was fixed for January 11, 1929, and on that date an order was made granting permission in terms of the application.

APPROVAL OF SCHOOL SITES.

Regina Public School District No. 4.

February 18—Block 10, Highland Park, Plan G.2311, Regina.

May 16.—Block 104, Plan AB.4989, Regina.

North Battleford School District No. 1438.

September 12—Lots 5 to 16, Block 28, Plan C.4240, North Battleford.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- February 22: Fixing proportions of cost of equipping and maintaining Full Time Health District No. 1 to be borne by the several municipalities co-operating therein.
- March 1: Order was made approving of use by the city of Prince Albert of the sum of \$6,293.37, being unexpended balance of debentures issued under bylaw No. 35 of 1924, for paying a part of the cost of installing new power house machinery.
- March 7: Approving a bylaw of the town of Gravelbourg to fix rates to be charged by way of rental or service charge for use of the town sewers against persons owning or occupying premises drained or which are required to be drained into such sewers.
- March 18: Approving change of interest rate on debentures issued under bylaw No. 10, 1929, of town of Delisle from 6½ to 6%.
- April 9: Order approving change of interest rate on debentures issued under bylaws Nos. 1914 to 1922 of the city of Saskatoon from 4½% to 5%.
- April 24: Order approving change of interest rate on debentures issued under bylaws Nos. 1873 and 1874 of the city of Saskatoon from 4½% to 5%.
- May 14: Order permitting the town of Indian Head to use the sum of \$10,000.00 from its depreciation fund for paying a portion of the cost of replacing wooden water mains; this order being conditional upon the depositing in the fund annually of the sum of \$1,500.00.
- August 19: Order approving of change of interest rate on debentures issued under bylaw No. 1474 of the city of Regina from 4½% to 5%.
- September 30: Order approving of use by the city of Regina of the sum of \$17,809.72, being the aggregate unexpended balance of debentures issued under bylaws Nos. 1335 to 1339, 1401 to 1404 and 1414, for the following purposes:
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Bylaw No. 1487, Boulevards | \$ 1,134.63 |
| Bylaw No. 1489, Domestic sewers | 1,933.89 |
| Bylaw No. 1490, Concrete walks | 2,106.83 |
| Bylaw No. 1491, Pavements | 10,349.12 |
| Bylaw No. 1497, Watermains | 1,785.25 |

- October 26: Order approving of the expenditure by the city of Regina from its property sales account of the sum of \$24,000.00 to assist in establishing an air harbour and landing grounds, as provided for by section 254 of The City Act.
- December 3: Extending time for giving the third reading to bylaw No. 10, 1929, of the town of Delisle to December 31, 1929.

Respectfully submitted,

C. O. DAVIDSON,
Secretary.

SCHEDULE "A"

APPLICATIONS TO BORROW BY WAY OF DEBENTURE

from

JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1929.

Cities

REGINA.

| Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Net amount of authorisation |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| \$ 3,671.75 | Plank walks | \$ | \$ | \$ 3,671.75 |
| 8,110.00 | Water mains | | | 8,110.00 |
| 6,973.20 | Domestic sewers | | | 6,973.20 |
| 6,376.50 | Storm sewers | | | 6,376.50 |
| 125.00 | Water mains | | | 125.00 |
| 100,000.00 | Air harbour | | | 100,000.00 |
| 57,000.00 | Waterworks extensions | | | 57,000.00 |
| 150,000.00 | Waterworks extensions | | | 150,000.00 |
| 33,000.00 | Sewer mains | | | 33,000.00 |
| 60,000.00 | Sewage disposal plant extensions..... | | | 60,000.00 |
| 15,200.00 | Watermains | | | 15,200.00 |
| 21,920.00 | Pavements | | | 21,920.00 |
| 927.10 | Concrete walks | | | 927.10 |
| 6,665.98 | Domestic sewers | | | 6,665.98 |
| 8,710.00 | Watermains | | | 8,710.00 |
| 15,420.25 | Plank walks | | | 15,420.25 |
| 80,000.00 | Storm sewers | | | 80,000.00 |
| 20,300.00 | Street railway extensions | | | 20,300.00 |
| 34,600.00 | Water house connections | | | 34,600.00 |
| 212,500.00 | Technical school | | | 212,500.00 |
| 350,000.00 | General hospital extension | | | 350,000.00 |
| 1,800.00 | Opening lanes | | | 1,800.00 |
| 1,831.50 | Opening lanes | | | 1,831.50 |
| 88,085.00 | Watermains | 11,585.00 | | 76,500.00 |
| 44,069.18 | Domestic sewers | 10,069.18 | | 34,000.00 |
| 47,794.64 | Concrete walks | 6,794.64 | | 41,000.00 |
| 267,578.68 | Paving | 81,578.68 | | 186,000.00 |
| 24,115.25 | Boulevards | 4,115.25 | | 20,000.00 |
| 21,023.94 | Plank walks | 2,458.25 | | 18,565.69 |
| \$1,687,787.97 | | \$116,601.00 | | \$1,571,186.97 |

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD

MOOSE JAW.

| Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Net amount of authorisation |
|---------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|
| \$ 38,530.35 | Concrete walks | \$ | \$ | \$ 38,530.35 |
| 2,319.90 | Sewer house connections | | | 2,319.90 |
| 3,630.61 | Water house connections | | | 3,630.61 |
| 175,000.00 | Concrete bridge | | | 175,000.00 |
| 2,986.73 | Concrete walks | | | 2,986.73 |
| 10,935.62 | Waterworks extensions | | | 10,935.62 |
| 11,291.25 | Sewer extensions | | | 11,291.25 |
| 22,000.00 | Hospital extension | | | 22,000.00 |
| \$ 266,694.46 | | | | \$ 266,694.46 |

PRINCE ALBERT.

| Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Net amount of authorisation |
|--------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|
| \$ 12,000.00 | Water mains, | \$ | \$ | \$ 12,000.00 |
| 48,000.00 | Electric light extensions | | | 48,000.00 |
| \$ 60,000.00 | | | | \$ 60,000.00 |

WEYBURN.

| Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Net amount of authorisation |
|--------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|
| \$ 65,000.00 | Electric light extensions | \$ | \$ | \$ 65,000.00 |

YORKTON.

| Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Net amount of authorisation |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|
| \$ 6,744.00 | Water mains | \$ | \$ | \$ 6,744.00 |
| 5,756.00 | Sewer mains | | | 5,756.00 |
| \$ 12,500.00 | | | | \$ 12,500.00 |

SASKATOON.

| Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Net amount of authorisation |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| \$ 33,500.00 | Exhibition ground | | \$ | \$ 33,500.00 |
| 73,650.00 | Street railway | | | 73,650.00 |
| 9,566.60 | Sewers | | | 9,566.60 |
| 20,000.00 | Sewer house connections | | | 20,000.00 |
| 30,000.00 | Water house connections | | | 30,000.00 |
| 20,069.50 | Drainage | | | 20,069.50 |
| 12,000.00 | Water meters | | | 12,000.00 |
| 62,312.50 | Water extensions | | | 62,312.50 |
| 32,000.00 | Garbage disposal plant | | 32,000.00 | |
| 85,000.00 | Electric power distribution | | | 85,000.00 |
| 184,852.35 | Street railway | | | 184,952.35 |
| 35,000.00 | Winter fair building | | | 35,000.00 |
| 17,500.00 | Street railway | | | 17,500.00 |
| 38,000.00 | Hospital extension | | | 38,000.00 |
| 130,000.00 | Police station | | | 130,000.00 |
| 25,000.00 | Technical school | | 25,000.00 | |
| 6,114.91 | Water extensions | | | 6,114.91 |
| 5,621.32 | Sewer extensions | | | 5,621.32 |
| 76,430.00 | Storm sewers | | | 76,430.00 |
| 250,000.00 | Technical school | | | 250,000.00 |
| 5,404.98 | Sewer mains | | | 5,404.98 |
| 2,680.57 | Water mains | | | 2,680.57 |
| 169,521.45 | Street paving | 21,521.45 | | 148,000.00 |
| 362,829.50 | Semi-macadam roads | 105,829.50 | | 257,000.00 |
| 76,345.56 | Sidewalks, curbs and boulevards | 20,995.56 | | 55,350.00 |
| 91,911.32 | Watermains | 22,911.32 | | 69,000.00 |
| 94,909.02 | Sewer mains | 25,909.02 | | 69,000.00 |
| \$1,950,219.58 | | \$197,166.85 | \$ 57,000.00 | \$1,696,052.73 |

SUMMARY.

| City | Applications | | Reduced | | Refused | | Authorisations | |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------|----------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | No. | Amount | No. | Amount | No. | Amount | No. | Amount |
| Regina | 29 | \$1,687,787.97 | 6 | \$ 116,601.00 | | | 29 | \$1,571,186.97 |
| Moose Jaw .. | 8 | 266,694.48 | | | | | 8 | 266,694.46 |
| Saskatoon | 27 | 1,950,219.58 | 5 | 197,166.85 | 2 | \$ 57,000.00 | 2 | 1,696,052.73 |
| Prince Albert | 2 | 60,000.00 | | | | | 25 | 60,000.00 |
| Weyburn | 1 | 65,000.00 | | | | | 1 | 65,000.00 |
| Yorkton | 2 | 12,500.00 | | | | | 2 | 12,500.00 |
| | 69 | \$4,042,202.01 | 11 | \$313,767.85 | 2 | \$ 57,000.00 | 67 | \$3,671,434.16 |

SCHEDULE "B"

APPLICATIONS TO BORROW BY WAY OF DEBENTURE

from

JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1929.

Towns.

| Name | Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Authorised |
|------------------|--------------|---|------------|------------|--------------|
| Alsask | \$ 1,500.00 | Water supply | \$ | \$ | \$ 1,500.00 |
| Cabri | 3,500.00 | Fire equipment | | | 3,500.00 |
| Delisle | 1,000.00 | Concrete walks | | | 1,000.00 |
| Estevan | 28,000.00 | Sewage disposal plant | | | 28,000.00 |
| Estevan | 11,500.00 | Fire equipment | | | 11,500.00 |
| Estevan | 3,727.35 | Sewer mains | | | 3,727.35 |
| Estevan | 3,929.38 | Waterworks extension | | | 3,929.38 |
| Estevan | 2,698.90 | Sewer & water connections | | | 2,698.90 |
| Foam Lake ... | 4,000.00 | Fire hall addition | | 4,000.00 | |
| Grenfell | 4,864.33 | Concrete walks | | | 4,864.33 |
| Herbert | 5,000.00 | Concrete walks | | | 5,000.00 |
| Indian Head .. | 2,200.00 | Fire equipment | | | 2,200.00 |
| Indian Head .. | 11,000.00 | Water extensions | | | 11,000.00 |
| Lumsden | 4,000.00 | Drainage | | | 4,000.00 |
| Melville | 6,600.00 | Sewer extension | | | 6,600.00 |
| Melville | 63,500.00 | Sewage disposal works & water extensions | | | 63,500.00 |
| Melville | 80,530.00 | Concrete walks | | | 80,530.00 |
| Melfort | 6,500.00 | Waterworks extensions | | | 6,500.00 |
| Qu'Appelle | 4,618.16 | Concrete walks | | | 4,618.16 |
| Radville | 10,200.00 | Concrete walks | | | 10,200.00 |
| Radville | 7,500.00 | Municipal building | | | 7,500.00 |
| Rosthern | 2,000.00 | Fire equipment | | | 2,000.00 |
| Shaunavon | 9,338.36 | Sewer extensions | 2,600.84 | | 6,737.52 |
| Unity | 25,000.00 | Electric light extensions... | | | 25,000.00 |
| Unity | 2,500.00 | Fire equipment | | | 2,500.00 |
| Wilkie | 2,500.00 | Waterworks extensions | | | 2,500.00 |
| | \$307,706.48 | | \$2,600.84 | \$4,000.00 | \$301,105.64 |

SUMMARY.

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| 26 Applications | \$307,706.48 |
| 1 Reduced | 2,600.84 |
| 1 Refused | 4,000.00 |
| 25 Authorisations | 301,105.64 |

SCHEDULE "C"

APPLICATIONS TO BORROW BY WAY OF DEBENTURE

from

JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1929.

Villages.

| Name | Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Authorised |
|------------------|-------------|--|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Abbey | \$ 3,000.00 | Water supply | \$ | \$ | \$3,000.00 |
| Amulet | 2,000.00 | Concrete walks & water supply | | | 2,000.00 |
| Bounty | 1,000.00 | Concrete walks | | | 1,000.00 |
| Bengough | 5,000.00 | Concrete walks | | | 5,000.00 |
| Beechy | 3,000.00 | Water supply & fire equipment | | | 3,000.00 |
| Colonsay | 1,350.00 | Cement walks | | | 1,350.00 |
| Conquest | 3,000.00 | Skating rink | | | 3,000.00 |
| Cut Knife | 3,200.00 | Concrete walks | | | 3,200.00 |
| Cut Knife | 1,800.00 | Plank walks | | | 1,800.00 |
| Dysart | 2,500.00 | Municipal building | 75.00 | | 2,500.00 |
| Denholm | 2,000.00 | Cement walks | | | 1,925.00 |
| Dinsmore | 6,750.00 | Cement walks | | | 6,750.00 |
| Edenwold | 2,500.00 | Water supply & fire equipment | | | 2,500.00 |
| Eyebrow | 600.00 | Fire equipment | | | 600.00 |
| Harris | 7,000.00 | Skating rink | | 7,000.00 | |
| Hague | 2,500.00 | Cement walks | | | 2,500.00 |
| Kelvington | 8,000.00 | Skating & curling rink | | 8,000.00 | |
| Kelvington | 1,000.00 | Gravel walks | | | 1,000.00 |
| Lintlaw | 1,000.00 | Road equipment | | | 1,000.00 |
| Lucky Lake | 4,700.00 | Cement walks & water supply | | | 4,700.00 |
| Lashburn | 1,500.00 | Cement walks | | | 1,500.00 |
| Meota | 6,000.00 | Municipal hall | | | 6,000.00 |
| Meyronne | 3,500.00 | Skating rink | | | 3,500.00 |
| Macoun | 4,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 4,000.00 |
| Maidstone | 2,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 2,000.00 |
| Nipawin | 8,500.00 | Fire hall | | | 8,500.00 |
| Neville | 2,830.00 | Fire equipment | | | 2,830.00 |
| Neudorf | 5,000.00 | Concrete walks | | | 5,000.00 |
| Piapot | 3,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 3,000.00 |
| Perdue | 3,000.00 | Skating & curling rink | | | 3,000.00 |
| Perdue | 1,500.00 | Cement walks | | | 1,500.00 |
| Pelly | 3,000.00 | Cement walks | 500.00 | | 2,500.00 |
| Ponteix | 8,000.00 | Cement walks | 1,000.00 | | 7,000.00 |
| Quill Lake | 3,500.00 | Cement walks | | | 3,500.00 |
| Springside | 1,500.00 | Cement walks | | | 1,500.00 |
| Springside | 1,000.00 | Skating rink | | | 1,000.00 |
| Stranraer | 1,550.00 | Cement walks | 250.00 | | 1,300.00 |
| Success | 1,000.00 | Cement walks | | | 1,000.00 |
| Sturgis | 4,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 4,000.00 |
| Tompkins | 3,500.00 | Skating & curling rink | | | 3,500.00 |
| Tugaske | 2,500.00 | Cement walks | | | 2,500.00 |
| Wakaw | 1,800.00 | Water supply | | | 1,800.00 |
| | 134,080.00 | | \$1,825.00 | \$15,000.00 | \$117,255.00 |

SUMMARY.

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| 42 Applications | \$134,080.00 |
| 4 Reduced | 1,825.00 |
| 2 Refused | 15,000.00 |
| 40 Authorisations | 117,255.00 |

SCHEDULE "D"

APPLICATIONS TO BORROW BY WAY OF DEBENTURE

from

JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1929.

Rural Municipalities.

| Name | Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Authorised |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Auvergne No. 344 | \$ 10,000.00 | Municipal building | \$..... | \$..... | \$ 10,000.00 |
| Aberdeen No. 373 | 10,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 10,000.00 |
| Cory No. 76 ... | 8,430.00 | Road machinery | | | 8,430.00 |
| Elma No. 291.. | 7,000.00 | Road machinery | | | 7,000.00 |
| Eagle Creek No. 376 | 5,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 5,000.00 |
| Elfros No. 307. | 10,000.00 | Road machinery | 1,000.00 | | 9,000.00 |
| Hazeldell No. 338 | 10,000.00 | Road machinery | | | 10,000.00 |
| Meeting Lake No. 466 | 10,000.00 | Road construction | 4,000.00 | | 6,000.00 |
| Piapot No. 110. | 3,000.00 | Municipal building | | | 3,000.00 |
| Preeceville No. 334 | 6,500.00 | Road machinery | | | 6,500.00 |
| Tecumseh No. 65 | 3,500.00 | Purchasing land for highway | | | 3,500.00 |
| The Gap No. 39 | 25,000.00 | Road construction | 15,000.00 | | 10,000.00 |
| Surprise No. 9. | 6,000.00 | Road construction | | | 6,000.00 |
| Wolseley No. 153 | 9,500.00 | Road machinery | | | 9,500.00 |
| | \$123,930.00 | | \$20,000.00 | | \$103,930.00 |

SUMMARY.

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| 14 Applications | \$123,930.00 |
| 3 Reduced | 20,000.00 |
| 14 Authorisations | 103,930.00 |

SCHEDULE "E"

APPLICATIONS TO BORROW BY WAY OF DEBENTURE

from

JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1929.

Union Hospital Districts.

| Name | Amount | Purpose | Reduced | Refused | Authorised |
|--------------|--------------|----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|
| Wilkie | \$ 27,000.00 | Union hospital | \$..... | \$..... | \$27,000.00 |
| Wadena | 8,500.00 | Nurses' home | | | 8,500.00 |
| | \$ 35,500.00 | | | | \$35,500.00 |

Recapitulation of Schedules A, B, C, D, E, F and G to report of the Local Government Board for the year ending December 31, 1929.

| | Total number of applica- tions | Amount | Reduced | | Refused | | Authorised | |
|--|--|----------------|---------|---------------|---------|--------------|------------|----------------|
| | | | No. | Amount | No. | Amount | No. | Amount |
| Cities (Schedule A) | 69 | \$4,042,202.01 | 11 | \$ 313,767.85 | 2 | \$ 57,000.00 | 67 | \$3,671,434.16 |
| Towns (Schedule B) | 26 | 307,706.48 | 1 | 2,600.84 | 1 | 4,000.00 | 25 | 301,105.64 |
| Villages (Schedule C)..... | 42 | 134,080.00 | 4 | 1,825.00 | 2 | 15,000.00 | 40 | 117,255.00 |
| Rural Municipalities (Schedule D) | 14 | 123,930.00 | 2 | 20,000.00 | .. | | 14 | 103,930.00 |
| Union Hospitals (Schedule E) | 2 | 35,500.00 | | | .. | | 2 | 35,500.00 |
| Schools (Schedule F)..... | 251 | 1,713,160.00 | 8 | 6,500.00 | .. | | 251 | 1,706,660.00 |
| Rural Telephones (Schedule G) | 120 | 404,609.00 | 1 | 790.00 | 1 | 2,100.00 | 119 | 401,719.00 |
| | 524 | \$6,761,187.49 | 27 | \$ 345,483.69 | 6 | \$ 78,100.00 | 518 | \$6,337,603.80 |

NOTE: Schedules F and G not printed.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 26

(In Part)

ANNUAL REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE SASKATCHEWAN FARM LOAN BOARD
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1928.

REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, *February 28, 1928.*

TO THE HONOURABLE W. J. PATTERSON,
Provincial Treasurer.

Sir,—We have the honour of transmitting herewith our Report concerning the work of the Board for the year ended December 31, 1928, as provided by section 28 of The Saskatchewan Farm Loans Act, being chapter 25 of the Statutes of 1917.

Applications for loans were received during the year to the number of 1,174 for an aggregate amount of \$3,591,575.00, making a total number of 14,916 applications received for a total amount of \$38,858,237.00 since the Board began business in 1917.

The collections for the year exceeded one million one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars and the Board paid the Treasury Department all interest due and accrued to December 31, 1928, and in addition paid \$107,121.56 on account of the money advanced to the Board for expenses of administration. Of the aggregate sum of \$525,666.64 advanced to the Board for administration expenses from the beginning on May 1, 1917, to December 31, 1928, the Board has paid back \$422,330.37, leaving a balance still owing the Treasury Department of \$103,286.27.

The Revenue for the year covered all operating expenses and depreciation and left a surplus of \$43,225.80. Of this sum \$15,000 was transferred to Real Estate Reserve. The Real Estate Reserve now stands at \$173,698.02 and the net surplus carried forward to 1929 stands at \$326,784.85. The two accounts, Real Estate Reserve and the Surplus, together aggregate \$500,482.87.

Prior to 1928 the Board had acquired title to 336 farms almost entirely by transfer or foreclosure following abandonment. During 1928, 31 additional farms came on the Board's hands, making a total of 367 since the beginning and 45 farms were sold during the year, leaving 177 farms still on hand, quite a number of which are rented for 1929 for a share of the crop.

Many of the sales made by the Board during the last seven years have been made on the crop payment plan, with only a nominal cash payment, and most of these sales have proven highly satisfactory to the Board.

The demand for farm lands is not abating and the Board looks to the future with confidence and hopes to lessen its farm holdings yearly hereafter and the Board is satisfied that the Reserves are ample to cover any losses on the sale of lands on hand. The Board has every confidence in the stability and the permanency of the farming industry in Saskatchewan.

During the year 321 new loans were made. Old loans to the number of 86 were paid off, making a total of 368 loans paid off altogether from the beginning and in no case was any notice or bonus required by the Board although some of the loans ran for less than a year.

Since its inception the Board has paid out on behalf of its borrowers the sum of:

| | |
|------------|--|
| | \$774,287.29 for Taxes, |
| | 259,832.67 for Seed Grain, |
| | 262,541.56 for Hail Insurance Premiums |
| Total..... | \$1,269,661.52 |

Of this large sum there remains uncollected:

| | |
|------------|---|
| | \$53,130.35 for Taxes, |
| | 8,893.43 for Seed Grain Advances, |
| | 3,690.70 for Hail Insurance Premiums |
| Total..... | \$65,614.48 (Rather more than five per cent.) |

Many of our borrowers have dealt fairly with the Board from the beginning and the Board wishes to express its appreciation of this co-operation.

Respectfully submitted,

| | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|
| (Signed) | COLIN FRASER, <i>Commissioner.</i> |
| (Signed) | J. H. GRAYSON, <i>Member.</i> |
| (Signed) | J. O. HETTLE, <i>Member.</i> |

SASKATCHEWAN FARM LOAN BOARD

BALANCE SHEET AS AT DECEMBER 31, 1928.

| LIABILITIES | | ASSETS | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|
| To ROYAL BANK—Overdraft..... | \$ 55,584.42 | By CASH | \$ 83,057.48 |
| To PROVINCIAL TREASURER | | By INVESTMENTS AND ACCRUALS— | |
| For <i>Working Capital</i> | \$11,157,096.01 | <i>First Mortgages on Lands</i> | \$11,145,399.90 |
| Less Repayments | 3,156,366.91 | Less Payments | 3,156,366.91 |
| | 8,000,729.10 | | \$7,989,032.99 |
| For <i>Hail Insurance Advances</i> | 262,541.56 | <i>Hail Insurance Advances</i> | 262,541.56 |
| Less Payments | 258,950.86 | Less Payments | 258,850.86 |
| | 3,690.70 | | 3,690.70 |
| For <i>Seed Grain Advances</i> | 259,832.67 | <i>Seed Grain Advances</i> | 259,832.67 |
| Less Repayments | 251,039.24 | Less Payments | 251,039.24 |
| | 8,793.43 | | 8,793.43 |
| For <i>Taxes Advances</i> | 774,287.29 | <i>Taxes Advances</i> | 774,287.29 |
| Less Repayments | 721,156.94 | Less Payments | 721,156.94 |
| | 53,130.35 | | 53,130.35 |
| For <i>Foreclosed Advances</i> | 714,569.23 | <i>Foreclosed Loan Advances</i> | 714,569.23 |
| Less Repayments | 112,409.03 | Less Payments | 112,409.03 |
| | 602,160.20 | | 602,160.20 |
| For <i>Tax Sale Certificate Purchases</i> | 155,780.41 | <i>Tax Sale Certificate Purchases</i> | 155,780.41 |
| Less Repayments | 155,780.41 | Less Payments | 155,780.41 |
| | 473,082.68 | | 473,082.68 |
| For <i>Real Estate Sales Advances</i> .. | 612,068.56 | <i>Real Estate Sales</i> | 610,766.58 |
| Less Repayments | 138,985.88 | Less Payments | 135,692.93 |
| | 6,855.81 | | 475,073.65 |
| For <i>Real Estate Sale Charges Advances</i> | 15,649.28 | <i>Real Estate Sales Charges</i> | 15,649.28 |
| Less Repayments | 8,793.47 | Less Payments | 8,793.47 |
| | 103,286.27 | | 6,855.81 |
| For <i>Administration Expenses</i> | 525,666.64 | <i>Interest on Loans and Advances—</i> | |
| Less Repayments | 422,380.37 | Accrued to Oct. 31, 1928, due on | |
| | | Nov. 1, 1928 | 4,736,875.37 |
| For <i>Interest on Advances</i> | 3,968,048.52 | Accrued to Oct. 31, 1928, Fore- | |
| Less Repayments | 3,968,048.52 | closed Loans | 54,043.89 |

FARM LOAN BOARD

OTHER LIABILITIES—

| | | | |
|---|----|-----------------|--|
| Saskatchewan Farmers Mutual Ins. Co... | \$ | 859.50 | |
| Wawanesa Farmers Mutual Ins. Co. | | 77.25 | |
| J. W. Blyth | | 217.16 | |
| Kern Agencies | | 37.50 | |
| Suspense | \$ | 1,660.01 | |
| Suspense, K. McDonald Loan | | 887.60 | |
| | | <u>2,547.61</u> | |
| Less net payments made in Suspense on Account of Real Estate | | 948.36 | |
| | | <u>1,599.25</u> | |

RESERVES—

| | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Real Estate Reserve</i> set apart from Profit and Loss to provide for losses | \$175,000.00 | |
| Deduct Losses on Paid out <i>Real Estate Sales Liquidated</i> <i>Reserve</i> | \$3,292.95 | |
| Less Profits from Sales of Foreclosures-Earned Reserve | 1,990.97 | |
| | <u>1,301.98</u> | |
| | | 173,698.02 |
| <i>Profit and Loss</i> | | 326,784.85 |
| | | <u>\$9,810,586.49</u> |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Accrued to Oct. 31, 1928, Real Estate Sales | 66,634.42 | |
| | <u>\$4,857,553.68</u> | |
| Less Interest Payments | 4,290,906.47 | |
| Less Interest Payments on Fore- closed Loans | 54,043.89 | |
| Less Interest Payments on Real Estate Sales | 45,478.53 | |
| | <u>467,124.79</u> | |
| | \$4,390,428.89 | |
| Interest on Loans Accrued for November and December, 1928, not due till Nov. 1, 1929..... | | 97,534.85 |
| EXPENDITURES RECEIVABLE— | | |
| <i>Mortgage Charges</i> Advanced | 396,634.23 | |
| Less Payments | 384,476.88 | |
| | <u>12,157.35</u> | |
| <i>Solicitors' Disbursements</i> | | 298.39 |
| <i>Inspection Revenue</i> | | 1,000.00 |
| EQUIPMENT— | | |
| Office Furniture | 7,764.75 | |
| Less Depreciation | 388.25 | |
| | <u>7,376.50</u> | |
| Automobiles (6) | 5,117.15 | |
| Less depreciation | 1,817.15 | |
| | <u>3,300.00</u> | |
| | | <u>\$9,810,586.49</u> |

I certify that for the year ending December 31, 1928, I have audited the books and accounts and have examined the securities of The Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board. All my requirements have been complied with and in my opinion the above statements are properly drawn so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the Board's affairs as shown by its books, but they must be considered only in connection with and subject to the attached schedules and report. The Mortgagors Trust Account is treated in a separate statement.

J. E. TANNER,
Deputy Provincial Auditor.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 33

(In Part)

ANNUAL REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE SASKATCHEWAN FARM LOAN BOARD FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1929.

REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, *February, 26, 1930.*

TO THE HONOURABLE HOWARD McCONNELL, B.A., LL.B., K.C.,
Provincial Treasurer.

Sir,—We have the honour of transmitting herewith our Report concerning the work of the Board for the year ended December 31, 1929, as provided by section 28 of The Saskatchewan Farm Loans Act, being Chapter 25 of the Statutes of 1917.

Prior to 1929 applications to the number of 14,916 were received for an amount of \$38,852,237.00, while during the year 1929, 2,425 applications were received for a total sum of \$6,803,468.65 being a total of 17,341 applications representing a total of \$45,655,705.65 since the inception of the Board. Of this number 4,491 loans were approved and disbursed prior to 1929 for a total sum of \$11,145,399.90, and during the past year an additional 642 loans were completed for a sum of \$1,839,951.93, making in all 5,133 loans totalling \$12,985,351.83.

In addition to the above there are 159 accepted applications representing \$370,880.00 in the hands of our solicitor not yet disbursed, and the Board has 92 applications which have been inspected by our inspectors but not yet dealt with by the Board. There are also several hundred applications which have been recently received which will have our early attention.

Loans totalling 829 in number have been retired either through payment in cash or by renewal for a greater amount of which 121 were so retired during the year 1929.

Prior to 1929 the Board had acquired title to 367 farms through transfer or foreclosure against which the amount due at date of foreclosure was \$1,158,008.39 of which \$679,449.76 was principal, and during the year 1929 a further 18 farms were acquired by the same means against which was due at the date of foreclosure \$64,975.10, of which \$32,924.07 was principal, being a total of 385 farms acquired in this manner and representing claims to the extent of \$1,222,983.49 of which \$712,373.83 was principal. Of this number 167 farms were sold prior to 1929 and 35 were sold during the year 1929, several of which have been split in smaller parcels. Most of these farms have been sold on the crop payment plan with a nominal cash payment.

At December 31st, 1929, the Board had on hand 170 farms representing total claims of \$550,895.90 as at that date to which no interest had been added since date of foreclosure.

Advances have been made to Borrowers and Purchasers as follows:

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Advances to Borrowers, including seed, taxes, etc., prior to 1929 |\$1,849,076.16 |
| Advances to Purchasers prior to 1929 | 15,649.28 |
| Advances to Borrowers during 1929 | 89,316.86 |
| Advances to Purchasers during 1929 | 4,871.92 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$1,958,914.22 |

Repayment of the above advances have been received as set forth in the following tabulation. It will be noted that this includes repayment by means of foreclosure as well as actual payment:

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Repayment of Advances by Borrowers (including through foreclosure) prior to 1929 | \$1,771,304.33 |
| Repayment of Advances by Borrowers (including through foreclosure) during 1929 | 82,128.10 |
| Repayment of Advances by Purchasers prior to 1929 | 8,793.47 |
| Repayment of Advances by Purchasers during 1929 | 3,846.01 |
| | \$1,866,071.91 |

The interest earnings of the Board prior to 1929 amounted to \$4,857,553.68 and for the year 1929, \$642,197.77, making a total of \$5,499,751.45, while the interest received from borrowers and purchasers and through means of foreclosure prior to 1929 was \$4,390,428.89 and for the year 1929, \$524,320.34 or a total of \$4,914,749.23.

The principal amounts repaid are set forth in the following schedule which also includes the repayment of principal through foreclosure proceedings or the acquiring of transfers:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Principal repaid by Borrowers (including through foreclosure) prior to 1929 | 3,156,366.91 |
| Principal repaid by Purchasers prior to 1929 | 135,692.93 |
| Principal repaid by Borrowers and through foreclosure during 1929 | 421,978.42 |
| Principal repaid by Purchasers during 1929 | 50,253.62 |
| | \$3,764,291.88 |

Of the farms owned by the Board, 127 were under lease for the year 1929. The gross charges for the year, not including interest on the Board's investment on all unsold farms, amounted to \$29,192.03 and the gross receipts totalled \$26,394.09, from rented farms owned by the Board.

At the 31st day of December, 1929, the Board had on hand the following amounts of grain:

| | | | | |
|-------------|------------|----------|------------|---------------------|
| Wheat | Oats | Barley | Rye | Wheat and Rye mixed |
| 8,081½ bus. | 2,145 bus. | 686 bus. | 3,417 bus. | 390 bus. |

and the following Pool Participation Certificates:

| | | |
|----------------|----------|---------|
| 1929— Wheat | Barley | Rye |
| 2,963 1-3 bus. | 229 bus. | 39 bus. |

proceeds from which will be credited to their respective accounts when received and added to the above gross receipts.

The amounts received from the Provincial Treasurer's Department have been as follows:

RECEIVED FROM THE PROVINCIAL TREASURER

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | Prior to 1929 | During 1929 |
| New Loans | \$11,157,096.01 | \$1,828,420.04 |
| Advances | 1,468,091.21 | 70,428.39 |
| Administration Expenses | 525,666.64 | 71,333.36 |

The following amounts were repaid to the Provincial Treasurer's Department:

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Prior to 1929 | During 1929 | |
| Including through foreclosure { | Principal | \$3,156,366.91 | \$421,978.42 |
| | Advances | 1,395,610.92 | 63,472.01 |
| | Interest | 3,968,048.52 | 523,918.24 |
| Administration Advances | 422,380.37 | 402.10 | |

At December 31, 1929, there were a total of 3,919 loans on the books of the Board. Of this number 2,009 were in good standing. 1,168 were in arrears to an amount not exceeding one instalment, while 742 were in arrears in excess of one instalment.

Our Real Estate Reserve and Surplus Account as at December 31, 1928, amounted to \$500,482.87 to which has been added the earned surplus for the year 1929, amounting to \$63,909.87, bringing the total Real Estate Reserve and Surplus Account as at December 31, 1929, to \$564,392.74. These accounts are largely represented by uncollected interest.

During recent months the Board has made a review of some 1,000 accounts which resulted in our decision that a re-valuation of the Board's assets is advisable in order to ascertain as accurately as possible the value thereof. This work we hope to undertake during 1930.

Respectfully submitted,

COLIN FRASER,
Commissioner.

J. A. THOMPSON,
Member.

W. W. BROOKE,
Member.

SASKATCHEWAN FARM LOAN BOARD

BALANCE SHEET DECEMBER 31, 1929.

| ASSETS | | LIABILITIES | |
|--|----------------|---|----------------|
| Cash on Hand | \$ 34,563.82 | BANK OVERDRAFT— | \$ 19,756.44 |
| First Mortgages | \$9,407,006.50 | To PROVINCIAL TREASURER— | |
| Hail Insurance Advances | 4,969.71 | Working Capital | \$9,407,170.72 |
| Seed Grain Advances | 11,013.25 | Hail Insurance Advances | 4,969.71 |
| Taxes Advances | 55,561.99 | Seed Grain Advances | 11,013.25 |
| Foreclosed Lands | 550,895.90 | Taxes Advances | 55,561.99 |
| Agreements of Sale | 556,368.27 | Foreclosed Lands | 550,895.90 |
| Charges Advanced on Agreements of Sale | 7,881.72 | Agreements of Sale | 564,145.66 |
| Interest Arrears | 585,002.22 | Charges Advanced on Agreements of Sale | 7,881.72 |
| | 11,178,699.56 | Administration Expense | 174,217.53 |
| Interest Accrued for November and De- cember not due until October 31, 1930 | 113,368.12 | Bond Costs | 142,648.50 |
| | | | 10,918,504.98 |
| EXPENDITURES RECEIVABLE— | | SUNDRY LIABILITIES— | |
| Mortgage Charges | 13,415.64 | J. W. Blyth | 217.16 |
| Solicitors' Disbursements | 484.48 | Sask. Farmers' Mutual Insurance Co. | 1,154.14 |
| | 13,900.12 | Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Co. | 53.80 |
| Deferred Bond Costs | 96,065.57 | | 1,425.10 |
| Office Equipment | 8,208.76 | SUSPENSE ACCOUNTS— | |
| Automobiles | 3,300.00 | General | 2,703.13 |
| | 11,508.76 | Real Estate Payments | 1,248.56 |
| Trust Bank Account | 557.00 | K. McDonald Loan | 1,094.55 |
| Deficit | 2,526,729.10 | | 5,046.24 |
| | | TRUST BALANCES | 557.00 |

SASKATCHEWAN FARM LOAN BOARD—*Continued*

BALANCE SHEET DECEMBER 31, 1929—*Continued.*

| ASSETS— <i>Continued.</i> | RESERVES— | LIABILITIES— <i>Continued.</i> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Loss on Foreclosed Lands | 266,202.30 |
| | Loss on Agreements of Sale | 163,899.99 |
| | Loss on Current Loans | 2,500,000.00 |
| | Reorganization of Board | 25,000.00 |
| | Reinspections | 75,000.00 |
| | | 3,030,102.29 |
| <u>\$13,975,392.05</u> | | <u>\$13,975,392.05</u> |

CERTIFICATE OF AUDIT

I have conducted an audit of the books and records of the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board for the period from the inception of the Board in 1917 to December 31, 1929.

I have verified all cash balances and have examined all securities of the Board. The Borrowers' accounts are now being verified by correspondence, and the result of such verification will be reported in due course.

Subject to my report of this date, I certify that, in my opinion, the Balance Sheet of the Board presented herewith is a correct statement of the financial position of the Board as shown by the books and records submitted to me and the explanations given me.

WALTER J. WESTON,
Chartered Accountant.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 28

THE REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE SASKATCHEWAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION, DATED FEBRUARY 6, 1930.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Your Trustees respectfully beg to submit the following report:

By an oversight no report was furnished you in the year 1929. The following report therefore covers the time which has elapsed since the last report, which was dated the 14th of February, 1928.

The investigation into the environmental factors affecting the milling qualities of Saskatchewan wheats and the baking qualities of flour made therefrom, for which your Trustees had decided to make a grant to the University of Saskatchewan, as set forth in their former report, was duly proceeded with under the direction of Dr. T. Thorvaldson, Professor of Chemistry at that institution. A report was received from him by your Trustees under date of the 1st of October, 1928, outlining the work which had been done to the 1st of July that year, and stating what was still necessary of accomplishment in order to attain the desired objective. In respect to the letter, he requested your Trustees to furnish a further grant to the University to meet capital and current expenditures relating to the investigation for the years 1928-1929, upon which he submitted estimates. Subsequently he informed your Trustees that a trained chemist was required to perform the large amount of additional chemical work necessary to the investigation, which could not be taken care of by his existing staff. Accordingly, at a meeting held on the 22nd of December, 1928, your Trustees decided to make a further grant to the University of \$4,500.00, to meet the estimated capital and current expenditure, and also a grant of \$1,500.00, to cover the salary of a qualified chemist. Under these several grants, there has been paid to the University to this date in respect of the investigation the sum of \$11,287.50.

Further reports have been received by your Trustees from Professor Thorvaldson regarding the investigation up to the 30th of June, 1929. The investigation is still proceeding.

Regarding the investigation into Plant Pathology, for which your Trustees decided to make a grant to the University, as set forth in their former report, we would say that the same was taken up under the superintendence of Professor W. P. Fraser, Professor of Biology at the University, from whom a report was received indicating the progress which had been made therein up to the 13th of September, 1928. He informed your Trustees that a trained plant pathologist had been appointed, as well as an assistant, to carry on the research. This investigation is still proceeding. There has been paid to the University by your Trustees under the grants made in respect thereof, in all, the sum of \$5,700.00.

In the month of December, 1928, a communication was received by your Trustees from the University, respecting several researches which were proposed by Professor Baker, of the Faculty of Agriculture, in the interests of the Poultry Industry of the Province. For this a grant was sought of your Trustees to enable the same to be made. The matter was duly considered by your Trustees who, at a meeting held on the 29th of December, 1928, decided to make allowances for certain of the proposed researches, as follows:

1. \$250.00 a year, to meet the estimated cost of a research for feeding for eggs;
2. \$100.00, to equip a poultry house, and \$200.00 for collecting data, etc.; thus aggregating \$350.00 for research into conditions in poultry houses during winter.

3. \$900.00, estimated cost of equipment to make proposed research into turkey breeding.

Nothing has yet been paid by your Trustees in respect of these allowances.

In the month of April, 1928, a letter was received by your Trustees from the United Farmers of Canada Saskatchewan Section, Limited, informing them that a resolution had been passed at its Second Annual Convention, asking that an investigation be made, upon the funds of the Foundation, into the Dairying Industry in Saskatchewan, in order to determine whether it might be put upon a better basis. Your Trustees accordingly met with representatives of the United Farmers, and considered with them the investigation proposed by the above resolution. Your Trustees were subsequently informed that the Government of the Province had also been requested by the Saskatchewan Dairy Association, to appoint a commission to make a similar investigation. They therefore called a meeting, at which they conferred with the Directors of the Dairy Association, and other representatives of the dairy interests in the Province, regarding the matter, with the result that the said directors, by a resolution dated the 29 of December, 1928, requested your Trustees to proceed with the investigation. Your Trustees then sought to engage someone qualified to direct the same. In this they experienced considerable difficulty, as the work was of a very specialised nature. Ultimately, on the 27 of May, 1929, arrangements were made with Dr. E. G. Misner, Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management at Cornell University of Ithaca, in the State of New York, to come to Saskatchewan on the 1st of July, 1929, and take charge of a survey into the dairy industry in the Province, at a salary of \$500.00 per month, and his travelling expenses. In Dr. Misner your Trustees considered that they had secured a particularly well qualified man. A meeting was held on the 12th of July, 1929, which was attended by Dr. Misner and representatives of the United Farmers of Canada and the Saskatchewan Dairy Association, as well as by the representatives of the various milk producing associations throughout the province. At this meeting the scope of the survey was determined, it being agreed that the same should not only be directed to the investigation of production costs, but also to cover those of manufacturing and distributing dairy produce. A committee was also appointed, which included representatives from the various bodies interested, to collaborate with Dr. Misner in the plan and method of conducting the survey. Since then, Dr. Misner has been proceeding with the survey, assisted by a special clerical staff averaging some five persons, who have also been paid by your Trustees. The remainder of the work, which has been large, has been executed by the staff of the Dairy Branch of the Provincial Department of Agriculture, assisted by certain members of the Co-operation and Markets Branch of the same department. The amount which has been expended by your Trustees upon the said survey to date is \$4128.84.

Your Trustees have paid to the University of Saskatchewan for Agricultural Scholarships since their last report, the sum of \$3200.00.

Audits have been made by the Provincial Auditor of your Trustees' accounts for the years ending 30th April, 1928 and 1929, respectively. A copy of his report upon each of such audits is attached hereto.

The total amount which has been received by your Trustees for income arising from the investment of the capital of the foundation, since the inception of their Trust, has been \$48,106.30. Of this the trustees have expended upon the purposes of the Foundation to date the sum of \$36,483.99. There remains in the bank, to the credit of your Trustees, the balance of such income, amounting to \$11,622.31; which, with the sum of \$310.00 uninvested capital funds, makes such total bank balance the sum of \$11,932.31. The remainder of the Capital Fund of the Foundation remain invested in a \$300.00 Debenture of the Province of Saskatchewan, maturing 1st May, 1946, and in the meantime bearing interest at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum.

Dated this sixth day of February, A.D. 1930.

P. E. MacKENZIE,
Chairman.

W. J. RUTHERFORD,

WAT. C. BUCKLE,
Trustees.

TRUSTEES OF THE SASKATCHEWAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS, YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1928.

| RECEIPTS | | PAYMENTS | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Interest on Investments | \$13,500.00 | University of Saskatchewan | \$ 7,695.00 |
| Interest on Bank Account | 176.65 | Overseas Commission | 600.00 |
| | | Sundry Expenses | 72.00 |
| | | Surplus for year | 5,309.65 |
| | <u>\$13,676.65</u> | | <u>\$13,676.65</u> |

CAPITAL ACCOUNT BALANCE SHEET 30TH APRIL, 1928.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Cash in Current Account | \$ 310.00 | Trust Fund | \$284,200.00 |
| Investments | 283,890.00 | | |
| | <u>\$284,200.00</u> | | <u>\$284,200.00</u> |

CURRENT ACCOUNT BALANCE SHEET 30TH APRIL, 1928.

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Bank Account | \$12,703.91 | Uninvested Capital Funds | \$ 310.00 |
| | | Current Surplus | 12,393.91 |
| | <u>\$12,703.91</u> | | <u>\$12,703.91</u> |

Certified correct,

G. L. HOPKINS,
Provincial Auditor.

TRUSTEES OF THE SASKATCHEWAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

CAPITAL ACCOUNT BALANCE SHEET 30TH APRIL, 1929.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Investments | \$283,890.00 | Trust Fund | \$284,200.00 |
| Cash in Current Account | 310.00 | | |
| | <u>\$284,200.00</u> | | <u>\$284,200.00</u> |

CURRENT ACCOUNT BALANCE SHEET 30TH APRIL, 1929.

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Bank Account | \$13,562.97 | Uninvested Capital Funds | \$ 310.00 |
| | | Current Surplus | 13,252.97 |
| | <u>\$13,562.97</u> | | <u>\$13,562.97</u> |

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1929.

| PAYMENTS | | RECEIPTS | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| University of Saskatchewan..... | \$12,900.00 | Interest on Investments | \$13,500.00 |
| Sundry Expenses | 74.25 | Interest on Bank Account | 333.51 |
| Surplus for Year | 859.06 | | |
| | <u>\$13,833.51</u> | | <u>\$13,833.51</u> |

Certified correct,

G. L. HOPKINS,
Provincial Auditor.

SPEECHES

ON

THE ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. R. P. EADES, M.L.A.

(Morse)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1930.

Mr. Eades, in moving the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, said:
Mr. Speaker,—

In accordance with time-honoured British Parliamentary custom, and by the kindness of the Honourable Premier and his colleagues to the constituency of Morse, I am privileged in rising to move a loyal address in reply to the Speech from the throne. In this connection, let me first mention a matter upon which every honourable member of this Assembly, together with all loyal British subjects, may express themselves in terms of complete unanimity of thought. I refer Sir, to the general expression of thankfulness to Divine Providence for the restoration to, and continuance of the good health during recent months, of our beloved Sovereign King George V. Throughout the length and breadth of the British Empire this spirit has been manifest, and without respect to language, race or creed, wherever altar fires have been kindled, prayers have gone forth, prayers are being said today entreating Divine Providence to preserve the good health of our Beloved Sovereign, that he may long continue to reign over us.

Quite recently, Mr. Speaker, on January 21st to be exact, through the medium of that late wonder of science and invention, embracing a world-wide hookup by radio, we listened to His Majesty's voice on the occasion of the opening of the Five-power International Conference for the reduction of naval armaments at London. While hundreds of thousands of his loyal subjects "listened in," I am sure it would have been an inspiration to His Majesty, had he been able to see, so far removed from the place of his speech as to entail a difference of seven hours in time, tens of thousands of the homes of his loyal subjects in these Prairie Provinces, illuminated in the early hours of the morning for the express purpose of listening to His Majesty's message of peace and good-will.

Mr. Speaker, humanity draws no line of distinction. One of the honourable members of this Assembly during the past summer has suffered a severe bereavement. Those of us who are fathers will best realize the deep affliction that has come to the home of the honourable member for Redberry (*Mr. Cockburn*) through the loss of his son. I venture, unhesitatingly, on the behalf of all the members of both sides of this House, to extend to the honourable member for Redberry our deepest sympathy in his great sorrow.

Changes of varying and far-reaching effect have been brought about in this Province of Saskatchewan, by the people, in this, the Legislative Assembly of the people, during the past year. The past twelve months have witnessed the defeat and retirement from office of the Liberal administration which had dominated the affairs of this Province for the last quarter century. It has also witnessed the setting up of a Co-operative Government, composed of Progressives, Independents and Conservatives co-operating together to give to the Province of Saskatchewan an administration based upon honourable business principles, the extension of the spirit of harmony and co-operation, equality and justice to all, without fear or favor, whether he be pauper or millionaire.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, many new faces are to be seen in this Assembly. Many well known in this chamber in years gone by are missing. Why? Because on June 6th last, the electors of this Province in their wisdom desired and said it should be so.

Among those who are missing, Mr. Speaker, let me mention The Minister of Agriculture in the late government (*Mr. C. M. Hamilton*) also the Provincial Secretary of the deceased Government (*Mr. S. J. Latta*) both of whom gave freely of their talents in conscientious and valuable service to the affairs of this Province.

Again, changes in the old opposition have occurred—noticeable, very noticeable changes. Every one of those who sought election whom we were accustomed formerly to see sitting in the opposition benches now grace, with increased brilliance, the seats to the right of the Speaker, while a considerable number of those who formerly sat on this side of the House for so long as to almost seem anchored in perpetuity, now grace the ranks of the opposition with diminished, but may I add, as yet, not entirely subdued splendor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time, on behalf of those on this side of the House, to congratulate the Honourable Premier on his election to the highest office the people of this Province can confer. May I also felicitate the Honourable Ministers of the Government and Mr. Speaker on being elected to their high and honourable positions. Permit me to extend this spirit of felicitation also to all members who, for the first time, have taken a seat in this House. It is significant with respect to the selection of his Cabinet by the Honourable Premier, notwithstanding that after June 6th the defeated Liberal Government refused to resign or vacate office, such was the confidence of the people in the judgment of our Premier, that when the time came for holding the by-elections, confirming appointment of the Ministers, not a single seat was contested.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to reconcile pre-election statements of some of the honourable members of the opposition who are here, and former honourable members who are not here but would like to be, to the effect, that should the then opposition be successful in winning a sufficient number of seats to the defeat of the Liberal Government, they would be unable to form a government through lack of cabinet material. With the actual facts which we have before us, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable members of this side of the House would welcome an opportunity of comparing, in points of intellectual strength as well as manly grace and beauty, the present Cabinet with the best ever exhibited in this House by a Liberal Government.

At no time in the history of the province has a government come into power with such heavy responsibilities resting upon them. At no time has a new government taken office with such difficulties attending them, nor do I feel it would be ungenerous to state that some of those difficulties were intentionally raised by a defeated and vindictive government for the purpose of embarrassing the new government.

Your Government has already demonstrated its ability to cope with the great difficulties confronting it when it took office. Some matters already have been settled, such as, for instance, that of which we have evidence today in the letter from the Prime Minister of Canada with reference to the Natural Resources of the Province. This was one of the great problems confronting the Government of Saskatchewan yet, in the short time it has been in office, that and other difficulties have been met and problems solved with despatch showing the desire of the Government to co-operate in whatever is in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan as a whole, and demonstrating its ability to lay hold of, and grapple with the problems of outstanding moment to the people of this Province. The Government has faced these problems unflinchingly and applied solutions in all cases tempered with a spirit of equality and justice to all (as I said before) without fear or favour to any.

Let me call your attention briefly to some items relating to the Dominion of Canada as a whole but later more particularly to our own Province of Saskatchewan. I quote my authority: "Canada for 1930." On page 34, it is stated that the net debt of Canada at the end of the year 1928 (although 1923 was the highest year) stood at \$2,296,850,223.00. In 1929, we are glad to note there was a reduction of \$71,345,518.00 bringing the net debt at the end of that year to \$2,225,504,705.00. The revenue receipts for Canada in 1929 were \$455,463,874.00; and the total expenditures were \$378,806,313.00. The difference between the amount of revenue receipts and expenditures, over \$76,600,000.00, does not exactly agree with the reduction in debt of \$71,345,518.00 but this difference is taken care of by items concerning the Railways and the Merchant Marine.

On page 7 of the same volume, it shows that in the matter of external trade of Canada, the first eleven months of 1929 showed a gain of \$92,521,789.00 in imports over the corresponding period of 1928, but in exports there was a decline of \$65,218,430.00. The favourable trade balance which was \$317,000,000.00 on November 30, 1926, and which had declined to half that figure in 1928 was an unfavourable balance of \$58,000,000.00 in 1929.

Adverse conditions not only in our Prairie Provinces but throughout the Dominion of Canada to a considerable extent are reflected in the bank statements. According to the bank statements published in the press on February 8, savings deposits in Canadian banks decreased by \$85,879,814.00 during the year 1929.

Let me come to an item which is particularly familiar to this western country—wheat. The wheat production of all Canada for the year 1928 amounted to 566,726,000 bushels; for 1929 it was 293,792,000 bushels, leaving a shortage in 1929 from 1928 of 272,924,000 bushels. This has been brought about to a large extent by the adverse crop conditions of the past season. Considerable importance attaches also to the figures with reference to production of other grains in Canada. Take production of oats. The oats production for the whole of Canada in 1929 was 280,270,000 bushels; barley produced in the same year totalled 100,467,000 bushels. The total value of field crops for the whole of Canada was \$1,125,000,000.00 in 1928 while in 1929 it was \$986,986,000.00 or a deficit of \$138,104,000.00. We are glad to note that while there is an outstanding deficit in dollars and cents coming into this Western Country in return for our field crops, development in production of other grains and other agricultural pursuits made up in some respects for the reduction in wheat products. This drop is not so great as might have been expected.

Let me now, Sir, turn to matters more closely relating to our own province. It requires a wide stretch of fancy to unfold the pages of history three and a quarter centuries to 1605 when the first bushel of wheat ever produced in Canada was grown at Annapolis, Nova Scotia. This same date and place mark the setting up of the first water-wheel which turned the first milling stone to grind the first bushel of wheat by mechanical means grown in Canada. By the end of the first half-century, 11,000 acres of land were under wheat and there were 3,000 head of cattle roaming over the pastures.

Passing over the pages of history including such major incidents as the coming of the United Empire Loyalists, to the year 1870, let me from that date present a short resume of development and conditions in our Canadian country and more particularly in Saskatchewan. In 1870, 85 per cent of all the wheat produced in Canada was grown in Ontario. Up to 1880, the wheat crop rarely exceeded 25,000,000 bushels. In 1885, the first car of wheat was shipped by the all-Canadian route—The Canadian Pacific Railway—from Winnipeg, and up to 1890 the Saskatchewan production had not exceeded 4 per cent of the Canadian wheat crop. But at the present time what do we find? Of the 294,000,000 bushels of wheat produced by all Canada in 1929, Saskatchewan contributed 154,500,000 bushels, or 53 per cent of all the wheat of Canada at an estimated value of \$176,204,000. Of the 280,270,000 bushels of oats produced in Canada in 1929, Saskatchewan contributed 68,944,000 bushels, or 40 per cent. Of the 100,467,000 bushels of barley produced in Canada in 1929, Saskatchewan contributed 30,755,000 bushels or 32.66 per cent. As citizens of a province that is so rapidly coming to the front in the matter of development, we have reason to be proud of the great strides which Saskatchewan has made in agricultural development. Not only do we speak with great pride of our grain growing, but the latest statistics show that we have over 3,000,000 head of livestock in this Province, and over 9,000,000 poultry. Figures obtained from outside sources indicate that 35,000 horses have been shipped east through Winnipeg during the past year from the Prairie Provinces, and no doubt Saskatchewan has contributed her share to that total.

Creamery butter production in Saskatchewan during the year 1929 amounted to 14,786,205 pounds as compared with 11,310,496 pounds in 1928. This is an increase of 3,475,709 pounds, or 30.7 per cent.

In connection with agriculture, which is one of our basic industries, one of the first actions of the Co-operative Government was to provide relief to farmers in the dried-out areas of the Province. Arrangements were made for dispensing coal and flour to those citizens in need of assistance and a large amount aggregating \$400,000.00 was expended in the way of municipal grants toward road building as a relief measure. At the present time, your Government, Sir, has purchased 220,000 bushels of oats which is now ready for distribution among the municipalities for seed, most of these oats being stored at Moose Jaw.

Through adverse conditions, many of our people find themselves in difficulties in regard to the payment of taxes, and in some cases farmers find themselves in a position where they are about to lose their homes and property. Let me suggest in all earnestness, Mr. Speaker, that, in my opinion, the time has come when something should be done towards granting relief to some extent from the penalties imposed on those who have suffered crop failures through no fault of their own and who now find themselves cumbered with taxes in arrears.

In many directions, Sir, progress has gone on apace. In regard to the building of our roads, we find that the figures completed for 1929 operations (I am quoting from the most recent report of the Department of Highways) show that 849 $\frac{3}{4}$ miles of earth road were built, bringing the total of earth roads constructed in the Province of Saskatchewan to 4,128 miles (and I hope, when the Engineers go to look for them they will be able to locate them all.) Then there was completed a total of 395 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles of gravel surfacing, bringing the total to date to 774 $\frac{3}{4}$ miles. Of oil-treated gravel surfacing, 46.08 miles were completed making a total in the province of 64 $\frac{3}{4}$ miles. Thus, Mr. Speaker, we have in the Province of Saskatchewan today a total of gravel and oil-treated gravel surface roads of 839 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

Again, Mr. Speaker, with reference to highways I wish to state that I stand absolutely for the construction of a trans-continental highway from ocean to ocean in order that Canadian citizens travelling from east to west can finish their journey without diversion to the roads of a foreign country; and I hope, Mr. Speaker, before this Legislature prorogues that it will express itself in no uncertain terms to the Government at Ottawa in support of this matter.

In connection with the Gasoline Tax, net receipts after deduction of refunds amounting to \$779,901.20, reached a total of \$1,229,665.61. The Motor License Tax which in 1925 produced \$1,361,509.70 stood at \$2,183,980.85 in 1928, and in 1929 produced a revenue of \$2,407,000.00. A new schedule of motor license fees has been drawn up for the coming year, including a general reduction of \$5.00 for each automobile, and an increase for some of the heavier motor trucks. I am glad to note that provision has been made for a rebate in respect to those trucks used exclusively in farm operations and for those trucks in cities which are not operated outside the city limits. The rebates in these cases will bring the license fee down to the same figure as last year. An increase in the Gasoline Tax from three to five cents a gallon is contemplated at this session, the intention being to place the burden of maintenance of the roads on those who use the roads most. It is expected that the increase in the Gasoline Tax will offset the loss of revenue for road purposes which will naturally follow upon the decrease in the automobile licenses.

Regarding the tourist traffic, Mr. Speaker, let me quote from a reliable source (*The Monthly Letter of The Royal Bank of Canada, Head Office*) to show the value of this traffic. Referring to the period between 1922 and 1929, the letter says:

"During this period the value of the Canadian tourist trade has grown at a more rapid rate than the income of any other individual industry in the country. According to a table published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the revenue from this source increased from ninety million dollars in 1922 to two hundred and fifty million dollars in 1928. Three hundred million dollars constitutes a conservative estimate of the total for 1929."

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that indicates the necessity of a Trans-Canada highway as well as of roads across this province which will be passable at all times and not just on a fine day, in order that tourists can travel through our province and over our roads without getting stuck in the mud.

Great strides have been made in connection with the Natural Resources question as the letter written by Prime Minister of Canada, as read today, will indicate. I think it is quite fair to say that the negotiations carried out during the five months the Co-operative Government has been in power has resulted in more satisfactory terms being obtained and greater progress being made than in the 24 years of former Governments. Let me give you three of the considerations we are now offered: first, we are offered a continuance of the subsidy with its increases, in perpetuity; second, we are to have an accounting of all alienated lands since 1905; and third, the Federal Government at Ottawa has offered to co-operate in taking a stated case to the Privy Council to determine compensation and accounting for lands alienated from 1870 to 1905.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant of the great potentialities of the resources that lie in this province to the north and in the coal fields of the south, that our railways are taking particular note, as indicated in the Canadian Pacific Railway's branch-line programme and in the proportion of branch line mileage to be built in this province this year. Of the 160 miles of proposed construction in the three Provinces of Quebec, Alberta and Saskatchewan for 1930, 126 miles are to be built in Saskatchewan, or three-quarters of all the proposed construction during the coming season.

There is no doubt that our railways are the barometers of future business. They are headed by men who have their fingers on the business and financial world, who see in

the development of Saskatchewan, in our great northern territory untold wealth in the transportation of our mineral and other resources.

I have here the latest report of the Vital Statistics. This report shows, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is not only the healthiest place in Canada to live in, but it is the healthiest place in the British Empire, for the death rate in the Province of 7.2 per 1,000 of population is the lowest in the Dominion and, according to the Registrar General of England and Wales, is the lowest death rate in the British Empire. A great loss is suffered by the Province in the keeping down of communicable diseases. In computing this loss, the Department statistics show that deaths from communicable diseases caused a loss of \$2,396,275.00 or \$2.81 for each man, woman and child in the Province. Much of this loss through communicable diseases is the direct result of carelessness. It is worthy of note that two causes, tuberculosis and influenza accounted for 70 per cent of the deaths from communicable diseases, those who are not physically fit being the victims. The death rate from tuberculosis was 44.4 per 100,000 of the population, but we all know what combative efforts are being put forth to reduce the death rate from this disease.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge upon you a matter which is to me of very great importance. I firmly believe that steps should be taken as soon as practicable towards the establishment of a central hospital or the setting up of psychopathic wards at strategic points for the care of those cases, mostly women, who at a particular age through physical conditions, are temporarily upon the borderline of suffering mental breakdown and who, on account of their peculiar condition, cannot expect or receive the proper treatment in either our general or mental hospitals.

The dread disease, cancer, the death rate from which between the years 1918 and 1928 increased 97 per cent, is receiving the close attention of our Department of Public Health. The work contemplated by the Department is not only receiving attention in this province but also throughout Canada. Let me mention my authority for saying so. I quote from the *Winnipeg Tribune* of date February 7:

"Of all the measures foreshadowed, however, the proposals to attack the cancer scourge will undoubtedly attract most widespread public attention. Though the death rate from cancer is high and constantly climbing higher, Saskatchewan is the first province in the Dominion to undertake a campaign against it. The honour for this step goes to Hon. Dr. Munroe, Minister of Health in the new Government."

Another paragraph says that all Canada will watch the measure which will come in the form of a Bill later in the Session—that is, speaking of the Bill which will be introduced at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, in the preface to my address, I made mention of the grave responsibilities resting upon the heads of the present Government of Saskatchewan. Let me say that, in my humble opinion, one of the greatest of these responsibilities is the continuance of their policies of building up, strengthening, improving, and enlarging the foundation on which to erect a greater super-structure of democratic citizenship. It is an established fact that structures built for permanence must rest upon bed-rock, and I submit the bed-rock of democracy lies in the spirit of toleration, harmony, and co-operation existing in the hearts and minds of the people. I submit further that the foundation of the citizenship of the future consists of the most valuable asset in our control, namely the youth of Saskatchewan—the boys and girls of today who in the near future will be administering the affairs of this province. It is necessary, therefore, to provide means of development along constructive, serviceable lines and to give opportunity to our youth to develop along those lines in the great preparation ground of democracy, the public school, to bring about the elimination of sectarianism, the elimination of unsuitable text-books and other undesirable influences, and have them replaced by an atmosphere and other influences tending to instil the spirit of equality, of harmony and friendliness among our children so that they may carry it throughout their lives. At the session of this Legislature, last year, the then opposition introduced measures designed to bring about a change in the deplorable conditions of our schools in this respect. What was the result? It met with the same cold defeat that other constructive measures introduced by the opposition had experienced at the hands of the then Government. Since June 6th, however, members of the then Government have had an opportunity of reflecting on the error of their ways and even at this late date may now be prepared to commend where formerly they condemned the same legislation when introduced in the near future. With this broader viewpoint no more lasting ornament could be built into our system of education than which would instil in the

hearts and minds of the coming generation, a greater spirit of loyalty, of justice, and of fellowship. I hope when the measure is brought up in the House, that the Opposition will assist with their co-operation towards making Saskatchewan a place where our youth will have a more intensive knowledge of our country and of our Empire, where they will honour the flag of our British forefathers, express loyalty to the King. Yes, and gratitude to Divine Providence that they are part of the citizenship of the greatest of all commonwealths, the British Empire, and that in the near future they will assist Saskatchewan to take its rightful place as one of the brightest units of that great Empire.

Mr. Speaker, let me, in conclusion, express the appreciation of the constituents of Morse to the Honourable Premier with respect to the kindness shown to their member on this occasion. The member for Morse is delighted to associate himself with that expression of thanks. I therefore beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*):

“That an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, as follows:—

TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE H. W. NEWLANDS,
Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,—

We, His Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present Session.”

MR. J. R. TAYLOR, M.L.A.

(Wadena)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to second the motion of the honourable member for Morse (*Mr. Eades*), I wish to join with him in extending congratulations to you, Sir, upon your election to the high office of Speaker of this Assembly. I would also join with him in extending congratulations to the Premier of this Province upon his elevation to that high and honoured position; and at the same time I would extend to him my thanks, and the appreciation of the constituency of Wadena for the honour conferred upon them by selecting their representative to second this motion.

It is with much hesitation that I endeavour to express myself in the midst of such dignity and splendour, but, if the honourable members will bear with me in proportion to their ability and my limitations, I think perhaps there will be sufficient latitude granted me to express myself for the first time in this Assembly.

I may say, Sir, that this is not the first occasion upon which the constituency of Wadena has shown its independence in politics, and been represented by an Independent in this House. Wadena was one of the first constituencies in the Province of Saskatchewan to elect an Independent member when, some years ago, Mr. McKinnon was sent to this Assembly. For a while his was a voice howling in the wilderness, and finally, I regret to say, he returned to the fleshpots of Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of the province we have a Co-operative Government in Saskatchewan. Possibly the present co-operative spirit which is prevalent in the province was influenced in some degree by the splendid spirit of co-operation which has been shown in the Five-Power Naval Disarmament Conference to which reference has been made by the mover of this Address. Surely, the principles of this conference could easily be applied to the business of the province of Saskatchewan, and to advantage.

The situation in this legislature at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat analogous to the situation which existed in the Federal Parliament at Ottawa in the short session of 1926. At that time, the Independent and Progressive members joined with the Government, which was in a minority in the House of Commons, for the good of the country, and united to give a programme of legislature to the country second to none in the history of Canada. Those of us who have watched the development of the two-party system, believe it has outlasted its time. The system is nothing more than just two parties competing for office, thinking more of party than of country. But, out of the minority groups in the Federal House of Commons in 1926, a government was formed and as a result more social legislation was placed on the Statute Books of the country in that short session than during the whole lengthy reign of the Liberal Government which preceded it. During that short session, the West secured much of what is desired and what it had been fighting for. The Old Age Pensions Act was enacted, completion of the Hudson Bay Railway was assured, and the Campbell amendments to the Canada Grain Act were put through. That is an example of what co-operation can do, Mr. Speaker. Broader still, perhaps, was the spirit of co-operation as exemplified by the allied armies in 1918 when the Allies decided on more co-operation and united under one leader to bring the World War to a successful conclusion. I remind you, Sir, that we have on this side of the House a sufficient number of men who volunteered in 1914 to give of their best on behalf of the British Empire, who are now pledged to see to it that the co-operative efforts of the combined groups on this side will be applied to the business of the province in 1930. I say we claim this particular advantage over any other group.

The people of this province are becoming impressed with the realisation that there is an honest endeavour being put forward by this government to implement the agree-

ment entered into by all the parties to your right, Mr. Speaker, with co-operation as the ultimate aim, and, as the days go, and the people have the opportunity to enjoy this Co-operative Administration, it will be possible to ask them to record their support of the co-operation of individuals and groups in the Government of the Province. The people of Saskatchewan must have been impressed with the results achieved in this province by co-operative efforts; and, if co-operation can achieve such wonderful results when applied to the Wheat Pool, the Co-operative Elevators, and so on; if it were applied to all industries, in order to make a real contribution to development and advancement of the province, if to municipalities and to school districts, then it should also be applied to the Legislature and Government of Saskatchewan. I would like to call your attention to the appointment of commissions and to the conferences held in which the Government has gone outside the Government for assistance. The Government has appointed several commissions to deal with matters coming before the Legislature. In this regard, the co-operation has gone much further than some of us on this side of the House asked for, in going outside the Government for assistance in sifting all evidence given before the commissioner's accumulates, a great amount of difference of floor of the House, we shall be in possession of all the facts and all the evidence. As the evidence given before the commissioner's accumulates, a great amount of difference of opinion, generally based on ignorance of the situation, is given, but the commissioner's can sift this evidence and bring in a considered opinion based upon it. In addition to that, the Government has been pleased to call into conference at different times, all people, or organizations of people, that are or should be interested in the welfare of the Province to assist in arriving at a decision as to how certain matters affect them individually or collectively, so that the ultimate decision will be for the good of the majority within the Province, and not of a party or group.

The honourable member for Morse, in moving this motion, has spoken with reference to the Department of Public Health. Public health is the main factor in our lives today. The Province of Saskatchewan—and here, I want to congratulate the former Administration in this regard as well—the Province is very free from epidemics of communicable diseases owing to the great work that has been done. But there is still a duty to be performed, and the Department is endeavouring to cope with that great and growing terror of cancer. I need not enlarge on that, as the matter will be dealt with fully when the legislation is brought down later in the session by the Minister of Public Health (*Hon. Mr. Munroe*). I shall, therefore, pass on to another matter vital in our daily lives—the matter of education.

It has been intimated that there will be several amendments to The School Act, and these are matters of great importance. I believe that, as representative of the most cosmopolitan constituency in Saskatchewan, I should speak for a few moments on education. Education should be such that all the children in our rural communities should be able to attend the public schools and receive a public school education. I believe the Act should be clear and specific and it should not be left to the whims of a local school board to say what form of education we are going to have in any particular district of the province. There has been considerable trouble in the Wadena constituency in the north, with regard to education. I had a letter just the matter of a day or two ago, giving an instance of this. In some cases people have even left the districts because of the trouble existing, and it works a real hardship on the people who have to live under those conditions. Some of them, because of the action of the school board, went into the backwoods to establish a home for themselves where they can live as true Britishers. I find in one school district a condition like this: These men had served their King and Country, and, though the district was not wholly English-speaking, they helped to create conditions which made for the enjoyment of life. They put on a dance to help purchase an organ and placed it in the school, but today, I am informed, this organ is in the church, although paid for by the school. Well, times get hard and while perhaps the best remain, many are forced to leave the district and immediately the control of the rural school passes into the hands of a minority who are absolutely opposed to the traditions of the British race. Many children in the community have not been at school for three years. I wish to make it clear that I am wholly in accord with the position taken by these people. I want to make this statement: If I had children attending that public school, I would be inclined to take the stand of the people who have refused to send their children to the school, because I had the great honour to be born in Scotland were children are taught to strive for that day when "Man to man the world o'er, shall brithers be for a' that"; and because I was taught at my mother's knee, "Thou shalt not bow down to any graven image"—and again, I say, I must agree with those people who refuse to send their children to that public school against the dictates of their own consciences. I would, therefore, advocate or support an amendment to the School Law which would make such conditions impossible in the public schools of this Province.

Mr. Therres: Would I be allowed to ask the honourable member a question: Where is that school situated?

Mr. Taylor: It is school district No. 803, Perigord.

Mr. Therres: Is it in your constituency?

Mr. Taylor: Yes. And I may tell the honourable member for Humboldt, that a somewhat similar condition exists at St. Front, also in the Constituency of Wadena, and in several others too. If the honourable member would like a list I should be glad to prepare one for him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is doing a great work. The question of weeds, today, has become serious in this province and weed eradication has become a vitally important problem. Where we have sloughs and waste lands, we have veritable breeding places for these weeds and the conditions there must be amended by the introduction, either through the Provincial Government or the Federal Government, of a more rigorous policy for the eradication of these weeds around the sloughs and waste lands. The situation in my constituency calls for immediate action. We have a large body of water there known as the Quill Lake and there should be more co-operation between the municipal weed inspectors and the federal and provincial authorities to take that situation in hand. I am living in hopes that, when the natural resources are returned to the province, this Government will be able to do something definite along this line. We are asking municipalities to appoint weed inspectors and making them responsible for keeping their municipalities clean, but at the same time we are leaving these sloughs and waste lands to furnish fresh crop of weeds annually. I think the time has come when we should have legislation to provide further assistance to the municipalities to cope with the conditions.

There is another situation, also, I would like to bring before the House, which enters directly into the affairs of agriculture, and that is in connection with our industries. We have promised, in our platform, to stimulate industrial development in Saskatchewan. Now, Sir, in my opinion, that industrial development should be on the lines most applicable to the conditions and the raw materials which we have in this province. In this connection, I would say that we are neglecting one of the industries that could profitably be developed—an industry based on a Saskatchewan resource, namely: the fur industry. In looking over the revenues derived from furs in Quebec, Manitoba and other provinces of Canada, I find that Saskatchewan is numbered among the "also rans." Yet we have the climate, the food supplies, and everything necessary upon which to base a real, live industry. Seventeen per cent of the furs sold in Canada last year were from fur farms. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that I saw with regret that large shipments of our Canadian fur-bearing animals had been shipped to Germany where they will form a basis for an industry on foreign soil to compete with an industry in our own country. I believe this industry will get more assistance and attention in the future. In those localities where this industry should be flourishing, we have Game Laws by which we are making it very profitable for the man who sets his traps, contrary to the law, two days before the season opens. The enforcement of the law, in the past, has been left largely in the hands of voluntary game guardians, who have been remunerated by getting part of the spoils of another man's theft for informing on him. I would recommend that we do away with this system of game protection altogether, because the money expended in the protection is more than is needed to create a good, live industry. All that the system has done, so far, is to create a certain amount of disregard for the law, which may or may not be enforced at the discretion of the people of the community. Since the present Government took office, we have felt that law enforcement is getting more attention than it ever did in the past. There may have been some criticism levelled at the Government for the different appointments made, but, as a member of the Government group, I have kept in touch with the appointments made, particularly of Justices of the Peace, and I can state that, in this connection, I have found the Attorney General's Department ready to cancel appointments made since September 9, if the men appointed did not come up to the standards expected of them. It is possible mistakes have been made—to err is human—but there is no inclination on the part of the Government to leave a man in a position if he does not measure up to it. I think that is true, at least, I have found it so.

The Department of Telephones and the Department of Public Works have a great deal of work on their hands. We know that Wascaua Lake has been drained and purified, and we know that affairs of the Telephone Department are being investigated. We also believe that there is going to be a definite policy in regard to power as the Government is committed to a provincial development of our hydro system. I hope the same course

will not be followed when the province embarks on this power program in the rural areas as was done in the Telephone Department. I think it is regrettable that the province should have its rural service on a separate scheme from the Telephone System. I think the public would have been better served had it been attached to the Telephone Department. I think the two departments should be co-ordinated so that we would have a real co-operative system that would be in the end a real provincial system. I believe that is something well worth while that should receive consideration. As regards power development, if power can be developed so that the rural districts will be able to benefit from it, whether that development be under public or private ownership, I stand prepared to support it. In developing this system, however, we must remember those homes in the rural districts, that are somewhat handicapped in the line of hydro development. There is no farmer here who has cows, pigs, and chickens—all in separate houses, but who has to go out with a lantern to attend to them in the winter evenings. We are continually urging the people of the province to go into mixed farming, but mixed farming today in Saskatchewan is drudgery, and that must be taken into consideration when we are dealing with rural hydro development. Up to the present, however, we have had no definite scheme for rural development in that line.

The same thing applies in the matter of highways. We have been endeavouring for years to get roads that would start somewhere and go somewhere, and we have been confronted with conditions in the past where the roads were not completed but just a stretch here and there. Admittedly, a great deal of work has been done on the highway system of the province, but a great deal has been left undone that ought to have been done. It seems to me that in order to complete the vast system of highways, which we have in this Province, it might be in order to call upon the Highways Department for a much larger grant than ever has been made before. This will be necessary, if we are to bring to completion the main market road system as well as to complete the three all-weather highways east and west, and the two running north and south, which we hope to see completed in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, there are many new members on the Government side of the House and we have much to learn. The old members, however, have much to forget; but if, during the time we are in this Legislature, we try to elevate discussion to a higher plane, particularly the attacks made upon the legislative programme of the Government, and if we try to know each other better and work together for the best interests of the Province, irrespective of party, we shall justify our presence here and have something to look back upon with pleasure.

This is the first attempt at co-operative government in Saskatchewan, the first time co-operative effort has been applied to government in this province, and the first real attempt to give Saskatchewan a real business-like Government. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion moved in such eloquent terms by the honourable member for Morse.

MR. J. G. GARDINER, B.A., LL.D., M.L.A.

(*North Qu'Appelle*)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—It is with considerable pleasure that I arise on this occasion to express my appreciation of the very fine way the mover and seconder of the resolution now before the House have acquitted themselves in this their “maiden” effort within this Chamber. I was reminded, when the honourable member for Morse (*Mr. Eades*) rose in his place, that sixteen sessions ago, from much the same position in the House, I had the privilege of doing the same thing as he has done today. I hope I was as successful on that occasion in maintaining the high standard in that debate that he and the honourable member for Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*) were able to set in this debate.

Those of us who have been in the House in the sessions intervening between then and now have had an opportunity of serving the people of our constituencies, and at the same time the people of the province at large and also the people of the Dominion of Canada because, after all, the duties performed in this Legislature redound to the benefit of all Canada. As members, therefore, we have been contributing our share to the advancement of the Dominion.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, we, as a Liberal party, are to be found on Opposition benches in this Legislature for the first time in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan. I do not know of any better circumstances under which we could be in that position than those confronting us at the present time. Of course, we would have preferred that the people on June 6, last, had chosen once more the Liberal party to function as the Government of Saskatchewan but, since that has not been done, we wish to express our appreciation to the electorate, from this side, for having placed us in the position we are today, with 28 members on this side in one well-organised and aggressive party as the Opposition to a Government party consisting of three separate groups sitting on the other side.

Before going on to deal with the question whether we have a Co-operative Government or a Tory Government in the Province of Saskatchewan, I wish, on behalf of those on this side of the House and more particularly of those here before, to welcome all new members here for the first time, and to express the firm belief that each of those members will put forth their best efforts and give of the best of their abilities to promote the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan. If, on occasion, we find it necessary, as members of the Opposition, to criticise members who form part of the Government or members who support those who form part of the Government, I trust that those on that side will believe us when we say that we are trying to do what we consider to be our duty in the best interests of Saskatchewan.

I propose to deal with some few remarks made by the mover and seconder but, before going on to that, may I extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations upon the honour done to you in your elevation to the office of First Commoner in your first term and during the first term of the new Government.

Some references have been made by proponents of the motion now before the House to the elections of last year. I am not going to take up much time of the House in this connection further than to say this: We on this side of the House represent 151,000 votes cast on June 6, last, and, in view of what has transpired since that time on the other side of the House, I do not think even they themselves know just how many votes they represent. Since June 6, last, a session of this Legislature has been held at which, as already stated, the Liberal Government of twenty-four years passed out of existence, and a new Government has taken its place — and there have been some doubts and controversy as to whether the new Government is a Co-operative Government, a Tory Government, or some other kind of Government. I suppose that, under our system of government, it does not matter much what you call it; but under

our system there are only two bodies which are recognised in a British Legislature — the majority and the minority, the majority forming the Government, the minority the Opposition.

The member who seconded the motion now before the House (*Mr. Taylor*) commented on the new state of affairs in the Province of Saskatchewan. I wish to state through you, Mr. Speaker; that no new condition has been set up in connection with this matter in this Legislature. Those sitting on your right, we presume, support the Government and those on your left (that is, on this side) oppose the Government and its policies and on that fact alone we have a Legislature in Saskatchewan organised exactly in the same way and on the same principles as every other Legislature or House of Commons throughout the British Empire where we have organised responsible government.

There have been some people who have advocated co-operative government not only in Saskatchewan but outside it. On all occasions, however, when anyone has advocated co-operative government or group government, they have defined that system of government as one having in its membership representatives of all parties in the House. The so-called co-operative system of government is impossible so long as you have, in the Legislature, a government party and an opposition party. So, Sir, in Saskatchewan today, we cannot have what is truly a co-operative government. In the past, the parties have not chosen the names of their governments, Grit or Tory, Liberal or Conservative, and so forth. They were usually given their names because of some distinguishing feature, because of the policies they adopted, or because of the legislation they enacted; and I believe that, in time, this Government will be named and classified in accordance with the principles laid down in the legislation they place on the Statute Books and their attitude towards the administration of certain departments of the government.

Looking at the Government today, we are told it is composed of twenty-four Conservatives, one of whom is now in the Chair, leaving 23 Conservatives who, together with six Independents and five Progressives make a total of 34 on the floor of the House.

Premier Anderson: Might I correct the honourable gentleman: One of the Conservatives is not in the Chair.

Mr. Gardiner: I think my honourable friend will agree that there are 34 on the floor of the House of whom eleven belong to the Progressive and Independent groups, and, if you take 11 away from 34 you have 23 Conservatives. No! I am wrong! I see your point now. I note now that he (*Mr. Speaker*) has been replaced in the group occupying these Independent or Progressive benches by a dyed-in-the-wool Conservative. But possibly I am justified in what I said for, when he sat over here on this side of the House, he sat among the Conservatives. So probably I am right after all. I do not wonder that my friends opposite have much trouble in distinguishing among their members!

The result of the vote in the September session was that 28 members were to go from that side of the House over to this side and that the 35 who sat here were to go over to the other side, not as a Co-operative Government but as a Government into which have gone seven of the 24 members elected as Conservatives, and one man who was elected as an Independent — a Government into which two members have gone as Ministers without portfolio. This again is a real indication, Mr. Speaker, as to what is the real cast of this Government. Thirty-five men, as I stated, went over to that side of the House and, in order to form a Government which they could call "Co-operative" (though, after all it is only a coalition dominated by the Tories) it was found necessary to place eight Tories in the Cabinet, and two men without portfolio and to place one man on the payroll of the province as Speaker of this House (and I say that without criticism) and one man as Deputy Speaker. When you total this, you will find that 12 out of the 35 members on the Government side of the House have been placed on the payroll of the province in addition to receiving the regular sessional indemnities. That is an indication of what this so-called Co-operative Government is costing this province and is in keeping with the established fact that coalition governments are more costly than any other form ever set up in every province of the Dominion in which that form has been tried, even when tried at the centre of the Empire itself.

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I strongly object to having yourself and the Deputy Speaker, who are always to be found in every Legislature,

included in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. We are quite prepared to take the responsibility in regard to any petty criticism directed against the Government, but, as Leader of the Government and as a member of this House, I strongly protest against the honourable gentleman including you, Mr. Speaker, and the Deputy Speaker in his remarks.

Mr. Gardiner: I think when I made the remark with regard to yourself, Mr. Speaker, I was careful to suggest that I was not reflecting in any way upon yourself or your position.

Premier Anderson: It was uncalled for. You should withdraw the remark. It is a reflection upon the Speaker.

Mr. Gardiner: It is a statement of fact. Why should I withdraw it?

Turning now to the Speech from the Throne itself, Mr. Speaker, I propose to discuss some of the matters contained in it and to give some of the reasons why I do not intend to support the motion now before the House. These reasons have to do not only with the subject-matter of the Speech but also with the remarks made from time to time by members of the Government as to the legislation based upon that Speech which we have been led to expect and as to the Government's policies as enunciated by those now included in the Government.

Some mention has been made of the highways of the province. Something is said in the Speech from the Throne with regard to the Government's intentions in the matter of highways, and something also has been said in this connection by previous speakers in this debate. In order to bring the matter clearly before the House, I shall read the mention made of highways in the Speech from the Throne contained in the following brief paragraph:

"Better roads and a resulting increased stimulus to business, with improved facilities for the transportation to market of the produce of the farm, are the aims of my Government in formulating the highways policy that will be placed before you."

Now, Sir, during the election campaign and since that campaign we have had certain criticisms of the highways policy of the late Government and we have also had certain indications of what would be the highways policy of the new Government. I would call your attention to this fact, Mr. Speaker: We have had many statements from the Leader of the Government in connection with this matter to the effect that he intended to carry out every one of the promises he made while the election campaign was on. Now the policy of the Conservative party insofar as the highways are concerned as enunciated by the present Leader of the Government was that of doing away with the Department of Highways and there was to be a Highways Commission appointed to administer the building and maintenance of highways, and that was to be independent of politics altogether. We were to have funds voted by this Legislature turned over to the Highways Commission to be expended by that Commission independent of the Legislature itself. We, for our part, did raise certain criticisms of this policy during the election campaign and did not advocate the adoption of such a policy, but I would like to know from the Minister himself if it still is his intention or the intention of his Government to do away with the Department of Highways and to set up a Highway Commission, because on the answer to that question will depend somewhat my own attitude to the debate in connection with this particular subject. I am prepared to await an answer from the honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Anderson: I am afraid my honourable friend is dreaming. I have never at any time made the statement that the Highways Department is to be done away with. It might be the "Red Book" (*Liberal Handbook*) he is thinking of.

Mr. Gardiner: My honourable friend can be quoted on many occasions, both from the Liberal press and the so-called "Independent" press of this province, to the effect that it was his intention to do away with the Highways Department. In case he has forgotten what his own platform said, I shall read to him what was drafted at the Conservative convention held at Saskatoon. This is headed "Conservative Platform" and, in one section you will find these words:

"Resolved, that this convention favours the creation of a Highways Commission, independent politically, to have jurisdiction over the building and maintenance of all roads and bridges constructed with, or maintained out of, provincial funds."

Premier Anderson: But that does not say "doing away with the Highways Department!"

Mr. Gardiner: No? I will read it to you again:

"Resolved, that this convention favours the creation of a Highway Commission, independent politically, to have jurisdiction over the building and maintenance of all roads and bridges constructed with, or maintained out of, provincial funds."

Nothing could be clearer than that, and in spite of that the Leader of the Opposition — I beg pardon — we have been accustomed for seventeen years to referring to the Opposition that I may be forgiven for doing so on this occasion. It is difficult to get away from the habit. The Leader of the Government and those who supported him in constituencies of this province contended that the Highways Department should be done away with and a Highway Commission set up in its stead. Today, the Leader of the Government says he never made such a statement. He says today that it is not his intention to set up a commission of this kind.

Premier Anderson: No.

Mr. Gardiner: What does my honourable friend say?

Premier Anderson: I said "No!" If the honourable member will be patient he will hear all about highways before the end of this month — more than he has heard in a long while.

Mr. Gardiner: Then there have been other criticisms of the Department of Highways than that it should not be administered by a responsible Minister of the Government. One of the criticisms was that the highway system of the province was of a "patchwork" character and one speaker said that they were so designed that they started nowhere and ended nowhere. I venture to make this prophecy: that by the end of this season the system of highways laid down in 1919 by the Liberal Government and the system prosecuted by that Government up to the present time will not be changed upon the map of Saskatchewan.

I am going to make this further prophecy: that if the present Government and the Conservative party remain in power long enough to build any considerable portion of that system of highways, the work which they will undertake to bring that system to a further stage of completion will be more truly "patchwork" than the work carried on in the last eight years by the Liberal Government. That must necessarily be so.

During the past summer they have been indicating that they are going to construct No. 1 highway. I am going to tell them that No. 1 highway is constructed up to earth standard all across the province, and a considerable part of it is gravelled and, consequently, the only work necessary to be done is the "patchwork" to recondition one section; and so far as gravelling is concerned, it is only necessary to place the gravel on sections which have been reconditioned and are ready for gravelling. So I say that is more truly a "patchwork" system than the building of the foundations of the road in the form of first-class grades from the Manitoba to the Alberta boundaries.

My friend the honourable member for Morse, (*Mr. Eades*), in referring to the mileage of provincial highway completed and the money spent, expressed the hope that when the inspectors went out (I understood they were going to do away with inspectors) they would be able to locate them all. Let me tell him that, if he goes out, he will find that every inch of the 4,000 miles of provincial highway actually is there, built to standard; and I venture to state that he will find that we got value for the money expended on any mile of road pictured on the map of the province.

When my honourable friends were out in the country in the election campaign and saying that they were going to build three permanent highways, east and west, they were enunciating a policy which they themselves are very doubtful they will ever put into effect. Why so? Because they found, when they took over the reins of office, that a great part of No. 1 highway was constructed and a considerable portion of it gravelled. They found that, on highway No. 14 (concerning which they had a delegation 400 strong), out of the 325 miles of that highway, only 120 miles remained to be constructed. They would find a few bad portions in the constituency of my honourable friend from Wadena, it is true, but in regard to No. 5 highway, they found a greater percentage of that highway from the Manitoba boundary along the present line of the Canadian National Railway to the town of Warman had been constructed up to the same standard. They found, as they went over the different

highways of the province, that from two-thirds to three-quarters of everyone of the important highways had been constructed during the past eight years by the Government that was in power. The work that is going to be done by any Government, therefore, is going to be more truly "patchwork" than that done by any Government in the past, if they are going to proceed to construct those highways now in the system and which I believe will be in whatever system is ultimately determined upon.

There was another matter brought up a few moments ago which is also the subject of a resolution, notice of which was given in the House today. I refer to the Trans-Canada Highway, and Federal aid in connection with the building of that highway. That is not a new matter here, Mr. Speaker. A year ago, the member for Touchwood (*Mr. J. M. Parker*) moved a similar resolution and it was passed unanimously by the House. At that time the Government of Saskatchewan was the only Government in Canada, in season and out of season, that advocated consistently the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway by the Canadian Government. The only party which took it up was the Conservative party in the House of Commons which, last year, backed a resolution to that effect. Those who attended the Good Roads Convention of a year ago will remember that representatives of this Government pressed for construction by the Federal Government of the Trans-Canada Highway and it was not passed. Let me repeat: This Government at Good Roads Conventions at Hamilton, the Coast, at Regina and elsewhere has been the advocate of a Trans-Canada Highway built by the Federal Government. That is another reason why I believe the present Government will not follow out the promises they made a year ago when they advocated the policy of constructing three permanent all-weather highways running east and west across the province.

After all, what kind of roads have been built in this province? They have been earth roads. They have been inter-urban roads. They have been built as foundations to form an inter-urban system between the towns and villages of the province and to serve as market roads for the farmers of the province. That is what they were built for; and, incidentally, they have become trans-provincial roads and finally inter-provincial roads.

There is a good reason why No. 1 highway will not ultimately be the Trans-Canada road and it is this: If you start at the city of Brandon and follow along No. 1 to the city of Calgary, you will go 150 miles further than you need to travel because of the departure from a straight line which the road takes through Saskatchewan to get from one point outside the province on the east side to another point outside the province on the west side. We have no highways as they have in the United States that can be described as through arteries of trade such as our railways are. I believe there is more necessity for a Department of Highways at Ottawa at the present time than for a Department of Railways. The great arteries of transportation so far as the railways are concerned are pretty well defined but the work of providing these great arteries of trade running from north to south and from east to west are more truly a Federal matter than some of the railways which were financed by the Federal Government. Why is that so?

We had quoted to us a few moments ago, the figures representing the tourist traffic of the Dominion; but if we had those great trade routes, the greatest part of the revenues derived from them would be going into the Federal Treasury, simply because they are arteries of trade. This applies not only to the roads running east and west, but also those running from south to north to the National Park. Trade or traffic going from south to north would be taxable through customs duties and thus would go into the Federal Treasury. Revenue on cars and trucks purchased collectable under the customs tariff would also go to the Federal Treasury; and in all kinds of ways, moneys would go not into the Provincial Treasury but into the Federal Treasury. Therefore, I repeat, inter-provincial highways, trans-Canada highways are national highways and should be built by the Government of Canada and we on this side of the House are proud to have been pioneers in the advocacy of that policy and I assure my friends on the other side that, when the time comes to vote on the resolution, notice of which has been given, we on this side will be for it.

I do not believe my honourable friend is going to set up an independent Highway Commission. I still believe he is going to let the Minister of Highways be responsible for highways and, while I have no confidence in his policy as a policy, I am going to believe that the Minister of Highways will agree that a road that will take tourists 150 miles out of their way, is not the road to be an Inter-Provincial Highway. Then I want to say this to my friends on the opposite side. I would like to point out to the members living on highway No. 13, which runs through Arcola, Weyburn, Assiniboia

and Shaunavon, branches out at Kincaid and thence to Maple Creek, with only a small section between Maple Creek and Vanguard to be completed or linked up, that it is the straightest and shortest road I know of across the southern part of the province. It is as straight as lakes and rivers will permit it to be.

When you start at one end of No. 1 on the Manitoba boundary and travel across the province, you pass through the constituencies of ten Tory members sitting in this House. But, when you start at Antler on the Manitoba boundary on No. 13, you pass first through Cannington, Francis, Weyburn and Milestone and so, although you travel many miles less, you travel through the constituencies of Independent and Progressive members. That is the difference.

The same conditions apply in connection with the three roads which the Government has said it would build across the province. I have checked them over very carefully and what I find is this: Fifteen out of the 24 Tory members in the House live on one or other of those roads, and, if they do a little squirming around, as I expect they will, they might eventually get 30 of the 35 members on that side located on some part of those roads.

How are they going to build those roads?

During the election, we were told by members of the present Government that it was their intention to borrow \$20,000,000 for road construction, which future generations would have to pay for. Well, I met my friend the Leader of the Government since the election, and we had occasion to discuss this plank in the Conservative platform and, at the time, I was not in possession of the campaign literature gotten out by the Conservative party. I referred to the statement that these roads were to be of a permanent nature which would cost in the neighbourhood of \$30,000 or \$40,000 a mile, and that statement was immediately denied. When I got back home, I found a statement in an election pamphlet gotten out by the Conservative party that the only way to build roads was the old Roman way with a foundation of solid rock and on it some sort of finishing material.

Now, I submit to members of this Legislature, that, to build three roads of this kind, two across the province and one north to the National Park, will cost an average of from \$40,000 to \$50,000 a mile and even more than that in certain sections of the province. I have no doubt, however, that, since my honourable friends have taken their places over the Treasury benches, they have arrived at other and very definite conclusions with regard to the building of highways. They find themselves day by day drawing closer to the policy formulated by the Liberal party when it was in power in this province and now they are coming to the place where, instead of advocating three roads, they are willing to advocate at least five or six roads, three from east to west across the province and three from south to north. Well, Sir, when we were in power, we were building sixteen main roads, eight going north and south and eight east and west.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You were building 52.

Mr. Gardiner: No. Only sixteen. My friend is confusing the number of sections; but if he remains long enough in office, he will get some of the confusion removed from his mind and get back to the old Liberal policy. And he is going in that direction, for we had been spending about \$5,000,000 a year on the average on these sixteen highways and now I find my friend is going to build five or six instead of the three they spoke about, and he is going to spend somewhere around \$500,000 or \$6,000,000 and not \$20,000,000, which approximates more nearly the policy we followed.

What I would like to ask the Leader of the Government at this stage is this: Is he going to carry out to the letter and the word the policies he has been enunciating to the people, more particularly the policies he enunciated during the last election campaign? I know he has done it to the extent of dismissing a number of \$100-a-month liquor vendors, and I know he carried it out to the extent of dismissing a number of good men from the Highways Department, who gave good service to that department.

Government Member: Good political service!

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, my friend. It is always good politics to build roads. Well, my friends will find, if they are there long enough, that the only way to get votes from the people is by giving good service to the people; and the Department of Highways, from 1905 down to 1929, did give good service to the people of Saskatchewan.

The only thing he has done, according to his own statement, is to fire 18 men. When my friend was in Rosetown, he calculated that he had fired between 300 and 400 men, but when he went down to Toronto, probably acting on the advice of some of his Tory friends, he got up and explained that he had not fired that many, that, in fact, he had fired only 18! It all comes back to this: They were so much more interested in functioning as a political party rather than as a Government that they fired 180 employees of the Highways Department. I met a friend who had been in the employ of the department for many years and he said to me, "That's some Government."

Premier Anderson: Was that Jim Cameron?

Mr. Gardiner: No. Nor "Snort" Williamson either. They did not need to fire this man, nor send letters of dismissal to the supervisors for, if they had just contented themselves for a week or two, the snow would have been on the ground and all of them would have automatically quit work and could not have worked again until the spring. That explains the difference between the figures my friend the Leader of the Government used and those of the Minister of Highways, when the Premier said 18 and the other 180 men had been dismissed. One spoke of those in the employ of the department, and the other of those on the Civil Service list.

There is another question in regard to highways. They said they were going to gravel highways, but they were going to carry on with No. 1 until it was completed. What did they do? They cancelled contracts on other roads, and despite all they said in the last Legislature and during the election campaign, they transferred equipment and men from one part to another without calling for tenders. Even the American contractor, about whom so much was said, was transferred and all were concentrated on No. 1. Then the snow came and we found ourselves in this position: No. 1 was buried over a foot in snow while highways in other parts of the province had no snow on them at all, and the gravelling could have been carried on in the northern and central parts of the province for a considerable while after work stopped on No. 1. This province proved too big for the policy enunciated by the Minister of Highways and the Leader of the Government. The latter apparently still thinks he lives in the eastern part of Canada, Mr. Speaker, but we are living in a territory which stretches from north to south as well as from east to west and we cannot bind ourselves, living in that territory, to a policy applicable to conditions prevailing in another section of Canada. What I want to say to my friend is this: You cannot have a cut and dried policy in regard to highway construction in a province like Saskatchewan. If the Minister of Highways is going to have a cut and dried policy, he will find himself in a short time confronted with difficulties. He will find such a policy unworkable and will be forced eventually to adopt other measures which have been found more efficient and more practicable both for the province and for road building in it, and that policy is the policy which was laid down by the Liberal Government when it was in power.

I would like to say to my honourable friend the member for Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*), that the criticism he is now hearing is constructive criticism. I would say this, that if the Minister of Highways tries to apply his policy, he will find himself in difficulties. How is it possible to lay out a definite programme of highway construction in a province of such vast proportions as Saskatchewan? If he applies that policy, work may be started in any part of the province late in the season which might have to be abandoned through weather conditions, which might make it impossible to do any further work during that season, with the result that time would be lost, and the department would be precluded from doing any work in other parts where conditions happened to be more favourable, because the money would be available only for that construction programme approved by the Legislature and for which it had been specifically voted.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is it not a fact that the province of Manitoba and the province of Alberta bring down a cut and dried policy in respect to highway construction on to the floor of the House?

Mr. Gardiner: They may do it in Manitoba and Alberta, but that is not to say that it can be applied properly to Saskatchewan. If the Minister takes a look at the Road Map hanging in his office, he will find that in Manitoba the highway area forms a very limited triangle with its base from the Lake of the Woods on the American boundary to the Saskatchewan inter-provincial boundary. If he looks at the enclosed area he will find that the province of Manitoba has a very small area in which there is highway construction as compared with the area in Saskatchewan. I think he will find that the highway system of Manitoba approximates 1,600 miles, whereas that of

Saskatchewan is 7,300 miles. I think he will find also that the Alberta highway system contains 2,600 miles as compared with the 7,300 in this province. That is, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan the provincial highway system is three times as long as the Alberta system and nearly five times as long as that in Manitoba. Thus what applies in Manitoba and Alberta need not necessarily apply to the province of Saskatchewan.

So much for the system itself. Let me now say something in criticism of the claim of the Government that they are going to save a considerable sum of money by the firing of these 18 road inspectors. I happen to have here a statement of the amount road inspection has cost this province in years gone by. In 1921, the total cost of road inspection was \$132,902. In 1922, which was the first year I was Minister of Highways, it cost us \$100,000 to inspect the highways of the province and when I say highways, I include the work done in the municipalities as well. Then we cut the cost in 1923 to \$83,000 and in 1924 we went up a little to \$84,000. Then in 1925 it rose a little higher, to \$94,000 and in 1928, the cost of this service was \$94,770. In other words, the cost of highway inspection every year since 1921 has been lower than it was in 1921, and there was a reason why the cost of inspection was higher in years prior to 1921. It was in those years, the entire road building programme of the province was mapped out and during that time inspections were being made all over the province as the programme was being laid out; and let me repeat that so well was the work done by the inspectors at that time (and they were not all engineers) that the Government in power from 1921 to 1929 did not find it necessary, except on very few occasions, to depart from the survey made at that time and to change the position of roads. Even the present Government will not change those locations materially in their building programme, so well and efficiently was the work done.

I can quite understand the argument of the Minister of Highways when he says that dividing the province into eight districts and placing in those districts eight engineers and eight assistant engineers to take over the work of road maintenance and construction throughout the province -- I can quite understand, I say, that that may make for efficiency, but I cannot understand his argument or see how he possibly can cheapen the cost to the province, if it is going to cost \$250,000 or even \$150,000 when it has cost no more than \$94,870.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: How does it come about that in 1924, their expenses averaged \$2,500 and last year the average jumped to \$3,400?

Premier Anderson: It was election year!

Mr. Gardiner: Not all the years mentioned were election years; but the explanation is this: When I went into the department in 1922, there were 27 inspectors and consequently their mileages were not so high. The first thing I did when I went in was to cut down the number of inspectors to 14, so I dismissed almost as many as my honourable friends did although I did not make so much fuss about it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. And I got the rest of them!

Mr. Gardiner: Why did I find the expenses higher, thereafter? Simply because each inspector had a larger territory to cover. I found also that, when you are seeking gravel pits as we have been doing, your inspectors are driving from one point to another inspecting pits and consequently, their mileages have risen higher. The inspectors had to be on the ground, as well as locating pits, to keep check on the run of gravel. I am sure if my honourable friend went down to his department and enquired, he would get a full explanation of all those expense accounts.

I do not think it necessary to criticise the highway programme at this stage. I believe it is the intention of the Government to bring down what they are pleased to call a new policy, and have the House approve their detailed road-building programme. When that is brought down, members on this side will be able to compare it fully with our good work in years past and I think they will find, even if they think it necessary to institute a system of inspection by engineers, that the more efficient and the less expensive policy is that established during the years we were in office.

With regard to the Power policy of the Government, I think that, possibly, to prevent any misunderstanding, I should read the Power plank in the Conservative platform used in the last election:

"Recognising that industry is yearly becoming more diversified in Saskatchewan, and appreciating as we do that it is in the interest of all our citizens

both rural and urban to secure electric power at the cheapest possible rate; and recognising that we have great natural resources in the southern part of our province in our great coal deposits and in the northern part of our province in our great water powers:

"Therefore, be it resolved, that the Conservative party pledges itself to develop as a publicly owned and operated utility the generation of electrical energy from said coal deposits and water powers for the use of the people of this province, so soon as the population, wealth and industry of the province will warrant same being done in any given area, and that in the meantime the power plants of the Province of Saskatchewan should be operated under rigid control and supervision of the Government."

Therefore, by a resolution in convention of the Conservative party, that party committed itself to a policy of public ownership of power in the province of Saskatchewan. This is the most important part of the resolution, however:

"So soon as the population, wealth and industry of the province will warrant same being done in any given area"

The point I wish to make in regard to that is that we have in this House three well-defined groups so far as a power policy in Saskatchewan is concerned. We have on this side, the Liberal party, which in its time as the Government of this province, decided upon and made provision in the statutes for public ownership of power; and in this connection I may point out that it was not stated by the then Government either during the session at which the legislation was passed or in the election campaign, that it was the intention of the Government to go out and secure all the power plants in Saskatchewan. When Regina decided to keep their own power plant, that was still public ownership, and it was not necessary for us to do anything pursuant to our policy of public ownership. On the other hand, when the city of Saskatoon started to negotiate with someone else and by these negotiations indicated a desire to dispose of their plant, the Government stepped in and stepped in so effectively that Saskatoon decided to deal with the Government and not with any private company. What I want to point out is this: In the negotiations with Saskatoon the necessities of the case were just as urgently put forward by private companies as in the case of Moose Jaw, but under the Liberal Government we were successful in saving to public ownership in this province the vast consumption of power that takes place in the second largest city in Saskatchewan.

We were criticised in the election campaign and during the last session because we had allowed certain smaller centres in the province to dispose of their plants to private interests but, when I look through the report of the Power Commission, I find that more than 80 per cent. of all the power consumed in Saskatchewan is in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw and that less than 20 per cent. is consumed in the province outside these three large cities. I am reminded also that in the province outside the three large cities the consumption of power is estimated for 1935 as 26,482,000 kilowatt hours — that is the difference between total estimated for the province, 175,339,000 K.W.H., and the estimated consumption in the three larger cities, namely, 148,857,000 K.W.H. — whereas the estimated consumption in Moose Jaw is given at 32,457,000 K.W.H. In other words, there is a greater consumption of power in the city of Moose Jaw alone than in the entire province of Saskatchewan outside these three large cities. When the Liberal Government was in power during the seven months following the close of the last full session of this House, a number of plants were taken over by the Saskatchewan Power Commission. One of the reporters for the local press in his summary of the report of the Power Commission included some facts taken from the report of the Local Government Board in connection with sales of plants. He makes this statement in his review:

"The ten plants now under the control of the Saskatchewan Power Commission, together with the amount of money involved in each case follows:

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| City of Saskatoon | \$1,500,000 |
| Leader | 5,000 |
| Prelate | 10,500 |
| Rosthern | 16,240 |
| Humboldt | 42,000 |
| Wynyard | 2,850 |
| Wadena | 6,500 |
| Elfros | 5,500 |

Then there are the plants at Shellbrook and Sceptre which are under the control of the Commission but in which no money is involved as there was no debenture indebtedness. I think I am correct when I state that the Orders-in-Council for every one of those transactions was signed by the Government while this province was still under Liberal rule.

Then there is given a list of those plants which were disposed of to private concerns, as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Broadview | \$ 16,600 |
| Melville | 175,000 |
| Davidson | 120,000 |
| Estevan | 250,000 |
| Fleming | 2,000 |
| Radville | 35,000 |
| Govan | 14,300 |
| Nokomis | 17,000 |
| Oxbow | 13,000 |
| Wilkie | 26,000 |
| Strasbourg | 12,000 |
| Wapella | 4,000 |
| Saltcoats | 16,000 |
| Canora | 59,900 |
| Lumsden | 2,500 |
| Rouleau | 20,000 |
| Yellow Grass | 9,700 |
| Avonlea | 4,500 |
| Wilcox | 5,700 |
| Fillmore | 5,000 |

That is a total of 20 smaller plants, and the total amount paid for those plants by the private companies, in spite of the fact that the amount paid in many cases was much in excess of the cost of the plants themselves, was approximately \$800,000. In the city of Moose Jaw a vote was taken and it was decided to dispose of their plant. How much was involved in that deal? A sum of \$2,875,500! That is, Mr. Speaker, from the time the legislation was brought down in this House to the time the present Government took over, the amount involved in transactions under which plants were disposed of to private companies was less by \$2,000,000 than the amount involved in the sale of the Moose Jaw plant when the present Government was in power.

What I want to say is this: While we were criticised by the present Government when they were the Opposition in this House for letting small municipal plants go into the hands of private companies, the amount involved in the case of plants that did go to these companies was only \$800,000, whereas, since they came into power a few months ago, the Moose Jaw plant involving the huge sum of \$2,875,500 has gone into the hands of a private company.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Would you have stopped them?

Mr. Gardiner: I need only point to the honourable gentleman's own city (Saskatoon).

Premier Anderson: You did not get what you wanted there.

Mr. Gardiner: We got the plant. That's the main thing. We have put into effect the principle of public ownership of power in this province. In the platform of the Conservative group, they advocated the production of power from the coal deposits and water powers under public ownership and at the same time they criticised us because private companies purchased those small plants.

What I want to say to the Leader of the Government at this time is this: Judging from his remarks and contrasting them with his inaction in the case of the Moose Jaw plant sale, he has given us to believe on this side of the House that he has departed from what he led us to believe would be the policy of the Conservative party if it got into power. We will await, on this occasion, the pronouncement of his policy in regard to this particular matter. We still adhere to the principle of public ownership which we carried into effect and in opposition we will act in this connection in the same manner as we did when we were in power.

Just before leaving the power question, I noted particularly the remark of my honourable friend from Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*) in discussing this situation, to the effect that we should not start on one policy of public ownership before we have completed another and he went on to infer that there was not 100 per cent. public ownership in regard to the telephone system in the province. I cannot reconcile that statement of his with his remarks with regard to co-operation; but we have some 70,000 rural telephones in this province and the part of the system which is not owned and operated by the Government Department of Telephones is owned and operated by the local people in the communities, who have done so much to build up what we have in Saskatchewan today. In other words, the responsibility has been placed on the local people to provide by debentures for their own local lines and before we thought of undertaking the public ownership of power plants we had practically 100 per cent. public ownership in telephones. So effective has been the policy of Liberal Governments in this province with regard to telephones — and I may be pardoned in calling this matter to the attention of my friend who is so solicitous about those of us who are living on the farms — that, since the telephone system was inaugurated in 1908, if he checks up I think he will find that there are three times as many telephones on farms in Saskatchewan as in the provinces of Alberta or Manitoba where they have the Government-owned system he was advocating a moment ago, rather than the public-owned system of Saskatchewan. If it was service he was advocating, then I would say that the system in Saskatchewan is more efficient and more to the liking of the people of this province than that in the provinces on either side of us.

Mr. Speaker: Six o'clock. I shall now leave the Chair.

Resuming at 8 o'clock p.m., Mr. Gardiner said:

Mr. Speaker,—When the House rose, I was endeavouring to indicate that, in connection with a number of policies enunciated by the Conservatives previous to the last election and a number spoken of since the election and since the short session, which we were led to believe would be put into effect, more particularly with regard to highways and power, the Government of today does not intend to carry out these policies as enunciated by them at the time. At the same time I was endeavouring to show why those on this side of the House, whether the criticism be constructive or otherwise, find it difficult to support the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Before the House rose, I had indicated that we would be compelled, because of the statements made since the Government took office, to await the coming down of legislation on these several matters to determine then what the Government proposes to put into effect. In regard to highways, if they are going to put into effect the policy announced before the election then those of us on this side have no option but to oppose the motion. In connection with power, if the Government puts into effect the policy of the Leader himself rather than the policy of the Conservative party, then there might be in the Opposition some support to his proposal. If, however, he is going to put into effect the policy of the Conservative party in convention met, namely "to wait until the population, wealth and industry of the province will warrant it" before going into public ownership, we would be impelled to the view that we are never going to have a publicly-owned power system in this province. Further, so far as the Moose Jaw sale is concerned, it would appear that he is going to follow the policy of the Conservative party rather than that of himself as Leader of the Government.

There is another matter I would like to deal with and that has to do with Civil Service reform. I think it would be well for me, at the outset, to read again from the Platform of the Conservative party on this question:

"Whereas it is common knowledge that employees in the Provincial Government Departments are habitually used as political agents, often against their wishes, in order to maintain the Liberal party in office, and whereas appointments are made under the system of patronage and on the recommendation of duly appointed Chairmen of patronage committees or Liberal members of the Legislature:

"Be it resolved, that this Convention goes on record as favouring the appointment of Government employees by the Civil Service Commission only, and advocates the principle that all selections shall be made on merit and efficiency and not by reason of political affiliations, by introducing the competitive examinations as a test for fitness for those who wish to enter the service. It further protests against the use of Government employees as political agents and workers by the Government."

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the Government has been in power for the past five months and, during that time it has fairly well indicated to the people of this province and more particularly to those on this side, to what extent it intended to carry out the policy of the Conservative party in convention met last spring, in this connection. You will note that there had been "patronage committees" and further that there had been "recommendations from Liberal members of the Legislature" in making appointments to the Civil Service. What I would like to ask the Honourable Minister is this: If that were the policy in the 24 years of Liberal rule in Saskatchewan, has the Government of the day changed that policy in any way? In saying that I am not admitting that there were "patronage committees" sitting in that time, but I am compelled to remark that, so far as my own constituency at least is concerned, patronage committees have been sitting, even at a central point in the constituency, since the present Government came into power; and they have been making recommendations to the Government regarding appointments and dismissals, and some of those have been acted upon by the Government, contrary to the pre-election pledge of the Government. It has not carried out the policy contained in this plank of its platform:

"Be it resolved that this Convention goes on record as favouring the appointment of Government employees by the Civil Service Commission only, and advocates the principle that all selections shall be made on merit and efficiency."

I pointed out to the House this afternoon, that, in connection with the policy of the Minister of Highways (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) regarding dismissals, he was more concerned with political considerations than he was to await the putting into effect of any plank in the Conservative platform dealing with Civil Service reform. I believe the people of this province thought that the Government would take time to search into the records to see if the allegations against the previous Government were sound or not. The people, I believe, expected them to see to it that we had a Civil Service in Saskatchewan that would have removed from it all the evils they had seen in it and which they said did exist. We were told that there are 1,700 Civil Servants in the province and we have been told that there have not been many dismissals. That statement has been made by the Leader of the Opposition

Premier Anderson: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: Well, it may not be long before that is true. I mean, of course, Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the Leader of the Government himself. The Leader of the Government in his home city of Saskatoon, gave an interview in connection with dismissals from the service. I am going to read part of it to the House because some statements in it are very significant:

"There is only one thing we are asking for, efficiency and loyalty in carrying out the policy of the Government. We made it clear during the campaign that those who had served the province faithfully and well and had not been active participants in politics, would not be molested. There are over 1,700 civil servants on the payroll, this not including telephone department and liquor board employees, who are not rated as civil servants. There are 25 less civil servants than when we took over. Out of the 1,700, only 88 have resigned or been dismissed."

Now I do not know whether the Leader of the Government in making that statement has left out of consideration the fact that when a new member is taken on the staff, he or she does not become immediately a member of the Civil Service. They are not considered civil servants until they become permanent employees, which is after a four months probation period, and not before that period is over do they become members of the Civil Service. If there are less, I think he loses sight of the fact that a number were dismissed and new appointments made within the last six months which have not been reported, and the reason for that is that these persons were not yet permanent employees, and such figures would not be forthcoming if a question were asked in the House.

Then he says that 88 were dismissed because of their political activities. If, after 24 years of power in which the Liberal party was engaged in setting up departments and bureaux of the Civil Service they have engaged 1,700 employees, a Government, even a Government so anxious to find cause as this Government is, could only find 88 employees who had engaged in political work (and one gentleman at least in that category was dismissed because he acted as a scrutineer and so this civil servant was dismissed by them for performing a duty which is the duty someone must perform in connection with elections); if, I say, they could only find 88 whom they suspected of having engaged in political activities out of 1,700, then the Civil Service of this province had not been used to any considerable extent by the Liberal Governments of this province during the 24 years they were in power. Then he goes on to say:

"In the liquor and beer stores of this province where political activities were rampant prior to the election, a number of changes have been made. In making them the Government is carrying out its pledge to returned soldiers to give them first consideration."

In connection with the statement that political activities were rampant in the liquor stores, all I wish to say is this: We are in a position to bring down at any time information to show that there has been more politics played in connection with the Liquor Board since September 8, last, than was played since the time the Liquor Board was formed down to September, last. There is more today, as there is more patronage of another kind.

We have no objection to returned soldiers being given appointments in the Civil Service. As a matter of fact, it will be found that a considerable percentage of the civil servants, previous to the last election, were returned soldiers. Indeed, when consideration is given to the fact that the majority of the members of the Civil Service are of the female sex, it will be found that a very large percentage of the remainder were returned soldiers.

The statement in this interview I am particularly interested in is under the heading "asked for resignation":

"I might add that in the Department of Education, over which I preside, out of 143 civil servants only one has been asked for his resignation, and he is not being replaced, as he held a post which was created for him when he sold himself to the Gardiner machine during the Arm River contest. His section, which is not necessary, is being closed down and the one other employee is being transferred."

In connection with that statement, I wish to point out that the one department of the Government that was most criticised because of its alleged activities to gain the support of a certain element of our people was the Department of Education. It was said all over the province that the Department of Education was used for political purposes by showing favour to this class of our people and that class; but now the Premier of the province who is also Minister of Education, comes before the people and says that, in all that department, he has found only one party who was guilty of an offence requiring him to be dismissed. And what reason does he give for dismissing this man? He says that the man supported the Liberal Government in the Arm River by-election and, because of that, he was appointed an inspector of school districts! At that time, he was not a civil servant. He was a school teacher in the constituency. He had always been a Liberal and always worked for the Liberal party if he worked for any party. It was not necessary to "buy" him. When the Leader of the Government says he was "bought," well — if I were in that gentleman's place, I would give the Minister of Education an opportunity to prove his statement. Not so long ago, in 1911, to be exact, he himself was a school teacher, and the Minister of Education of that day offered him a position in the Civil Service and he left the Conservative party during the election campaign of that day to serve the Liberal Government of this province. If I were to use the same argument as my honourable friend . . .

Premier Anderson: You should have fired him.

Mr. Gardiner: Probably we should have fired him. I could give you many more reasons why he should have been fired than have been given for dismissing the school inspector in Arm River. But, if I were to use the same argument as my honourable friend, I would say he was "bought" in 1911.

Then another gentleman was given an appointment. I may tell my honourable friend this, too, that since he became Minister of Education, he has appointed an inspector from Arm River constituency, and I would also say that the gentleman in question worked more ardently for the Liberal party in that election than did the gentleman he fired. But that does not interfere with his efficiency. As a matter of fact, I think you will find him a very efficient civil servant in spite of the fact that he is a Liberal working for a Conservative Government, just as we did with Conservatives in the Civil Service when we were in power.

Returning to the interview from which I have been quoting, it states in conclusion:

"In conclusion, I might say that the whole story of the dismissals will come out in the House."

All I can say to that is that we on this side of the House will await with interest the explanation which the Leader of the Government has promised in justification of these dismissals.

Now, in conclusion in connection with this matter of Civil Service reform, let me say this: So far as Civil Service reform to be undertaken by the Government or the Legislature is concerned, if it is to improve the Civil Service, then we are prepared to give every assistance to the Government to that end. There is no Civil Service in Canada, be it provincial or Federal, that is ideal or as good as it can be. Any efforts that are made to improve the Civil Service of this province will be backed to the limit by members of this Opposition during this or any other session of the Legislature. At the same time, I wish to point out that the Government of this province was not acting in good faith with the people of this province when, immediately after taking over the reins of office, it appointed a Commission to make recommendations to the House and when that Commission was sitting and before the Commission had time to complete its investigations, it proceeded to dismiss civil servants all over the province. When the report of the Commission comes before the House it will be more or less affected by the actions of the Government since it was appointed, and in as much as politics have entered into these actions of the Government, the report to that extent, will have been made ineffective.

I now wish to deal with the question of Natural Resources for a few moments. We had read to the House, this afternoon, the final or latest letter of the Prime Minister of Canada dealing with the return of our natural resources. One of the speakers today (I think the member for Morse) stated that this Government had done more in the five months it had been in power than the Liberal Governments preceding it in the 24 years they had been in power, and I noted that statement met with approval from members opposite.

Now, Sir, there has been no criticism of the present Government because of what they have asked from the Federal Government, and there is a good reason why there has been no such criticism. That is to be found in the fact (as the records will show) that the previous Government asked for practically everything that the present Government has asked for. There was one place we differed, however, and that had to do with the methods taken to secure the settlement. In 1922 a letter from the Hon. Charles A. Dunning to the Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King indicated that, in 1922, there had been a definite line set out by the Government of Saskatchewan with regard to the return of the natural resources, and that line of policy had been made possible because of the offer made in the letter written by the Prime Minister of Canada to the then Premier of Saskatchewan, when he said he was prepared to turn over to the province the natural resources provided the province was prepared to forego the subsidy in lieu thereof. The answer at the time was that the Government of Saskatchewan was not prepared to forego the subsidy they had received in years gone by or were to receive in the years yet to come.

Following the submission of the letter to the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, a new line of action was taken. The three Governments went into a conference to try to secure a better bargain. I think I am correct in saying that, after 1922, the three Governments did not go down to Ottawa together and the reason for that was that Alberta was prepared to accept a settlement from the Federal Government, a settlement which Saskatchewan, at least, was not prepared to accept. Alberta was agreeable to take back their resources and accept their annual subsidy for three years after which time they would forego that subsidy for all time to come. When that offer was made to Saskatchewan, we refused to accept it and we stated that the only proposal we would consider would be based upon a minimum of payment of our subsidy in perpetuity. In addition to that, we asked for the transfer of the School Lands Fund and the amount received by the Federal Government for pre-emptions and purchased homesteads.

As a result of these and other differences, between the demands of Alberta and Saskatchewan there was no settlement with Alberta at the time. Then a later offer was made to Alberta giving them the unalienated resources and, in addition to that, the subsidy of that date in perpetuity which does not come within \$150,000 of our present subsidy. At the time that offer was made the Government of this Province was under my leadership. I went to Ottawa for a conference with the Government there, but before that was held we had an inter-provincial conference in Ottawa. This was in 1927.

There is this to be remembered in connection with this whole question: In 1918, when we had Union Government at Ottawa, a conference was held and the province

was told that it would have to satisfy the claims of the eastern provinces before we could proceed any further. A report of 1918 sets that fact forth.

In the 1927 conference the matter came up for discussion and on that occasion this province was the only province which put forth the claim now being put forth by this Government. We pointed out to the Maritime Provinces that when a settlement with the Maritime Provinces had come up we had not disagreed with it — in fact we had assured them that there should be some settlement made with the Maritime Provinces — but they had been claiming that they had an interest in these western lands and they even claimed that they had an interest in the taxes levied in the province of Saskatchewan on homesteaded lands, such as municipal taxation.

I still remember the attitude of Hon. Mr. Baxter on that occasion, and he stated that these claims were not in the submission of the Maritime Provinces with the approval of his Government, if they were there. We read them to him, and then he stated that he did not think it was the business of the Maritime Provinces to interfere with any settlement in connection with the resources and lands of the western provinces and he concluded with the statement that the better the agreement with the western provinces the better it would be for the Maritime Provinces. I make reference to that fact to show that it was the province of Saskatchewan alone which fought for a better deal than had been made by or offered to the other provinces. Alberta was offered its present subsidy which, I think, is \$150,000 less than our subsidy at this time.

Then in 1929, the same offer was made to Saskatchewan as had been made to Alberta. The Dominion Government said we could have \$750,000, our subsidy at present, in perpetuity, and the same agreement as Alberta. We immediately replied that we were not prepared to accept that offer and we made the demand that the subsidy we receive in perpetuity should be \$1,125,000 for the homesteads alienated, which would be the subsidy that we would receive under the existing arrangement when the population of the province reaches 1,200,000. We demanded, too, that for all other alienations there should be a settlement and an accounting — much the same as the present Government asked for, but with this difference: We did not say that we were prepared to go to the Privy Council. That was in 1929, and as there was a previous understanding with Alberta that a better offer should not be made by the Federal Government to any other province than had been made to Alberta, we agreed there should be another conference with the Alberta Government before we made any further overtures to the Ottawa Government. But I say tonight, Mr. Speaker, that the brunt of the fight for a better deal for the return of their natural resources to the western provinces was carried on by the province of Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government, and the matter had been brought forward to a point where practically the same was offered as the Federal Government is now offering to the Government of this province.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Am I to understand from the honourable gentleman's remarks, that this Government was offered a return of the resources, the subsidy in perpetuity and an accounting for all alienations?

Mr. Gardiner: I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. During the last two years, we have had the offer of a subsidy in perpetuity and the return of the unalienated resources which we refused asking for the maximum subsidy in perpetuity, the return of the resources and an accounting, but we had not gone beyond that for the reason that it was necessary for the Federal Government to have a further conference with the Government of Alberta. But, before that conference with Alberta was held, the Commission appointed to report on the accounting for Manitoba reported. It reported in May 1929, just before the general election was held in this province. But the Federal Government did not offer and did state then that it was prepared to give to all three of the western provinces just exactly what they are now offering to the Government of this province.

Premier Anderson: I do not think the honourable gentleman is trying to mislead the House, but I would like him to answer this question: Did the Federal Government offer to Alberta what they offer us today?

Mr. Gardiner: The Federal Government offered to the Government of Manitoba a subsidy and an accounting and appointed a Commission for the purpose of determining what accounting should be made. The Federal Government was committed to give the other two provinces identically the same kind of deal. That was the understanding.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: But there is this difference: There is the question of the accounting from 1870 to 1905, acknowledged in today's letter!

Mr. Gardiner: I do not know that it is acknowledged in today's letter. I just heard it read this afternoon, and as I understood it, the point is this: The question of the right for an accounting from 1870 to 1905 is to be settled by the courts and it all depends upon the outcome of the legal argument as to whether or not there shall be any accounting for the period between 1870 and the formation of the province in 1905. Outside of that, the offer of today is exactly what they were committed to offer to the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Alberta because of their offer to Manitoba.

Now there is no reason why there should be any political divisions on this question. There is no need for that. We on this side of the House since we formed the Government in this province advocated practically the same deal that you on that side are advocating today, and we waged the fight for practically identical terms from 1922 to 1929. All I ask of our friends on that side is that they give us credit for having raised the amount of the subsidy in perpetuity from nothing to \$1,125,000 and we will be prepared to give them credit for anything they get over that.

This is not a political issue. The only criticism we have to make is on the attitude the honourable gentlemen took when they were in eastern Canada in connection with the agreement on the natural resources. I have not much complaint to make at the fact that they addressed in Ottawa and Toronto, Tory audiences. I have not much complaint to make of their addressing Tory audiences for I am convinced that they are a real Tory Government. In fact, I think we have the highest form of Tory Government in the province of Saskatchewan of any province in the Dominion of Canada. The criticism we have to make of their attitude while in the East is to be found in the statement of the Leader of the Government that he was going to make one or more prominent men in the Federal Government in that conference speak their mind on this particular question and he was going to tell the whole world what one of them thought. He published a letter written by the Hon. Mr. Dunning to Prime Minister Mackenzie King, setting forth practically identically the same position as he himself was taking.

Another thing struck me, while they were in the East. When the honourable gentlemen got to Winnipeg they had not arrived at a definite conclusion as to the effect of their visit in the East, so they gave an interview to the effect that Mr. King had to wait until Hon. Ernest Lapointe came back from France or from Rome—it is easy to see what the insinuation there is. But even after they got back to the city of Regina they were not very sure where they themselves stood, so they called a conference to consider what they should have done at Ottawa. They invited to that conference members of the Government side, but none from this side of the House, and they invited others who were not elected to this House. I am not criticising that. But they also had invited Mayor Webb, of Winnipeg, I do not know why; but the evening before, I had the honour of sitting beside the Premier and we heard the Mayor of Winnipeg address a Regina meeting in which he made a real first-class Tory speech making a direct attack upon the Wheat Pool. The next day, he was invited into conference with the Government on the question of Saskatchewan's natural resources!

Apparently, after he had done this the Leader of the Government had some qualm of conscience for he wrote me a letter and gave it to the press. It was not confidential and, as he gave it to the press, I am going to read it to the House:

"The Government has under consideration the reply received from Premier King to the memorial placed before the Federal Government in relation to our natural resources.

"I am sending you a copy of the memorial and the reply and would like you to feel free to write me your views on this question which I should like to have before me when preparing our reply to the Rt. Hon. Mr. King. As I stated to you upon our accession to office, there are certain public questions of provincial-wide importance which should be considered by all sections of our people irrespective of politics, organisations or parties. Our natural resources question is one of these and I trust that you will not hesitate to let me have your opinion on this matter."

I answered that letter as follows:

"Your letter of January 10, was delivered at our office yesterday, January 13. I note in this morning's paper an account of a conference held on Saturday,

January 11, on the natural resources question to which a number outside the Legislature as well as at least one from outside the province were invited.

"It occurs to me that if your desire was to secure the views of those interested in the question before the House met and to secure the views of the members of the Opposition in particular, they should have had the benefit of the discussion which took place at the conference. My personal view is that any discussion of that kind might more properly have taken place before a committee of the House.

"Since we are now approaching the session and your policy in the matter is to be presented to the Legislature, it would not be advisable on such short notice for me, beforehand, to call in the members of the Opposition to place myself in a position to speak for them."

I read that, Mr. Speaker, in order to indicate to the House that, had we been invited to the conference to hear all the arguments, we would have been delighted to have been there. But, since we were not there, we are prepared to discuss on the floor of the Legislature, the whole question in an effort to arrive at a conclusion that will be to the best interests of the people of this province, and in doing so, I trust that those in the House, on this side and on that, will leave these political considerations, which apparently actuated members of the Government when they were in Eastern Canada, completely out of the discussion.

I only propose to deal with one other matter at this time, Mr. Speaker, and that is Education, and I only intend to touch upon it because it was made one of the foremost issues of the last election. I would refer you to a statement I made a few moments ago to the effect that, after the Government had been in power for five months, it did not think it necessary to dismiss any of the employees of the Department of Education because of that campaign. Yet the very things which had been claimed against the Government in that campaign could not have been carried into effect unless we had the backing and the support of a considerable number of those employed in the Department of Education! I think it will be admitted by the Minister that very much of what was said in the last campaign had not much foundation in fact.

I was much surprised to hear the honourable member for Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*) quote a letter he had received from a certain school district. I happen to have a letter sent to me from the same school district refuting practically every statement his correspondent made. I am not going to read it tonight; but I am given to understand the gentleman he (*Mr. Taylor*) referred to has been for years secretary-treasurer of the district and was in that position until last annual meeting. The school board of the district denies every statement made in the letter read by the member for Wadena. If I read this letter, the honourable member would appreciate that his correspondent is not the type of gentleman who should be quoted in the Legislature of this province. I would be prepared to show this letter to my honourable friend to prove to him that my statement is correct.

I think all the members will agree that when any matter pertaining to education comes up in this Legislature first consideration should be given and most attention devoted to the interests of those who are attending the schools of the province. The welfare of the children should be first and foremost in our minds, instead of seeking to start propaganda to be broadcast all over the province stirring up racial and religious strife. If we are to get anywhere with what legislation is brought down, we must be prepared to abandon tactics of that kind. I think all members should agree that if there is anything in our schools which interferes with the education of the children in the district affected, it should be removed; and if by any chance anything can be placed in the schools to assist the children in getting better education, a means should be found to place it there.

The only thing we desire as members of this Legislature is that the children of the province should be given every opportunity of receiving a good education without interference, whether that demands the taking of something from the school or the putting of something into the school. We have a system of schools in this province paid for by the citizens of this province and I hope that any legislation that may be brought down will be in the interests of the great mass of the people of Saskatchewan and, more particularly, of the children of Saskatchewan. When this question comes up in this Legislature, members on this side of the House will express themselves upon it, and I shall have an opportunity at that time of discussing the question on its merits.

At the present time, I do not know the nature of the legislation that is being brought down except insofar as it has been revealed in the statements given to the press and made in public addresses by members of the Government. When it is intro-

duced and is under discussion, I hope that every member on the floor will forget anything of prejudice or intolerance he may entertain, and not allow it to creep into the discussion. I hope that the legislation will be of such a nature that we can all get behind it. All I can say tonight, to the two members who have just spoken, is that I shall await the legislation being brought down, but I wish to add this also: We have only the public statements of the members of the Government, and, more particularly, the Leader of the Government, by which to judge as to the attitude of the Government on educational matters, and if that attitude is persisted in and insisted upon, then there are some members on this side who are going to find it difficult to be 100 per cent. behind the proposed legislation. That is another reason why I find it necessary to vote against the motion which has been presented to the House.

Finally, may I deal for a few moments with the question of finance! If there has been one question that has been dealt with more than any other in recent months, it is the financial question. We have maintained, in season and out of season, that we have given the Province of Saskatchewan sound financial administration that has placed this province in the forefront of all Canada insofar as finances are concerned — and I doubt if that statement will be questioned by those on the Government side of the House. As a matter of fact, the Premier, since taking office, has admitted that we had the lowest public debt in the Dominion; but he also said that in a few years we would not be in that proud position. I am compelled to admit that it has been customary for Liberal Governments to be busily engaged in keeping down the public debt and keeping the public finances in good shape and in due course to turn over to a Conservative Government which immediately proceeded to spend everything in sight and the people had to put a Liberal Government back in to get the mess straightened out. And I have no doubt that this Government is going to play true to Conservative form!

Whereas we had a public debt of \$57,000,000 when we took over, and whereas just previous to the last election, according to the Price, Waterhouse Report we had a public debt. We would still be in the same position we always held as long as we had \$7,000,000 bringing the total up to \$68,000,000, I venture to say that, if this Government remains in power for any length of time, a very different story will have to be told. If the Liberal policy were carried on, even with this increase, it would still place this province the lowest of any of the provinces west of the Ottawa river, in respect of the public debt. We would still be in the same position we always held as long as we had Liberal Government in this province.

Earlier in my remarks, I referred to the \$20,000,000 to be borrowed for highways and the claim that it would not be a burden on the present population because it would be paid for by future generations. We already have a public debt of approximately \$25,000,000 because of highway construction. In other words, the policy being advocated of borrowing \$20,000,000 and paying the interest with the gasoline tax or motor licenses, has been carried on for years and years in this province and we are carrying \$25,000,000 now because of highways and bridges constructed on amounts paid for by those taxes. If the policy our friends are advocating is adopted the public debt on account of highways that we shall have to carry, will be increased immediately by \$45,000,000. In the end the public debt would not be \$25,000,000 but \$60,000,000 and possibly \$70,000,000 — for highways, because you cannot enter into such lines of construction in one part of the province without being called upon to do the same for other parts of the province. So I say now, the policy advocated by our friends will not place the burden of payment for the highways on future generations but will place a tax upon the population at the present time and in the immediate future. Ten dollars a head for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan would do little more than pay the interest on the Capital debt incurred on the highways and look after the funds required in connection with highway maintenance and secondary construction together with bridge construction. Those items alone would cost \$5,000,000 more than the last Government was prepared to spend in connection with highway construction in the province.

I have listened to what honourable gentlemen opposite have had to say in connection with this policy they are advocating, and I say to them: I would like you to go down to that part of the country from which the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) comes and look over into the State of Montana, and you will see there the effects of that policy. If you run up the public debt, as this policy involves, you immediately incur high interest charges imposing a high taxation cost upon the land which drives the people off the land.

If you cross over into the State of Montana and drive along their fine roads to a filling station and say to the people there: "You certainly have got fine highways here,"

they will tell you that is all they have left. As you drive along, you will see large consolidated schools with their windows boarded up; you will see homesteads deserted and boarded up, the land abandoned. The people have been driven off because of high taxation costs. We are going to watch that the people of this province are not placed in that position where they, too, will be driven off their land.

We are critical of the Government in this connection because we have some regard for our public debt, and we are going to do all in our power to persuade some of our friends on the opposite side, who were elected on policies different from those of this Government and who cannot support a policy of this kind, to join with us and help us vote this Government out of office before they do all the harm they can do to Saskatchewan.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me appeal for a united effort to give to the people of Saskatchewan the best legislation possible. Let us try to build up a citizenship that will live not only in conformity with the laws we place on our Statute Books but which will make Saskatchewan one of the first provinces of Canada — a citizenship based on harmony, good will and tolerance, on the views expressed by the public men whether on the opposite side or on this, and on views on which the British Empire has been built up. There is no place in the world where there are men of more diverse races, sects and colours than in the British Empire and all agree to live under the Union Jack because of what it stands for and because it recognises that for all who sojourn under it there shall be freedom from intolerance and prejudice. We shall make the Canadian Nationality something all will be proud to acknowledge, if we incorporate in the citizenship of the province, the best, the highest ideals of all the peoples that go to make up our population.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to oppose the motion.

THE HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D.Paed.

(Premier and Minister of Education)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—Before proceeding to discuss some of the subjects dealt with in the Speech from the Throne may I, following the example of others here, extend my congratulations and felicitations to those who are occupying seats in this Chamber for the first time. I believe we have on this side of the House twenty-nine new members experiencing their first session in the Legislative Assembly of this province. Of the fifty-three faces we of the Opposition faced last year no less than thirty-three are absent today. Twenty of the former Government members are now facing us from the opposition benches and we know that they will find great solace there because it has been said from one end of the province to the other in recent months by members of the former Government, including the Leader of the Opposition, that Liberalism has always been and is always greatest in opposition. Therefore we expect to see the Liberal party ascend to greater heights in this session than it has in any previous session of this House.

We have in this House, on both sides, some thirty-seven new members and might I express my personal satisfaction that the Leader of the Opposition in opening this debate has departed very largely from the usual custom followed in debates on the address at the opening of a session following a general election.

It has been customary in past years in the first session following a general election that all those tragic things that happened and all those assertions made by candidates and others are brought forth in all their ghastliness in this first debate. Possibly it is because my honourable friend is not anxious to repeat in this House some of these reminiscences that caused such an upheaval. However, I am going to follow his example in not discussing what happened prior to the 6th of June.

After this date, when the majority of the people of this province voted against the Government, those who were elected in opposition to the policies of the Government, acting in a spirit of good faith, sincerely desirous of putting into effect the expressed will of the people of this province, decided that their duty, whether Conservatives, Progressives or Independents, was to join hands and undo some of the wrongs that had been done, and try to solve some problems which had not been solved by the then Government. Acting in that spirit of good faith they agreed to co-operate with every feeling they were doing their duty not only by the people responsible for their election but by the majority of the people of this province. I may say, Mr. Speaker, it does not become the Leader of the Opposition nor any member of the Opposition, to cast any slur or direct any accusation against the members who were elected in opposition to the policies of the Gardiner Government.

If there is any doubt in the minds of the people as to the propriety of the steps taken by those on this side of the House, then the people will in due time register their disapproval.

An Opposition Member: They will, first chance!

Premier Anderson: Saskatoon County seems to be quite resonant!

Mr. Agar (Saskatoon County): Saskatoon County had not anything to say.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, when the members on this side of the House representing the three parties in opposition to the then Government, Independents, Conservatives and Progressives, met together after the election they decided, as I said before, to unite in a spirit of co-operation under certain conditions, and I might point out one of those conditions so there will be no misunderstanding. One of the conditions upon which co-operation was decided upon was that no appeal would be made to the people

of this province except where the government has been defeated on a straight vote of "want of confidence." So, if my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition desires to be as successful as he is evidently thinking he may be, he will have to bring in a direct, definite "want of confidence" motion before he can expect to defeat this Government in this House.

I want, before passing on to some of the subjects referred to in the Speech from the Throne, to refer to one or two other statements made by gentlemen who have been going up and down the province in a vain effort to resuscitate the "Grit" party.

In the month of October in the town of Shaunavon, the present Leader of the Opposition is reported in that faithful organ of his, the *Moose Jaw Times* of October 17th, as stating that "the new Government has violated every pledge it had made to the electorate." Mr. Speaker, the present Leader of the Opposition, thirty-eight days after this Government took office, got up and insulted the intelligence of the people of Shaunavon by saying this Government had violated every pledge which had been made.

Mr. Davis: (Prince Albert): Hear! hear!

Premier Anderson: The "hear! hears!" are very faint!

Some Opposition Members: Hear! hear!

Mr. Gardiner: What have you got to say about it?

Premier Anderson: The Leader of the Opposition will find we have a lot to say about it. In the Speech from the Throne there was mentioned the business depression that exists throughout the rest of Canada as well as in the prairie provinces at the present time. It was mentioned that there is considerable unemployment, probably more than has been the case for a number of years. The Government has met the situation and met it in such a way that possibly this is the only capital city in any province of Canada where we have not witnessed parades of unemployed to the Parliament Buildings. I think this is a source of gratification to the members of the House and to the people of the province.

In conjunction with the people of the cities, towns and municipalities, the Government has taken steps to remedy this situation and relieve the suffering. The Minister directly in charge of this work will give you details as to what has been done. During the fall, arrangements were made to provide relief in the nature of road work. It was necessary, owing to the manner in which the previous Government left the situation, for our present Minister of Highways to visit the sections where assistance was needed and obtain all information which we thought would be of value. He will go into details as to what has been done in that connection; and I do not think there is a member on either side of the House who will have anything but words of praise for what was done by way of road work relief.

In the matter of providing fodder, just before the previous Government resigned an arrangement was made whereby the Government would assume one half of the freight charges and the railway companies one half. The Minister of Agriculture will give you details of what has been done to meet that situation.

The next subject dealt with in the Speech from the Throne was that referring to the natural resources. The Leader of the Opposition went into ancient history and the Government is no more anxious to see this matter drawn into politics at this stage than at any other stage. The members of oppositions in this House in years gone by have unanimously voted to ask the Federal Government to return these resources,—our natural resources. What we say is that the public of this province had not been taken into the confidence of previous Governments and therefore we knew very little about what had been going on and we stated we would let the people know exactly what was being done in connection with the solution of this problem. As has been stated, and criticised by the "Grit" newspapers of this country, some members of this Government waited upon the Federal Government last fall. My honourable friend went down to Ottawa and Toronto a good many times in days gone by and no one in the Opposition ever thought it worth while to get up and criticise him because he had fraternised with some of his Liberal friends when he stayed at Ottawa and Toronto—I should perhaps confine it to Ottawa for it is quite likely he would not find many left in Toronto! The smallness of such criticism is not worth noticing, as you will agree, Mr. Speaker.

These delegates waited on the Federal Government, were received with courtesy and we presented our proposal to the Government. When we got back to Saskatchewan we found the *Regina Leader* and other "Grit" newspapers going to great extremes in criticising our delegation and our attitude. They said we went down with "chips on our shoulders." Well, I do not see many chips on the shoulders of my friends opposite.

Mr. Davis: We are all good blocks!

Premier Anderson: We went down to the Federal Government to demand our rights and demand them with firmness; and we were received in that same spirit. We naturally expected when we had the Prime Minister of Canada and two other Ministers of the Crown representing seats in this province that we were in a better position than ever before to get this matter settled; and we believe that those who are representing this province in the Federal Government have so far given us satisfactory consideration in this regard. When we came back we received a reply from Mr. King and in this reply he stated that he was prepared to give us the same treatment as the Province of Alberta had been given but, if we were going to take a case to the Supreme Court and if necessary from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, then the matter of settlement must be delayed until the decision came from the Supreme Court or, (if such was the course) from the Privy Council. Then we were asked to accept two commissioners then named by the Federal Government and a third to be agreed upon. We wrote back and said we were not prepared to accept this proposal. We asked him for an immediate settlement for the period from 1905; then to receive back all our lands, water powers and so on, at once, those that had not be alienated, and for the cash subsidy with increases in perpetuity, and also for an accounting for all alienations since 1905, because, as you know, some 45,000,000 acres of land have been alienated since 1905. If we set aside 25,000,000 for homestead holdings, there remain 20,000,000 acres and we feel we should have an accounting and that accounting should take into consideration the valuation of these 20,000,000 acres.

Mr. Davis: In compensation for that?

Premier Anderson: The accounting should be to determine what we should receive for these 20,000,000 acres of alienations.

Now, in addition to that, we asked that a separate case be made of the period between 1870 and 1905 and we did not agree to accept the Commission named by the Federal Government. Now, Mr. King's reply to-day is very generous. He said, "We will give you back your natural resources and we will continue the cash subsidy for all time to come and of course the School Lands Trust Fund will be returned. In addition to that we will allow you to choose one commissioner and the Federal Government will choose one and then those two commissioners will choose the third." Then he said "that the matter of an accounting for the period from 1870 to 1905 should be decided by the courts, and if the courts decide we have some rights for compensation for alienations prior to 1905 then this Commission will deal with the period from 1870 to the present time." If they say we have no right then the Commission will deal with the period from 1905 to the present time; and we expect if we have an accounting from 1905 there shall be considered these 20,000,000 acres of land alienated. Those are the correct figures because they are contained in a letter received from Mr. Stewart this morning. I asked Mr. Stewart to give me some information regarding school lands sales and he tells me in a letter this morning that the minimum price of school lands has been, since 1903, \$7.00 an acre and that the average price at the school lands sales runs from seven to fourteen dollars. So, if we place a value of \$7.00 on each acre we have \$140,000,000. If you place half that we have \$70,000,000. I merely cite this to give some idea of what alienations amounted to between 1905 and the present time.

Then we have some 750,000 odd acres alienated by way of grants for building a railway in northern Manitoba and a further 200,000 acres for building railways in Alberta, and so on. Some of the very best land we have in this province went for building railroads in other provinces. This information will have to be considered when the accounting takes place, and I may say that I believe the proposition placed before us today is highly satisfactory and I am quite prepared to have the Opposition co-operate with us in getting this matter settled before this Legislature prorogues. If we can agree upon that, it will be necessary to make another trip to Ottawa, and we shall promise the Leader of the Opposition we will not attend any banquets if it will effect their co-operation.

Mr. Davis: The more banquets you attend the better for us.

Premier Anderson: In the matter of immigration we continually stated prior to the time of the election and during the last four years when half-a-dozen of us sat on the other side of the House that, although according to the British North America Act immigration is very largely a Federal matter, yet, according to that same Act, we had some rights as a province so far as immigration is concerned. We maintained, if we were placed in a position of power, we would set before the Federal Government an immigration policy for the Province of Saskatchewan and we would ask the Federal Government to act accordingly. We were laughed at. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition thundered verbal criticisms on the policy of those facing him and my friend the former Minister of Highways said, "This is purely a Federal matter and the Province has nothing to do with it, and the members opposite do not know whereof they speak." What was the result? Hardly had we taken office than the Federal Government, realising we had rights and were disposed to assert them, asked for our advice in connection with the matter of immigration and, when we took the stand we did and which we are prepared to justify in this House, the Federal Government said, "We are not going to have large numbers of immigrants go into Saskatchewan if the Government of that province say they are not wanted." That is the stand we took, and yet it was said by members opposite at every session of the Legislature that the province has no jurisdiction.

We have, at the present time as you know, a Commission investigating this whole problem of immigration and when that Commission brings in its report we shall be in a position to frame an immigration policy which, I trust, will be favourable to all sections of the people in the province. We are anxious that all shades of opinion be expressed in making representations to that Commission. We have chosen the members of the Commission with care, and we want every member of this House to feel at liberty to approach that Commission with his personal views or the views of his section of the country in connection with the all-important matter of immigration. Notwithstanding all the things said to the contrary, some of the most pressing problems that we have in the province today come as a result of an unwise immigration policy on the part of the Federal Government in the past and some of you will remember how you stood over on this side of the House when the subject of immigration was touched upon. I notice the former Minister of Public Health making notes. Let me recall to him the occasions when he stood up on his feet to denounce the attitude of the then members of the Opposition. You will remember that some years ago he took it upon himself to place before the people of this province immigration conditions in this province and in the campaign of 1925 members opposite and members of the political "machine" that flourished in those days in this province, travelled from one end of the country to the other making these statements and in particular among those sections where there is a high percentage of illiteracy and there they poisoned the minds of the people against the party I have the honour to lead by making statements that were absolutely false and were not fair to those people and not fair to this great province of which they are citizens.

During the past election campaign this same thing was carried on, but I have said I am not going to mention that now. Later on, my honourable friend will find there is no hesitation in going ahead and going a long way, and, in connection with some of the legislation that will be brought down in this House, we shall place before the members of this house some of the scandalous propositions that were placed before many of the people throughout this province by gentlemen who have had the audacity in the columns of the press and on the platform to accuse us of intolerance and hypocrisy and will no doubt in this House point to us and say we have created uneasiness by our attitude, that we have stirred up hatred and fanned the flames of ill-will. We trust that we shall be able to show without the shadow of a doubt that the guilt lies in one place and in one place only—with that organisation which has been referred to as "the Gardiner Machine."

Mr. Agar: No, no.

Premier Anderson: Saskatoon County is getting "breezy" again. In connection with immigration then, we hope, before very long, that we shall have for the people of this province a safe and sane immigration policy and we trust that some of the members from the opposite side—members of the Opposition, those independent Liberals, of whom we have many in this province, will take the opportunity to support the policy of the Government during this session.

Now in connection with roads, we have a very capable and efficient Minister of Highways, who is quite capable of looking after himself as well as his roads and some of the wild fantastic schemes to which we have listened this afternoon and evening

given utterance to by the Leader of the Opposition will be shown by the Minister to be utterly impossible and illogical. The Leader of the Opposition at one moment emphasised the importance of No. 1 Highway and a few moments later he said, "You should centre on No. 13." Let me ask him why he did not centre on No. 13!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They spent all the money.

Premier Anderson: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the present Government and all those members elected to this side of the House was endorsed by the people of this province on the 6th of June and nothing that can be said by members opposite will remedy the situation so far as they are concerned. The fact is that we have been building political roads in this province for a number of years. When, shortly after this Government took office, we were met with demands from a gentleman in the northern part of this province to have paid him some \$800, and another man \$600 and another \$1,000 for road work alleged to have been done which was not authorised.

Mr. Gardiner: Is it not true that the candidate of the Conservative party, who was called an Independent, who contested the Ile a la Crosse constituency made representations to the Leader of the Government at Battleford that the \$800 should be paid?

Premier Anderson: That is the first I have heard about the matter. We are talking about a proper road building policy removed from the realm of politics. That is what we are speaking of; and, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will hear all about the highways before we are through with this session.

Over two thousand men in this province, the majority engaged in the farming industry, have taken part in delegations to this Government since the 9th of September in connection with roads. I am sure that my good friends who are opposite who accompanied those delegations will find it very hard to say that the road policy of this Government meets at all with their disapproval.

Mr. Gardiner: If I might interrupt the honourable member—

Premier Anderson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Leader of the Opposition to remain seated because I have a lot to say to him and have no time for interruptions just now.

In connection with the subject of Farm Loans, the members of this House will have some very interesting information before very long on this subject, and this Assembly is going to have some very enlightening details in regard to the management or rather mismanagement, of the Farm Loan Board. I am going to leave it to the Minister in charge to give you the details of that. I remember quite distinctly, some one of us of the Opposition, two or three years ago, when venturing the opinion that the province was likely to lose large sums of money through the manner in which the Farm Loan Board was operating, was sneered at and ridiculed. The Leader of the Government, now the present Leader of the Opposition, told us that we were dreaming.

Mr. Davis: How much has disappeared?

Premier Anderson: You might not be able to sleep peacefully tonight were I to tell you. We have this information in the greatest detail and you will hear it from the Minister in charge of that department. I may say it is our policy to continue farm loans, and the House will be asked to vote money for farm loan work in this province during the consideration of the estimates.

Mr. Gardiner: Before the honourable gentleman leaves that subject, I wish to object on a point of order to the speaker going along in this line insinuating that there are hundreds of thousands of dollars missing and getting it out in red headlines in his press tomorrow.

Mr. Davis: Did we steal that money?

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition surely is not going to worry about red headlines. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, I am quite within the rules of order to proceed as I am proceeding. I have stated the Minister in charge of the Farm Loan Board will get up and tell the House what the deficits are in connection with the Farm Loan Board.

I want to spend some time on the subject of education, because it is the department

I have the honour to preside over. As has been indicated by the Leader of the Opposition, it was discussed at considerable length during the election campaign. He has stated that, because no member of the Civil Service connected with the Department of Education has been dismissed, it is an indication that there was no politics in the educational administration. I cannot see logic in that reasoning. I might add, for his information, that I have voluntarily signed statements from employees in the service of the Department of Education, who claim they took an active part because some member of the Liberal executive in Regina ordered them to go out and do so. They are still in the employ of the Government, and my honourable friend knows I know whereof I speak. These things could not have been done without his knowledge.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any such thing!

Premier Anderson: I have to accept the honourable gentleman's word. I will show him the signed statements if he wishes. Perhaps he will remember having stated on one occasion to an official of his Department, when dealing with the educational administration and dealing with school troubles, that political expediency must be the guiding principle.

Mr. Gardiner: If I might interrupt: No! I did not make any such statement to anyone!

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, we will have to accept that until he comes face to face with the particular employee. Let me state that we have very definite proof that politics did interfere with the administration of the educational affairs of this province.

Mr. Hogan: Yes, it does now.

Premier Anderson: My honourable friend from Vonda says: "It does now." Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will receive his education before the end of this session. I wish to give you some idea of the manner in which our future citizens have been jeopardised in their education in this province through political influences, and I am going to point out one instance and a hundred such may be cited. In a Ukrainian school district near the town of Theodore in the north-eastern part of this province, there was a recommendation by the school inspector to have an official trustee appointed. The people were having trouble in the district and, according to the inspector, it was found necessary to appoint an official trustee. On the 3rd of May—just note the dates please!—on the third of May one of the ratepayers wrote a letter to the Minister of Education. He wrote and asked that a Board of Trustees be elected. The official trustee had been appointed a couple of weeks before this—perhaps three or four weeks. He says in his letter to the Government:

"The Ukrainian people have supported the Liberal Government but we are going to look for help from the other side if this Government don't make this matter right and give our children the chance to finish the term with the present teacher. Also we want the right to appoint our own school board We, the Ukrainian people, have asked our teacher to write a letter to our Ukrainian paper so that all our people may know the way we are being treated unless we are given back the rights we believe any loyal Canadians should have."

That was on May 3rd. On May 9th, a letter goes from the Department, signed by the Deputy Minister, which says in part:

"On the advice of the inspector of schools, it was deemed expedient to have the affairs of the district managed temporarily by an outside person. This step was taken, not because the Department believed that the ratepayers were not capable of managing their own affairs, but because a situation has arisen in the district that, for the present, prevented the efficient conduct of its business."

And on May 6th, a few days before that, a letter was written by John Melanchuk, which is received by the department and which says in part:

"Unless we are allowed to appoint a new board of trustees, we will vote solid for a new Government and further, this feeling is spreading into the Ruthenian district north."

Remember, that was written on May 6th!

Then we find that, on May 14, a letter is received in which Mr. Garry, M.L.A., appears to have been concerned. This is what is written by Mr. John Smith of Theodore:

"Mr. Garry, our local member, called on me this afternoon, at your request, to ask me if I would recommend the return of the Caldervale school to the local school board."

This letter is addressed to R. F. Blacklock, acting Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. Garry being the then member for Yorkton, and he apparently, was anxious to have a local board formed. The letter continues:

"Mr. Garry gave as his reason that you were being besieged by requests to do so. I am somewhat at a loss to understand your position in this matter considering that the appointment is only of six weeks' duration. Even in that short time, however, I am convinced that an Official Trustee is the only solution of the school problem in this district. . . ."

And so on. That was on May 14th. On May 17th, getting closer towards the 6th of June, the Deputy Minister replies to Mr. John Smith of Theodore, the Official Trustee, and the letter in part reads:

"The department has received a petition . . . requesting permission to elect a new board of trustees. The department has also received numerous letters from the district protesting that the ratepayers are capable of managing their own school affairs. The department believes that, in view of the recent experiences of the district, the ratepayers can be depended upon to elect a board of trustees who will conduct the business of the district strictly in accordance with the school law and the regulations of the department The department appreciates your services in this district but believes that it would not be in the best interests of the district to retain an official trustee any longer than is absolutely necessary."

In other words, there is every indication, with the pressure brought to bear on the department by representations from these quarters, with a general election approaching that the policy of the Department of Education of the Government was to be thrown aside and these people allowed to have a board of trustees.

Mr. Gardiner: Where do I come into that?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: You administered the Department.

Premier Anderson: Does the Leader of the Opposition want me to tell him where he comes in? Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with education, I think every member in this House, on both sides, will agree that one of the greatest problems we have to solve in this growing province is that which has to do with rural education. I have here the figures showing the percentage of pupils enrolled in the schools of the province, both boys and girls:

A. In all schools both Elementary and Secondary:

| | |
|---|------|
| Percentage of enrolment in one-room schools | 55 % |
| Percentage of teachers in one-room schools | 60 % |

Percentage of pupils in high school grades enrolled in one-room schools:

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Grade IX | 27 % |
| Grade X | 17 % |
| Grade XI | 1.4 % |
| General average | 16 % |

Percentage of pupils in high school grades in elementary schools, i.e., schools functioning under The School Act:

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Grade IX | 37 % |
| Grade X | 24 % |
| Grade XI | 2 % |
| Grade XII | 2 % |

B. In rural and village districts:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| Percentage of total enrolment | 77.29 % |
| Percentage of teachers | 82 % |

C. In Elementary Schools only:

| | |
|---|------|
| Percentage of enrolment in one-room schools | 57 % |
| Percentage of teachers in one-room schools | 62 % |

D. 1. Racial origin of population of Saskatchewan (1926 census):

British—rural 44.6 % ; urban 67.9 %
 Foreign—rural 55.4 % ; urban 32.1 %

2. Racial origin of population under 21 years of age:

British—rural, 40 % ; urban, 65.6 %
 Foreign—rural, 60 % ; urban, 34.4 %

The majority of our future citizens, then, are enrolled in the one-room rural schools in the province, and in connection with that situation I have very often stated that the rural school is one of the most important educational institutions we have. In spite of that the rural school is the most inefficient school we have, inefficient because of certain conditions in certain sections of the province. I think, however, we have come to this stage in our development when we are prepared to launch on a comprehensive scheme for making our rural schools more in keeping with the necessities and demands of the chief industry of this province—agriculture. It is because of this feeling that the Government now is centering its energies on that special phase of education, remembering that such a large percentage of our boys and girls, our future citizens, are found in these rural schools and only a very small percentage of them ever reach the Grade VIII stage. Under present conditions the vast majority are leaving school in Grade V, VI and VII — a very large percentage, entirely unfitted for the work they will be engaged in. Then too, we must consider that 60 per cent of those engaged in farming in this province are of non-English origin, many of them fine farmers but a great many of them knowing very little about farming under modern conditions.

Now, it has been customary, when criticising the farming methods among the new Canadian farmers of this province, to have those criticisms used against the critics when the next political campaign comes around. So I was much pleased to hear that at a great Ukrainian Convention in Winnipeg recently, one of their own people announced that he was very strongly in favour of an educational campaign amongst his own people, urging that it was greatly needed.

Mr. Hogan: That applies to the English too!

Premier Anderson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Irish might come under that.

Mr. Davis: No, no!

Premier Anderson: Well, the Scotch might! But the interruption only indicates the lack of serious thought on the part of members opposite. When you get a settlement in this province that is thirty years old, a farming settlement, and when you are paying out some thirty or thirty-five thousand dollars a year on old age pensions it indicates there might be a little education along the lines of better farming; and my honourable friends know that is the case. Let me point out at this stage that it will be the policy of the Government to assist these people, as they have never been assisted, in education on better farming methods. A lot of these people on scrubby land will be encouraged to adopt better farming methods and will come in for assistance from the Government. I stated many times while in opposition that the then Government insisted on securing their political assistance at election times rather than in helping them become better farmers, and I have yet to find out that my assumption was wrong.

In connection with the matter of making more efficient our rural schools we must concentrate on what is the real factor in the case, the teacher. Most of our teachers from our three Normal schools going through their Normal course, learn to teach from observation in the city schools where surroundings are entirely different from the environment they experience when they go to the rural school. It is our intention to formulate a policy whereby our Normal teachers-in-training will spend some time in the rural schools. In Alberta and Manitoba this scheme has worked successfully. What do we find in the Normal school in Regina? A young girl who will go out in a few months' time has to do her practice-teaching in one of the city schools. She is called upon to teach a class in arithmetic to Grade IV. She will never meet that condition in the rural school, to which she will proceed in a few months' time. She will find instead of one

class, six or eight classes. This is one of the most difficult problems that this country has to face in the field of education. Our most inefficient teachers are the ones who have the most difficult problems to face. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree that we should concentrate on that particular aspect of education—teacher training.

The matter of better school equipment I shall not deal with at the present time.

There is another phase of the rural education problem in which we should be interested and that is that hundreds, probably thousands, of our boys and girls are not able to go any higher than the higher grades of public schools. They have to enter into the duties of farming and they have no way of getting a secondary education. We must provide educational facilities for them and we are considering establishing correspondence courses whereby we may give the boys and girls of the rural districts an opportunity of securing an education, where, under the economic conditions prevailing, they cannot receive it otherwise.

We heard, two sessions ago, a wonderful statement of policy regarding what was called "Winter High Schools." The Leader of the Opposition will remember how he stood over at this side of the House and thrilled us with the story of his 'Winter High Schools.' I am sure the members of the House will be glad to know of the wonderful success of these high schools! He made a most remarkable attempt to put the policy before the people. An inspector was taken off his regular work; he travelled 4,700 miles and he asked the people to vote "Yes" or "No" in favour of these Winter High Schools, and invariably they voted "No." He came back and reported "No Success"; and there was not one Winter High School organised and the then Government voted him \$404.10 as an extra honorarium for the work done!

Now I took occasion to send a questionnaire to the school inspectors of this province because I had stated from the opposition benches a few years ago that, if the men engaged in educational work in this province were to express themselves, they would proclaim in favour of the principles enunciated by the members of the Opposition. So what I have to say of Winter High Schools comes from the school inspectors who operated under my honourable friend.

Mr. Gardiner: And you can prove it by an expenditure of \$400?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: More than \$400!

Premier Anderson: That \$404.10 was a little extra honorarium in addition to the regular expenses of the school inspector for his work. If he had been free to tell the people of the province of the reception of the plan it would not have been necessary for me to tell you.

Forty-one inspectors state definitely that there is no real need for Winter High Schools; two did not report and three state there is a need.

Now, these are the inspectors who operated under the previous Government and it only indicates how necessary it is for a minister to call in his inspectors and take their advice on educational matters under consideration. If my honourable friend, the former Minister of Education had taken into his confidence and counsel the inspectors who were in the employ of the Government, then he would never have made an attempt to bring in the policy, a policy which we are going to ask the House, on this occasion, to wipe off the Statute Books. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Continued Tuesday afternoon, February 11, 1930.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the adjournment of the debate, last evening, I was discussing some phases of the great problem of education and I indicated that the Winter High School policy adopted by the previous Government had proved to be an entire failure, and it would appear that, in some quarters at any rate, there are those who feel that scheme was in some measure successful. It is usual for editors of newspapers to acquaint themselves fully with public happenings so that in their criticism they may be fair and may give to their readers accurate information. It is rather surprising, in view of the failure of this scheme, to find no less a person than the editor of the *Regina Morning Leader* apparently lacking in knowledge of this question. For his benefit, and for the benefit of those who have been misled by reading his recent editorial, I might explain that there are no Winter High Schools under the legislation

that we find in The School Act today. In the editorial mentioned, dealing with the Rural Education Branch, the last paragraph or the appendix, is very much diseased. Here is the second paragraph:

"In view of the fact that Saskatchewan's population—both adult and school—is predominantly rural, and in view of the further fact that children of foreign birth and descent are chiefly to be found in the rural areas, the Department of Education does well to give close study to the rural school situation, with a view to improving it if possible. Dr. Anderson's long personal experience as a teacher in the provinces and his previous association with the Department of Education should enable him to know the needs of this phase of educational effort in the province very thoroughly."

Now the last paragraph says:

"To the credit of the previous Government in this field are the Winter High School districts that have been provided for in many parts of the province. The object of this legislation was two-fold: to provide the best possible secondary education facilities throughout the rural areas and to keep young people on the farms. If any Government can contribute anything further to this splendid two-fold programme it will deserve the appreciation of the public."

Now, it may be asked what is this Government intending to do in order to meet the situation that it was intended that the winter high school legislation should meet? I have already indicated that, in order to assist the many hundreds of boys and girls throughout the rural areas of the province more particularly, who, because of economic or other conditions, are unable to attend the continuation or high schools now in existence, we have in mind the inauguration of some correspondence courses, something after the style of what they have in British Columbia. It is our intention to ask the rural schools in some instances to co-operate in the teaching of high school work. The regulations in connection with school grants allow a grant to be paid for high schools in operation in rural districts, provided the whole attendance averages fifteen members. It is our suggestion to lower that average requirement. It has been lowered already to ten. So if when a rural school is averaging twenty from Grade I to Grade VII and one to ten above VII they will be entitled to \$1.50 a day and for a senior room—

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of order the Minister of Education has just introduced into this House and given first reading to a Bill to amend The School Act and those amendments are now before the House. He is now proceeding to discuss the Bill and discuss it at a time when no member in this House has any information as to the amendment, and I would suggest that it be left.

Premier Anderson: When my honourable friend sees the School Bill that has received its first reading he will see that anything that I have said or intend to say has nothing to do with anything that is contained in that Bill. I might say we have two or three School Bills before this House.

Mr. Gardiner: On the point of order, that amendment opens every section of the Act and immediately the amendment is presented the whole Act is before the house.

Premier Anderson: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not The School Act I am discussing.

Mr. Gardiner: I submit it is.

Mr. Speaker: We will allow Mr. Anderson to proceed.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling. Is it out of order?

Mr. Speaker: Out of order!

Mr. Gardiner: Would you mind reading to the house the rule proving it out of order?

Premier Anderson: In connection with the Secondary education there is a hardship because of the fees that are—

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask you this question, Mr. Speaker? Did you hold that the honourable gentleman is out of order? Or what did I understand you to say? Or have you ruled that my point of order is not well taken?

Mr. Speaker: That your point of order is not well taken.

Premier Anderson: In order to relieve the situation I shall discuss the Secondary Education Act, Mr. Speaker. No amendment has been suggested to The Secondary Education Act. In connection with The Secondary Education Act fees for high school students are allowed. Those in opposition when the Bill was introduced into the House opposed the charging of fees because it was felt by them that it would work a hardship; and we find such is the case.

Now, in connection with the matter of school grants, as I have stated the grant is \$1.50 per day for the one-room school. In some districts the taxation is exceedingly high, the mill rate running from twenty to thirty mills, and it is my feeling that there should be some regulation in the matter of school grants whereby weaker districts will receive larger grants than the more well-to-do districts. The Leader of the Opposition will know that, during the year 1928, some \$15,000 was paid out to weak school districts by way of special grants, and I can tell him that, during the year 1929, almost twice that sum, or nearly \$30,000, was paid out for that purpose. If we go back to the year 1920, we will find the special grants for all weak school districts to be less than \$3,000. Thus it would appear to be increasing from year to year. In those districts where the debentures have been paid off, where the people are in more comfortable circumstances than in the weaker districts, they should not receive as much from the public treasury as the weaker districts.

It is not intended at this session of the Legislature that we shall introduce from this side of the House legislation to bring about this condition, but we wish to assure the House that assistance will be continued during the present year with a view to giving relief by way of educational grants to these districts that are severely handicapped at the present time.

There is another subject that is being discussed in many quarters and has been discussed in many quarters. I have reference now to the French language. I have received certain information from the inspectors of schools who have to do with these schools in which French is taught. Let me point out that, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary in the press of this province and in the press outside the province, notwithstanding the statements that have been made by those who were opposed to the former opposition, the French language was not an issue during the last provincial campaign. In 166 schools in this province, French is being taught. Thirty-five of the school inspectors expressed an opinion regarding the teaching of French, and twenty-five were in favour of abolishing the present primary course in French. Two of them were in favour of English and French for the first year at school, and eight favoured the present policy. Of fourteen, only one favoured French as optional in Grades VII and VIII, and thirteen were opposed to it. Here are a few of the statements by the inspectors: One inspector says "The teacher is chosen for her knowledge of French and the work in English suffers," and another says:

"My experience has proved to me that when pupils are instructed in French for the first year at school their standing in English is nearly a year behind the standing of pupils of the same age who have not been so instructed. My experience has also shown that the beginner makes more progress in English during the first year if his mother tongue is not used. In comparing the average Ukrainian beginner with the average Mennonite beginner and with the average French beginner, I find at the end of three years the Mennonite ranks first, the Ukrainian second and the French third in their language ability."

Then another inspector says:

"I am in favour of abolishing the primary course in French. The pupils taking this primary course come from homes where French is spoken. With the opportunity these pupils have at home and a course of French for one hour a day there will be no difficulty in this subject."

Still another says:

"For some years I have quietly discussed with a good many people the omission of all instruction in French in Grades I to VI inclusive. I have been astonished at the kindly reception of the suggestion by the French people."

Now you will ask what is the policy of the Government? As I said, this was not an issue in the last campaign. It will be our policy, Mr. Speaker, to have a thorough survey made by the inspectors of these 160 odd schools. The idea we have in mind is that two inspectors will be sent to examine conditions in those schools and in order

to be absolutely fair it is my intention to select one of the men from the Normal School staff who himself is French and have him, with an English inspector, go to all the schools and report to us as to the teaching of French. I hope by the time another session comes around we shall have their report for your consideration.

Now, there is another subject which is receiving the attention of the Government and that is the matter of teachers whose command of English is not what it should be. We find that seventy-two teachers are reported as being not proficient in the speaking of English, eleven of these being so deficient in their command of English as to be unable to use it as a medium of instruction.

I think I mentioned, yesterday, that steps will be taken to overcome that situation and, henceforth, teachers in training will be examined orally in English before letting them leave the Normal Schools.

The matter of Community Schools is another subject presented to this House a few sessions ago. It was intended to meet a real need in the rural communities and, more particularly, in certain sections of the province. Here again there has been a failure and no response on the part of the people, and the general feeling on the part of the school teachers is, I think, that this legislation was not satisfactory and might be erased from The School Act. One of the inspectors says:

"A school imposed without regard to specific needs is more likely to prove parasitic than edifying in its functioning."

and this was not a Tory inspector.

Mr. Davis: Are there such?

Premier Anderson: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter. It has been stated that every single pledge and promise made has been violated by this Government. We stated during the campaign of June, when referring to school matters, that school books should be provided at a lower cost to the pupils. It is the intention of the Government to carry out that promise with the sanction of the members of the House and we hope the members of the Opposition, when the proposition comes before the House, will fall into line and give it their support. The proposal is that the Department of Education will handle the textbooks for the elementary and secondary schools in this province, providing them to the people at cost price plus a sufficient amount to pay the cost of administration. Thus there will be no drain on the public treasury. Advances will have to be made to initiate this system. In the province of Alberta such a scheme has been followed in past years with the result that many thousands of dollars have been saved in the matter of buying text books. It is our intention to carry out our promise and ask for the sanction of the members of the House in that connection. Here again the *Regina Morning Leader* has an element of fairness in an editorial of November 14, 1929. It says:

"There will be general approval of the idea outlined by Premier Anderson in a recent speech at North Battleford whereby Saskatchewan school books may be placed on a more uniform basis and made available to the student at lower prices than at present. Cost of school books today places a heavy burden on the man of small means or of average means, who is anxious to have his children educated and anything that may be done toward reducing the cost and toward making it unnecessary to purchase new issues every year or two will have public endorsement. While there is general appreciation of the fact that our educational system should be kept up-to-date it is possible that the province could get along with fewer changes in text books than has been the case in the past. There is also a growing appreciation of the point that our school books should be made more Canadian and that our children should be given a better grounding in Canadian history, geography and Canadian literature."

We shall expect our honourable friends in the Opposition to support this, and if not, it should be duly noted by the editor of *The Leader*. We shall expect that.

A few years ago there were conducted in parts of the province a number of successful night schools. In the years 1921, 1922 and also 1923, an average of ninety districts per year conducted night schools in this province. Most of these classes were taken up in the teaching of the reading and writing of English. There was a grant of \$2.00 an evening which was paid to the teacher of the local public school who conducted the classes. In 1924, the grant was lowered to \$1.00 an evening, with the result that in

the following six years up to and including 1929, only 238 districts or an average of thirty-nine per year conducted night schools. We propose asking the Legislature to increase this grant to encourage this worthy work. I am not going to take time to relate to you what the school inspectors say about night schools, but they intimate there is a great demand for night schools in those sections of the province where illiteracy prevails to a very alarming extent.

Now, there has been considerable criticism because of the ruling of the Attorney General's Department by which it is stated that, under the law enacted by previous Legislatures and introduced by previous Governments in this province relating to religious teaching, religious teaching under the law should be in the English language. This was not an interpretation of the Government. It was not a specific ruling of the present regime, but it was a ruling, or an interpretation, by the law officers of the Crown, who were, incidentally, in the employ of the former Government. When they were asked to interpret the law in this matter, their ruling was given and made public. The result was that this Government was charged with introducing something entirely new. It will be for our honourable friends of the Opposition, if they are not satisfied with the legislation, to oppose this matter in order to meet the demands of some of their friends.

Now this whole matter of education, I think every member will agree, is the most important problem we have to deal with, and I am particularly anxious that the situation that obtained during the past four years in relation to Government and Opposition should not continue. I am quite prepared to accept constructive suggestions from the members of the Opposition in connection with this important work. It is my intention, as publicly stated, to call together a conference during the coming year in order to discuss from various angles and phases this great question of education. There has been for years a growing dissatisfaction over the course that has been followed in education. Even the newspapers in opposition to the present Government will accept the new order of things.

The Government is busy with the idea of adopting a series of text books and regulations in this province that will be satisfactory to the vast majority of the people in the province and I will say that, notwithstanding all charges to the contrary, we are taking into our confidence the people particularly in this matter of education, and we shall be willing to listen to any suggestions from members of the Opposition or the Leader of the Opposition along that line.

During the last two or three sessions in this House, while in opposition, I took occasion to criticise the conduct of the Weyburn Mental Hospital and those who were here will remember that the members of the then Government, who are now in opposition, took strong exception to this criticism, particularly the late Minister of Public Works. He read from his place in the House letters indicating my criticisms were not well founded and indicating to the members that some of the statements were not what they should be. Now, it is no great pleasure for me or for the present Minister of Public Works to tell them what we have to tell them in connection with the Weyburn Mental Hospital. All I now propose is to place before you some of the deficiencies found in the management of that institution by the three commissioners who recently made a survey of the Government institutions. Let me say they have no hesitation in saying that the institution at North Battleford was one of the most outstanding, if not the best, in the whole Dominion of Canada. On the other hand, the administration of the Mental Hospital at Weyburn was condemned most strongly by these commissioners. No one of the Opposition can claim that we went out and selected "Tory" inspectors. We got the best men we could find, bringing up Dr. Hincks from Eastern Canada to head this Commission and, as many of you know, Dr. Hincks is one of the most outstanding specialists on mental diseases and holds high degrees. You will remember I criticised the airing courts of the institution at Weyburn, that I condemned having the patients housed in with a high board wall in one section of the institution's grounds. Here is what the commissioner says:

"There are four airing courts, two for female patients and two for male patients. These airing courts have nothing to commend them. They are bounded by high board fences and have neither grass nor trees. Two day rooms occupied by female patients have windows looking out upon these airing courts without any view of the surrounding country. For months of the year when they are in use, the patients walk in aimless fashion round and round the enclosures."

At the time I referred to, they were walking around ankle-deep in water. That was denied by the then Superintendent.

"There is a mingling of low grade demented types with those who are in better mental condition. Such airing courts have no place in the treatment of mental patients."

There are some fifty defects pointed out by the Commission:

- "1. Presence of mental defectives in an institution designed for the care and treatment of the insane;
- "2 Lack of adequate segregation of mental defectives from the insane and the presence of adults and children in certain wards;
- "3 Bad ventilation throughout the hospital."

It will be remembered that that was another point of criticism. The children were in wards without being properly classified.

- "4. Faulty hospital design with eight dormitories with windows opening onto enclosed verandas and with no direct access to the outside air during the winter months;
- "5. The presence of four airing courts unsuitable in every way;
- "6 Lack of adequate arrangements in the hospital to segregate patients according to type;
- "7. Overcrowding, particularly on the male side;
- "8. Day-room and sitting-room accommodation much too contracted;
- "9. Lack of sufficient number of comfortable chairs throughout the hospital and the utilisation of uncomfortable benches without backs in the basement wards;
- "10. Unsatisfactory accommodation, equipment and staffing of reception wards;
- "11. Practically complete lack of expert dental service

And I think that the Commissioners pointed out that \$60 had been spent in dental fees.

- "12. Lack of laboratory equipment and laboratory work in hospital;
- "13. Lack of requisite morgue facilities;
- "14. Frequency of colds, influenza and physical illness because of poor ventilation, overcrowding and other factors;
- "15. The hospital is gravely understaffed with regard to physicians;
- "16. Lack of trained nurses and absence of a nurses' Training School;
- "17. High turnover of nursing and attendant staff;
- "18. Appointment of nurses who are too young;
- "19. Unsuitable method of commitment of mental defectives and unsatisfactory method of dealing with mental defectives in the institution;
- "20. Lack of adequate occupational therapy programme"

And so on down through some fifty different defects. The Minister of Public Health and the Minister of Public Works will tell the House what steps have been taken to remedy this particular situation which has been handed on to us by the previous Administration. Now, much has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and it is likely that considerable will be said by other speakers of the Opposition in regard to the Civil Service and changes that have been made in the Civil Service since the 9th of September. I was following the Leader of the Opposition very closely, last evening, when he was reading the report of an interview with myself contained in one of the Saskatoon newspapers. I have here a copy of the edition in which was contained that interview, and I want to point out to you and to the members how clever my honourable friend is in just reading certain sections that will suit his purpose. I will read the other sections for the benefit of the people in this Assembly and acquaint them with the unfair tactics that are being practised in this House. He read that there

were eighty-eight civil servants out of 1,700 displaced. There he stopped. The next sentence is, "Twelve of these were returned soldiers. In the replacements there were thirty-four returned soldiers." Then he went on to speak of conditions in the liquor and beer stores. He did not read this, however:

"In 149 changes made, only six returned men were included, while in the replacements there were 108 returned men employed, which means that there are over 100 more returned men in the service of this Department than when we took office."

We are not ashamed of that record, Mr. Speaker, and if the Leader of the Opposition wishes, we are quite willing to let

Mr. Gardiner: If the honourable gentleman will permit me, may I say that the only reason I did not read them is because I did not want to trouble him with the proper figures which these are not.

Premier Anderson: The Leader of the Opposition need never worry about troubling us, neither in the past nor in the future.

Mr. Gardiner: You will hear them at the proper time.

Premier Anderson: So, notwithstanding all the effusions of our Liberal editorial writers and the frantic statements of some members opposite, who were members of the former Government, we are in the position to state most emphatically, that we have tried, in our efforts to re-organise up to the present time in the Civil Service, to deal out justice in every case. I may say further, if it should at any time by any member of the House, including the Leader of the Opposition, be brought to the attention of this Government that there is any case of any servant being dismissed unjustly, we are quite ready to reconsider that case. What more could you ask than that? I can tell the Leader of the Opposition of case after case where it was decided that, owing to the activities of civil servants in the last election, they should not be retained in the service of this province, but, after an investigation of their private and domestic conditions, it was decided not to molest them. That is why I can say to the Leader of the Opposition and I can say to the people of the Province, that we have proceeded most cautiously and with the greatest care in connection with this question and that is why only six per cent. of the civil servants of this province have been replaced since the 9th of September. Yet we have men prominent in public life, such as Mr. McIntosh, the Federal member for North Battleford, writing editorials in his weekly newspaper referring to "the axemen of the Government." Now, he is a gentleman who has been spoken of — largely by himself — as "The Second Laurier of Canada," and yet he makes statements such as that! I hope that I shall have the pleasure of meeting him sometime, and the other side of the story will then be told. As far as "axemen" are concerned, it seems to me that the people of North Battleford will wield the axe and wield it in his direction at the next Federal election.

Our policy will be, Mr. Speaker, as we stated before and as we state today, to establish the Civil Service of this province on a non-partisan basis. Surely my honourable friends, in view of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, have not much ground for criticism when they have it, on such authority, that we have, out of 1,700 in the employ of the former Liberal Government, some 1,600 still in the employ of the people today. We might say, quite fairly, "Let us work on a fifty-fifty basis; let us nominate one-half of the Civil Service from those members on this side of the House." But we have done more than that. There have been about one hundred appointed from, if you like, the friends of those on this side of the House, and there are about 1,600 now in the Service from the friends of those on that side of the House.

Mr. Agar: You are not through yet.

Mr. Davis: Might I ask my honourable friend if the Government has not a great number of applications?

Premier Anderson: I have no hesitation in telling my honourable friend from Prince Albert that there are quite a number from his own city. We have almost a hundred applications from Saskatoon, five hundred from Regina and upwards of a thousand from the other parts.

Mr. Agar: And I can speak for the efficiency of the "committees."

Premier Anderson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I should have reason to expect that the member for Saskatoon County will join us.

Mr. Agar: In the next world!

Premier Anderson: We will never meet in the next world, Mr. Speaker! But some things are possible in this. We shall then, before the end of this session, give the members on the other side of the House the opportunity of supporting legislation tending to remove the Civil Service from the realm of partisan politics; and we shall watch closely, and the people will watch closely, the conduct of these honourable gentlemen when the matter comes before the House.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the appointment of a school inspector and he gave you the information that this man had supported his Government during the last election. I was not particularly concerned about that. I have known this young man for a number of years.

Mr. Gardiner: In case the honourable gentleman misunderstood, he was helping in the Arm River by-election.

Premier Anderson: I am sure if he helped in the Arm River by-election he is very much ashamed of it.

The Leader of the Opposition did not point out to the members of the House that this Government had promoted to the high post of Deputy Minister of Health, Dr. Middleton. If we had been trying to play narrow party politics, as has been hinted, then we would not have promoted Dr. Middleton. In connection with other public institutions you will find that capable men, whose ability has been long recognised, have been appointed to positions and in the case of Dr. Middleton, his promotion should have come long ago; but he was not promoted for reasons best known to the former Minister of Public Health. We took the stand, when in opposition, that Dr. Middleton should be promoted and we carried out that pledge notwithstanding all that has been said about broken pledges.

Some criticism has been made about the method of appointing Justices of the Peace. I suppose to satisfy our friends in opposition, we should appoint good Liberal Justices of the Peace. Well, we have had enough experience to keep clear of that.

Mr. Agar: You keep clear of all recommendations.

Premier Anderson: We have no Jim Camerons to select these people, and we have to find some method, and naturally we consult with the people in the local community. We have nothing to hide in that connection.

Now, on the matter of Power: I listened with the greatest care to the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with power, and there again he told only one-half or one-quarter of the story. He left the impression—or tried to leave it—with the House and with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and of Canada that we have abandoned public ownership, that we have fallen down and sat idly by while private companies were buying the plant at Moose Jaw. And the Moose Jaw paper, which I do not consider very reliable, of course, in its headlines points out:

"Gardiner declares Anderson-Government is straying from Tory Platform on Power Question. —

"Scores Anderson for his inactivity in Moose Jaw Plant deal; Points out all Plants operated by Commission Bought Under Liberal Rule."

Now the last statement is not true. Humboldt was bought since the 9th of September. My honourable friend talked about headlines. Well, I can imagine he will see quite a few with even less of truth in them than those of the Moose Jaw paper. I may just as well say to the Leader of the Opposition that he and his Government, while they were in office, sat idly by and let three private companies enter this province and spend, they claim, some five or six millions of dollars and they never raised a finger against it until February, 1929. My honourable friend will remember that he himself signed permits allowing companies to build in this province over 1,000 miles of high power transmission lines, and I will tell him that this Government will not come to the point where they will sign permits for the erection of high power transmission lines and let me tell him that every mile that will henceforth be built in this province will be built under the direction of this Government and by the Government.

Mr. Spence: It was before.

Premier Anderson: My honourable friend is again romancing. The honourable member who interrupts me knows that the former Government spent no money on high power lines.

Mr. Davis: What are you going to do about the plants?

Premier Anderson: Well now, Mr. Speaker, the point is this: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, says we stood idly by and did not interfere with the sale of the Moose Jaw plant to a private company. The Power Commission made an offer. Citizens irrespective of their political affiliations, the majority of them, wanted to sell to a private company, and when the committee was drawn up there were some eighteen members of the "Grit" party including the former Liberal member of this Legislature, on that committee which supported the selling to a private company — eighteen out of twenty-three! And I wonder if my honourable friend called the ex-member down to the McCallum-Hill Building and rebuked him? I wonder whether the former Government went to the people of Melville and Broadview and Estevan and Fleming and so on, I wonder if they went to the people there and said, "Here, you must not sell to the private companies; you must sell to us"? Why try to deceive the people by referring to the one case at Moose Jaw? We have never heard about the other plants. We made an offer but the people of Moose Jaw saw fit to turn down the offer and sell to another company. In the case of Saskatoon the people had no vote on the matter. It was arranged between the Government and the council. If they had had a vote they might have done the same as Moose Jaw. In my opinion they should have had a vote, and if there is a proposal to sell the Regina plant there will be a vote. That they did not have a vote, of course, was largely the result of the attitude of the council and I wonder if my honourable friend knows that some of his chief lieutenants, including Cameron, McCallum and others, in their periodic trips to Saskatoon boasted that the building of a million and a half dollar plant at Saskatoon was going to deliver Saskatoon to the "Grit" party in this province! Well, I want to thank him to-night, and my honourable friend understands that. You cannot buy the people of Saskatoon with their own money, and you cannot so buy the people of the province.

We shall place before this House, when the estimates are being considered, the reasons why the members of this Legislature should grant us so many millions of dollars for power extension in this province, and we shall watch again very closely, as the people of the province will watch, the Leader of the Opposition and the men who sit beside him, and the attitude they take on this important matter of Power. We are sincere in our desire for government-ownership and you can study the history and the activities of the late Government and you will see insincerity written over a great part of that history.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been stated, let me repeat again—and reported in the press—by the present Leader of the Opposition that the Government of the province, as constituted today, has violated its pledges to the people of this province and because of that statement and because he says he cannot support this motion, which is a statement of policy which has met with general approval throughout the province, I am going to summarise some of the things that have been done by this Government up to the present time.

In the first place we have assisted the municipalities in coping with the unemployment situation, and these municipalities will tell you with what degree of success. We are meeting, and have met and shall continue to meet, the many requests for relief from the people of the municipalities. Then we have brought the natural resources question nearer to solution than ever before. In the matter of immigration, we have had the Federal Government recognise the principle of provincial authority over immigration.

Mr. Spence: It always did that.

Premier Anderson: Notwithstanding what my honourable friend says, we assumed the responsibility and our record is there, and it may be compared with the record of the previous Government at any time. Scores will tell you they (the late Government) evaded their responsibility and even took a "hands off" attitude because they did not wish to embarrass the Federal Government.

Then in addition to this, we have prepared and will establish a road policy which has met with approval from one end of the province to the other. The Retail Merchants

met the Government and expressed their confidence and appreciation in view of the road policy of this Government. Upwards of 2,000 delegates have met the Minister of Highways and the Government and have, by their expressed opinions and interest, endorsed the policy of the Government. We have investigated the Farm Loan Board and the result of that investigation will be placed before you in due time. We promised we would make changes with respect to the office of Official Guardian and place it under the Department of the Attorney-General; and that is being done. The educational reforms we promised, last year, will become law. In the matter of Public Health, our present Minister has set the lead for the other provinces of the Dominion in the treatment of the dread disease, cancer, and comments upon the proposed programme from all sections of the Dominion indicate that Saskatchewan is leading. We have investigated the Mental Hospital at Weyburn, so that we are now in a better position to give better treatment to people afflicted with diseases of the mind than has ever been given. We have, by agreeing to give grants to the technical schools to be erected in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, shown our interest in the problem of technical education, carrying out another pledge we made. We have given the returned man a squarer deal than he has ever received. The returned soldiers can answer that statement with emphasis. We have had independent audits made of the Telephones Department and the Farm Loan Board, and it is the intention of the Government to carry the idea of the independent audit much further. We have a definite policy regarding Power, more definite than any issued before. The Minister of Agriculture has begun to grapple with the weed menace, and he will give the House the details of that later in this debate. His department has co-operated with other organisations in the matter of fodder, and he has sufficient seed oats on hand to meet demands. The Workmen's Compensation Board has commenced to function and will be in complete operation by the 1st of May. The Teacher's Superannuation Act machinery has been set up. In addition to all that, we have brought to justice wrongdoers in the province and thus done something that we were told by honourable gentlemen opposite that we dared not do. We have carried out our pledge in that connection as well. We have prepared legislation that ensures, when this legislation passes, that the public schools of this great province will be freed from sectarian influences. We have promised that; we have the legislation ready and we expect honourable friends opposite to examine it carefully and decide whether or not they will give us their support in that connection. Yet they say that this Government has violated every pledge made to the electorate! We are quite prepared to allow the great jury of public opinion to render their verdict in this connection. Let me say, in voting for this motion you are endorsing these policies that I have outlined; in voting against this resolution you are opposing them. If there are members who think, as does the Leader of the Opposition, that every pledge has been violated, then of course they will oppose the motion.

Let me outline, before I take my seat, the attitude of this Government and the attitude of the members of this Government towards members of the Opposition. I am speaking more particularly of activities outside of the House, and this includes my honourable friend from Saskatoon County—

Mr. Agar: We are not asking for sympathy at all.

Premier Anderson: If any member on the opposition side wants to consult with any Minister, do not hesitate to do so. For four years my friend here (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*) and I sat as members for the City of Saskatoon and not on one single occasion were we asked to accompany a delegation to the Government. The general feeling in Saskatoon was you must be a "Grit," or you would be of no assistance to Council or School Board. Now the policy of the Government—

Mr. Hogan: You must now be a Tory.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: We want you to understand that is not going to be the practice.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there are any Tories in Vonda.

Mr. Hogan: There are not many, I will tell you that.

Premier Anderson: I want them to feel free to come to this Government and I will assure them they will not be penalised the way we were while we were on the opposition benches. Our first duty is not with the "Grit" party nor with the Co-operatives, nor with the member for Vonda or Saskatoon County; our first duty is with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and we are going to endeavour to carry on, both inside this House and outside, along that line.

THE HONOURABLE HOWARD McCONNELL, B.A., LL.B. K.C.

(Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Municipal Affairs)

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to resume the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech of His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, I should like to extend felicitations to the Honourable J. T. M. Anderson upon his assumption of the office of Premier of this province. I should like to assure him that he has, and will continue to receive, loyal support from the honourable members from this side of the Chamber to assist him in the carrying out or the performance of his duties as Leader of the Government.

I should also, at this time, like to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on the honour conferred upon you by your fellow-members in selecting you as Speaker, to preside over the deliberations of this Assembly. Your training (and I do not refer particularly to your Theological training) should fit you to carry out your duties in such a manner as will command the respect of all the honourable members and enhance the dignity of this Chamber.

May I also extend my good wishes to the former Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition. He has important duties to perform. We, on this side of the House, know what those duties are, because it was only yesterday that we occupied those benches. We want him to know and feel we shall welcome constructive, helpful criticism from himself and his followers, concerning anything we do as a government.

I should be altogether remiss, Mr. Speaker, were I to fail to tell the honourable members present, how happy those of us on this side of the House, who know the honourable member from Wynyard, are at his restoration to health and bodily vigor again. We express the hope that he may be spared for many years to come.

It has been mentioned before, and I am going to mention it again, that there is an absence of many faces in this Assembly, and I notice the presence of new ones. To the new members I extend my best wishes.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we all rejoice at the restoration of health to His Majesty, both on account of himself as a man, and because of the symbol which he represents. It is very fitting that he should have presided at the opening ceremonies at the recent Five Powers Limitation of Armaments Conference in London.

Since the session of the Legislature last winter, the will of the people has been expressed in no uncertain manner. They were the jury and their verdict has been well understood. The old Government was found wanting to that degree that even its own supporters turned against it and assisted in putting it out of office. The new Co-operative Government is in office today, and if this new Government wishes to stay in office it must correct the sins of omission and commission of the old regime, and they were many. It must give an earnest of its good intentions in the form of necessary legislation and in the matter of departmental administration. The new Government proposes to do things. The speech of His Honour indicates some of the projects which this Government has in mind and some of the reforms it proposes to bring about. The Government intends to stand or fall by this program.

It is my purpose during the remarks that I have to make in this debate, to refer to that portion of His Honour's Address which deals with the Farm Loan Board. I do this because the control of this Board falls under one of the departments which I have the honour to administer. It is my wish to present this subject in a business-like way, and the conclusions which I shall arrive at are the conclusions which I trust will be warranted by certain facts which I shall present, and the conclusions I trust, which any impartial individual would arrive at.

The Saskatchewan Farm Loans Act, under which the present Farm Loan Board operates, was passed in 1917. Its purpose, in the terms of the Act, was, amongst others,

to lend money to agriculturists on the security of first mortgages on farm lands. A further reason why this Act was passed at that time, was to lower the rate of interest charged by the Line Loan Companies in their loans to farmers in this province. The Act was also passed to secure increased production of farm products and in this way assist the Allies in winning the war. To accomplish this purpose the loaning of money up to \$10,000,000.00 was authorized. The Act further provided that no loans should be for an amount greater than fifty per cent. of the Board's valuation of the property offered as security. In 1920 the Act was further amended to make provision for advances for seed grain, and to raise money for the use of the Board up to \$15,900,000.00. During the year 1921-1922 the Act was further amended to permit the Board, on getting title to mortgaged properties, to maintain the property, to pay taxes, premiums on insurance for fire, hail, cyclone, windstorms or tornados, and as security for such advances, to require the Board to deposit with the Provincial Treasurer, the duplicate title for such property. These amendments were necessary to give the Board a free hand.

The policy of the Board almost since its inception, has been unfavourably commented on from time to time, by the Deputy Provincial Auditor. As early as 1919 the Deputy Provincial Auditor commented on the Board's practice of increasing loans over the Inspector's recommendations. In January 1924, when criticising the 1923 balance sheet, he stated in part as follows:

"In reviewing the standing of these assets in the balance sheet as above, no other conclusion seems possible than that the position disclosed is very weak and not encouraging for the future."

In his report of January 28, 1928, the Deputy Provincial Auditor, when criticising the 1927 Balance Sheet, stated in part as follows:

"The total credit balance of the profit and loss account and reserves, amounts to \$464,833.65, which is purely a paper item and represents the uncollected interest in arrears by the borrowers of practically the same amount — \$474,473.62."

As far back as 1922, the Provincial Auditor compiled a table showing the percentage collected each year of the total interest due, including, of course, the arrears from the preceding years as follows:

1. Year ending December 31, 1918—paid 80 per cent. of accrued and payable.
2. Year ending December 31, 1919—paid 58 per cent. of accrued and payable.
3. Year ending December 31, 1920—paid 46 per cent. of accrued and payable.
4. Year ending December 31, 1921—paid 37 per cent. of accrued and payable.

Let us see what Mr. Dunning had to say about the Board's operations. In his Budget speech during the Session of 1921-1922 Mr. Dunning, then Provincial Treasurer, stated in part as follows:

"We have given more financial assistance in Saskatchewan than in all the other provinces put together. In connection with the Farm Loan Scheme, our loans in this province exceed the total Government loans to agriculture in all the other provinces put together. There is another reason why we have carefully to consider this matter and I regret to have to refer to it. It was pointed out, at the time the scheme was launched, that loaning cannot be continued unless the attitude of the borrowers in general toward the obligation is sound and right. If the borrowers in any large numbers take the attitude that this money need not be repaid or need be repaid only when the borrower cares, because it is Government money, this attitude will kill the scheme and compel the Government to restrict its operations."

From these various reports and criticisms it should have been apparent to anyone that all was not well with the Farm Loan Board. Criticisms from outside sources, from men who were in a position to know what they were talking about, must have reached the ears of the Government from time to time. I am informed that amongst men in the Line Loan Companies in Saskatchewan, some of whom were supporters of the past Government, the business methods of the Farm Loan Board were a bye-word and a jest. The usual comment was "go and sell your farm to the Farm Loan Board." These unkind references must have reached the ears of the Cabinet, because they were continually reaching ours. And yet, did the old Government by any action signify that all was not well with the Board? It did not. It did nothing at all. To show that the Government decided to flout this criticism, to reassert its confidence in the Board's management, and to show that all was well, two years ago, it reappointed the present manager of the Board, Mr. Colin Fraser, for a further period of ten years, at a time when, I am informed, Mr. Fraser was sixty-nine years old — four years beyond that period when, by provision of one of our Statutes, the Government superannuates its Civil Servants.

Mr. Gardiner: No! The Act says seventy.

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): No! Retirement is voluntary at sixty-five and compulsory at seventy.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: No! That is not correct; I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago, we find Mr. Fraser was reappointed for a period of ten years and he will thus draw a salary until he is seventy-nine years old.

I may say further that during the past three years, the opposition has continually criticised the operations of the Board, but the Government still continued to do nothing.

Although the new Federal Farm Loans Act limits the loan to any one individual to \$10,000.00, no such limit was ever placed in our Act governing loans made by the Board. As a consequence, the Board made loans to a single individual up to \$25,000.00. It has made other loans all the way from \$5,000.00 to \$19,000.00. It is true that these larger loans are not particularly numerous, but they were made nevertheless.

The present Co-operative Government feels that the spirit behind The Saskatchewan Farm Loans Act was to provide small loans to as large a number of farmers as possible, instead of large loans to fewer farmers. The Line Loan Company can adopt whatever policy it likes, but when the people of Saskatchewan are providing the money, this Government feels that as great a number of farmers as possible should get the benefit of these loans. As a consequence, one of the first things the new Government did was to issue instructions to the Board that in the future no loans should be made to any one individual for an amount greater than \$5,000.00.

Shortly after assuming office in September of last year, one of the first duties of the new Government was to suspend two of the members of the Board, Mr. Hettle of Saskatoon, and Mr. Grayson of Moose Jaw. May I say at this time, that I have the highest regard for Mr. Fraser, Mr. Hettle and Mr. Grayson. These men are all good citizens, and have served their communities faithfully. There can be no doubt as to their personal integrity, for that was never in question. The Co-operative Government felt, however, that it had no confidence in the Board, and, acting within the scope of its authority, it asked for the resignation of Mr. Hettle and Mr. Grayson and received them. The Government then appointed in their places Mr. J. A. Thompson of Moose Jaw, realtor, and Mr. W. M. Brooks of Saskatoon, farmer. These two men with Mr. Fraser constitute the Board today.

The next step the Government took early in October, was to appoint Mr. Walter Weston of Saskatoon, Chartered Accountant, as auditor, to make a detailed audit of the finances and affairs of the Farm Loan Board, and in particular to investigate into the worth of the standing loans, the value of the lands in the possession of the Board now, on account of foreclosures, and any sales that had been made on said lands. He was asked to give his opinion as to whether the administrative charges of the Board were excessive, and whether the methods of accounting were sufficient to prepare a balance sheet as at December 1, 1929. Mr. Weston has been president of the Saskatchewan Chartered Accountants Institute; has been a member of the National Council of the Dominion Institute of Chartered Accountants, and was auditor for the city of Saskatoon for a number of years. He is a thoroughly reliable accountant in every way. He set about his task forthwith, and in his report which was tabled by me today, he gives his findings. It is with reference to this report, its criticisms and its recommendations that I now wish, with your permission, to direct your attention.

The report consists of over one hundred pages. The first thirty-eight pages of the report are made up of the auditor's findings, his criticisms and his recommendations. The balance of his report is made up of appendices and schedules. These appendices contain data covering a large number of individual loans which are cited by the auditor to substantiate any criticism which he makes in the preface of his report. This is the method he has adopted throughout his report to prevent any one from saying that the report is only a statement of biased opinion, and not founded on fact.

May I state here, that the whole report is a severe indictment of the Farm Loan Board, its management and its operations. The report establishes that the Board will be faced with a large deficit, which the people of this province will have to assume.

Mr. Weston at the outset finds particularly with reference to auditing:

1. That although the Provincial Auditor performed certain work each year, no proper audit of the Board's books was ever made.

2. That Loan Accounts were never verified by the auditor by direct correspondence with the mortgagor.

3. That with the exception of one or two years, the postings to the loan ledger had never been called to ascertain whether charges, etc., had been posted to the correct account or not.

4. That cancelled mortgages were mixed with current mortgages.

5. That some securities which should have been in the Treasurer's office were found in the Board's office.

6. That some mortgages and duplicate certificates of title had been recalled by the Board from the Treasurer's office and had never been returned.

7. That the Provincial Auditor had never examined the files of the Board to see whether any payments on the loans should have been made. In one case the Board paid \$96.00 to a tenant for the Board's own seed grain.

8. That no check of the fire insurance policies of the Board had ever been made, and that same were found in a bad state.

9. That expense vouchers of various inspectors had been permitted to be destroyed for all the years except 1928 and 1929.

Mr. Weston says: "The Provincial Auditor did, however, see that the books were balanced each month. He also verified the payments whether such payments were in order or not." The Provincial Auditor also prepared the Financial Statement each year for the Board. Mr. Weston reiterates, however, that no proper audit of the Board's books was ever conducted.

Mr. Weston does not condemn all the loans made by the Board, because the Board has made many good loans. There was, however, too large a percentage of bad loans. The criticisms that Mr. Weston makes, fall under the following headings:

1. Incompetent administration of the Board's affairs.
2. Board's bad Inspection Policy:
 - (a) Loans granted on bad inspections.
 - (b) Loans granted where doubtful whether any inspection had ever been made.
 - (c) Loans granted where the Inspector had recommended that no loans be granted.
 - (d) Loans increased over the Inspector's recommendation.
 - (e) Loans made for over 50 per cent. of the valuation.
3. Loans granted to aged men and women.
4. Board's failure to see that the money was expended for the purpose of the loan.
5. Outside influences on the Board's policy.
6. Board's lack of a proper collection policy.
7. Lack of careful management of the Board's properties.
8. Board's faulty foreclosure policy and foreclosure of loans.
9. Board's bad sale policy.

I wish to deal with Mr. Weston's criticisms in the order given by me. First, I shall give to you the comment of the auditors concerning the "*Incompetent Administration of the Board's Affairs.*" He states that "Three men met one or two days a week and attempted to go over every detail of a business amounting to several millions of dollars. During all these years the Board wasted its time over petty details which would have been delegated in any well organized office, to subordinates. Employees were reduced to the same clerical status. No action could be taken and no letters of any importance could be written without the authority of the Board. The Chairman of the Board called for the mail every morning at the Post Office, instead of having the Post Office authorities deliver the mail at the office. All the letters were personally opened by the Commissioner." The above methods are those which would not be tolerated in any well managed office of a line loan company.

I come now, to the second main criticism which the auditor has to make. It deals with the "*Board's Bad Inspection Policy.*" In this connection the auditor found that the Board would grant loans several years after the inspection was made without having the land re-inspected; the Board would give loans on property when the inspector reported that there were several inches of snow on the ground so that it was impossible to properly inspect the land; loans were made on land that turned out to be a gravel pit and which was later on sold to the Highways Department; loans were

made on lands that subsequently proved to be veritable stone piles; loans were made on lands that later on proved to be pure sand; loans were made on lands that later on proved not to be cultivated at all, being used only for pasture; loans were made on lands that proved to be muskeg and alkali flats; and finally, loans were made where the inspector failed to report how many acres were cultivated and how many were not cultivated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as an example of the Board's bad inspection policy as reported on by the auditor, I have some illustrations of loans where bad inspection policy is evident:

1. We have here a loan that was made on a farm which was located three miles from Wisetown. I have the name of the borrower and the number of the quarter section. There were, cultivated, 50 acres, and uncultivated, 109 acres; inspector's valuation of the land \$1631.00; inspector's valuation of improvements \$400.00. The inspector recommended a loan of \$800.00, which the Board granted. Standing of loan, 1929, \$1612.52, and interest from foreclosure in 1925. Although the inspector recommended this loan, he remarked, "This is a poor, gravelly quarter and not good security." And still the Board made this loan. The notes the auditor has made are,—that the inspector recommended a loan on poor security; property was not correctly shown on Board's statements for two years; the loan with interest exceeds valuation of the land; and the Board is trying to sell for more than the property is worth.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I just ask, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member will give the dates of these different loans?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: September 26, 1919, is the date. The loan number is 2079.

The second illustration is loan number 2859. A quarter section eight miles from Eyebrow. Cultivated 30 acres; uncultivated 130 acres; inspector's valuation of the land \$1620.00; inspector's valuation of improvements \$200; inspector recommended a loan of \$700.00, and the Board granted a loan of \$600.00; and the standing of the loan (it was foreclosed in 1926) in 1929 was \$1,006.67 plus interest from date of foreclosure. The inspector remarks: "This is practically just a pasture quarter, the thirty acres that are broken would be better seeded down to grass." The auditor says in his report, "As the report does not show that the borrower was cultivating any of the land, and as he had nothing above his exemptions in livestock and machinery, it is difficult to ascertain from what source repayment of this loan was expected. The borrower appears to have abandoned the property in 1925, and the land has not been under cultivation since." He comments that there was poor security.

Mr. Speaker, the above are only a few examples of the numerous loans referred to by the auditor. The reason why the Board made these loans in the face of such inspections, I leave to the intelligence of the honourable members.

I come now to the third class that the auditor has to make of the Board's management. This has to do with "*Loans made where there is more than a suspicion that no inspection whatever was made of the land prior to the loan.*" To illustrate this class of loan I refer to loan number 3662, eight miles from Cando, 800 acres. The honourable member from Biggar will know something about this district. Cultivated 120 acres; uncultivated 690 acres; inspector's valuation of the land \$8,820; inspector's valuation of improvements \$2,400; date of inspection, October 1, 1920; no character report; inspector recommended loan of \$5,000; Board granted \$5,000; and the valuation of the land, Mr. Speaker, was \$8,820! and \$2,400 in buildings, of course. The standing of the loan at foreclosure in 1924 was \$6,648.38; standing of the loan in 1929, \$7,616.41 plus interest. The comments of the auditor are as follows:

"Apparently the mortgagor had sold the property at the time he applied for the loan, and appeared to have considered the property mortgaged for its full value. The mortgagor and his brother hauled away some of the buildings and disposed of them in a neighbouring town. The original inspector made no particular mention of any stones. In 1929 a second inspector reports as follows: 'The whole farm is so stony that it will be very expensive to break any of it.' He saw two parties regarding breaking. One offered to break and clear the land of stones for \$15.00 per acre, and the other would not consider the work at all."

And this was a loan where the first inspector made no mention of stones whatever. The notes are, "No character report;"—And I would like to point out that the inspector, who is the eyes of the Board, should make a character report — "no purpose of loan given; bad management; Board permitted buildings to be removed and sold by other

parties; land proves too stony to break." This has been revalued by the Board's inspector at \$4,000.00.

Mr. Davis: Who made the last valuation, the revaluation?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: That was one of the Board's inspectors. One of the old Board's.

Mr. Davis: Who were your inspectors?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I cannot recall all the names. Mr. Currie, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Anderson, — "

Mr. Gardiner: Did I understand the minister to say that the inspector recommended a \$5,000.00 loan?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: In the first case. The point the auditor wants to make is, that the first inspector recommended the loan and made no mention of any stone whatever and the auditor then draws the conclusion that there was no inspection made of that land.

Mr. Davis: Is that Mr. Anderson the same T. A. Anderson?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: It is Mr. Anderson of Regina.

I shall let the honourable members present say whether or not the auditor was correct in his statements.

I come now to the fourth criticism of the Board's management, and in many respects it is most illuminating as to the business methods adopted by the Board. It deals with "*Loans granted when the Inspector recommended that no loan should be granted.*" That is, Mr. Speaker, the inspector, who is they eyes of the Board, recommends one thing and the Board, which has never seen the land, grants a loan against his recommendation. I think the honourable gentlemen present can understand the reason for this action. It should be clear. I have drawn my own conclusion.

Mr. Davis: Will you say there were not some Conservative applicants?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I will bet you there was not a Conservative application in the bunch.

Mr. Agar: I can give you at least ten from Saskatoon County and some of them got \$10,000.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Against the inspector's recommendation?

Mr. Agar: I can give you the names!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I want to give two illustrations of this class of loan. Quarter section near Marengo: Cultivated, nil; uncultivated, 160 acres; inspector's valuation of land \$2,050, with no improvements; date of inspection, August 10th, 1917; character report—unknown; purpose of loan—to make improvements; inspector recommended that no loan be granted, and what did the Board do? The Board granted a loan of \$1,000.00, and today there is outstanding \$1,615.40. The auditor's notes are:

"No land under cultivation and no character report. Inspector declined the loan; Board granted loan of \$1,000.00; Board granted loan to resident of Norway; loan with interest exceeds valuation of land; property transferred to son at suggestion of solicitor, in order to close a loan the inspector declined."

The owner of the land at the time of his application was in Norway. At the suggestion of the solicitor for the Board, he transferred the property to his son, a railway employee, and the Board granted the loan.

Mr. Gardiner: How long ago was that?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: In 1917.

Mr. Davis: Would you give the loan numbers as you go along?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The loan number is 511.

The next illustration is number 3888, 640 acres, seven and a half miles from Lintlaw; cultivated 15 acres, uncultivated 625 acres; inspector's valuation of land \$6,160; improvements nil; character report missing; purpose of loan missing; inspector recommended no loan be granted; Board granted a loan of \$4,000.00; standing of loan at foreclosure (1926) \$3,589.76; standing of loan in 1929, \$4,601.97 and interest. Here are the comments:

"The original inspector remarks, 'I cannot recommend anything that would do this man any good. I don't know how he can meet his interest charges and get his land under production.'"

And in the face of that the Board goes ahead and grants the loan!

"At the present time there are ninety acres under cultivation and no mention is made of any buildings. The Board is asking \$6,000 for the place. The property has not been reinspected by an inspector of the Board but I am reliably informed that this property has been visited by all three members of the original Board."

The Board granted \$4,000, and there is no character report. The loan, with interest is now nearly twice the value of the land. The land has been revalued at \$4,480.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are two illustrations where the Board deliberately disregarded the inspector's recommendations and, for some reasons, which are quite apparent, loaned money to these gentlemen, and still people will wonder how this Board managed to get along all these years. The surprising thing to me is that this Board was not investigated before it was.

I come now to that class of loans which the auditor criticises as "*Loans increased over the Inspector's Valuation,*" and I shall give you two illustrations here again. The number of the loan is 950, 160 acres: cultivated 145 acres; uncultivated, 15 acres; the inspector valued the farm at \$3,875.00 with \$300.00 improvements; the inspector recommended a loan of \$1,800.00, and the Board granted \$2,000.00. That is where they again disregarded their own inspector's recommendation.

Mr. Gardiner: Would the honourable gentleman mind giving the dates as he goes along?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The date of inspection in this loan is September 12, 1918.

Mr. Gardiner: How much is owing?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: \$5,599.58.

Mr. Davis: And there was a loan of how much?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: \$2,000.00.

Here is the next illustration, loan number 203, 640 acres: cultivated 370 acres; uncultivated 270 acres; inspector's valuation of land \$8,600; improvements \$1,000; date of inspection was May 10, 1929. The inspector recommended a loan of \$3,500, and the Board increased the loan to \$4,000.

The above practice would be condemned by a line loan company. As to why this was done I leave with you.

This brings me now to an interesting class of loans. They are "*Loans granted which are over 50 per cent. of the valuation of the land.*" I wish, however, before giving any illustrations of such loans to refer you to section 14, subsection (1) of The Saskatchewan Farm Loans Act. This reads as follows:

"No loan shall be made for an amount greater than fifty per cent. of the Board's valuation of the property offered as security."

There is no misunderstanding this; and yet, Mr. Speaker, in direct contravention of the Act, this Board grants loans that were strictly prohibited. It apparently had been in office so long that it became a law unto itself. I will give you some illustrations of this class of loan. Loan number 103, 160 acres: uncultivated 113 acres; cultivated 17 acres. This loan was inspected on July 28th, 1917. The character report is "Probably poor"; inspector's valuation of the land \$708.00; improvements \$100.00; inspector recommended no loan, and the Board granted a loan of \$500.00, which was granted after the inspector's valuation of \$708.00! The property was inspected in 1917. I would like to call this note of the auditor's to your attention: "The Board violated the terms of the Act; the inspector declined the loan; the Board granted a loan of \$500.00; the

sale appears hopelessly inflated; and the Board has to pay taxes for 1929 to protect its security."

Mr. Davis: How much did it sell for?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: \$1,701.00.

Mr. Davis: How much was due on the loan?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: At the time of the sale in 1929, \$1,537.67.

Here is a second illustration: a farm of 320 acres; cultivated 50 acres; this land is near Readlyn; uncultivated 270 acres; inspector's valuation of the land \$3,000; improvements \$1,850; date of inspection, October 5, 1918; inspector recommended a loan of \$2,300; Board granted a loan of \$2,500, which was more than half the value of the land.

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): And the number?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: 185.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to a class of loans in which I must admit there is some difficulty. These are "*Loans granted to aged men and women.*" I think that I am stating the case fairly when I say that banking institutions and loan companies when lending money give as much importance to the age and character of the borrower, as to his statement of assets. In other words, when a line loan company loans money to a mortgagor, the company knows that no matter how good the land and buildings may be, they cannot of themselves pay back the loan. A great deal depends upon the age and character of the applicant. I agree that we should make generous provisions for our aged people when necessary, but I doubt the wisdom of a farm loan board, in open competition with line loan companies, making numerous loans to mortgagors without considering these important details. And when the Farm Loan Board advances money in such cases, in a great many cases the inspectors made no comment about the character of the applicant. That, apparently, was of no consequence to the Board. Can you wonder, therefore, that losses were incurred?

I am going to give two illustrations: In the first, the property is near Benito, 160 acres; number 672; cultivated 20 acres; uncultivated 140 acres; and the land was valued at \$920.00 by the inspector; improvements \$100.00; character of applicant unknown; purpose of loan unknown; date of inspection, October 31, 1917; the inspector recommended a loan of \$300.00, and the Board granted \$300.00; and owing, at the date of foreclosure (1925) \$783.78. The selling price was \$500.00.

Here are the important things with reference to this loan: The first inspector's report was incomplete; forty to fifty acres of valueless muskeg were discovered when it was reinspected. In his application the borrower claimed nine years' residence, during which time he had broken twenty acres and had sixteen horses, one cow, and five pigs. The borrower was eighty years of age; there was no character report; the Board lost \$425.45 on a \$300.00 loan. And the question arises, was this land ever inspected prior to the loan?

The second illustration is: Loan number 827, near Hearne. Date of inspection September, 1917. The inspector's valuation of the land and improvements was \$4,150; the inspector recommended a loan of \$1,750, and the Board granted \$1,500. There was no land under cultivation; the borrower was sixty-nine years of age, and died in 1919 leaving no one to carry on after his death.

I come now to a further criticism of the Board's activities: "*Board's failure to see that money was expended for the purpose of the loans.*" In our Farm Loans Act, it is lawful for money loaned under these Acts to be spent for certain purposes. These are:

"To make permanent improvements of property; to assist in productive development; payment of liabilities which have been incurred for any of the aforesaid purposes; and for the acquisition of land for agricultural purposes."

May I say it is considered quite as important by loan companies to see that the proceeds of a loan are spent properly by the borrower as it is to see that the security is good in the first place. Did our Board see to it that the proceeds of the loan were properly expended? In a great many cases it did not. It had the mortgage and that was apparently as far as the Board's interest in the matter went. Here I have two cases to illustrate: The first is loan number 685, 157 acres, near Argo; cultivated 40

acres; uncultivated 120 acres; the purpose of the loan was to purchase the south-east quarter for \$2,000, with \$600.00 cash; the inspector recommended a loan of \$500.00, and the Board granted a loan of \$500.00. At the date of foreclosure in 1924 there was outstanding \$1,069.40, and in 1929 \$1,169.51, not including 1929 taxes and interest. The auditor remarks, "You will note that this borrower wished to purchase an adjoining quarter for \$2,000, and \$600 cash. The Board granted him \$500.00 just for what purpose cannot be ascertained. The inspector reported that the land was poor and sandy and could not be expected to raise a crop.

Mr. Davis: What is the date of that?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: May 9, 1918.

The second illustration is loan number 334; 320 acres: cultivated nil; inspector's valuation of the land \$4,800.00; inspector recommended loan of \$2,400.00 which was granted; outstanding at the date of foreclosure \$4,194.78, and at date of sale outstanding \$5,988.64. The loan was made by the Board, \$1,500 for breaking 300 acres, \$900.00 for buildings, the money to be paid only on completion. These disbursements were made to the borrower without further investigation as soon as the work was reported finished. Subsequently it is discovered that the wages and material used in the buildings were not paid for and that the breaking was poorly done. The above illustrations are of the poor business methods followed by the Board.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Yes.

Mr. Gardiner: Is there any evidence to show there was no further inspection or nothing further was spent, or nothing to show where the money was spent?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The auditor reports he could find none.

Mr. Gardiner: That there is nothing on the file?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The auditor reports it should be on file but there is nothing on file.

Mr. Gardiner: There is nothing to show it was not done?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Nothing to show it was done!

I come now to an important class of loans, and this concerns "*Outside influences on the Board's policy.*" During the Session of 1928, the Honourable Mr. Patterson, Provincial Treasurer, when making his Budget Speech, stated that the Government had never interfered with the internal management of the Board in any way. It is true that there may be no documentary evidence that the Government interfered with the operations of the Board. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that interference of that kind would be highly improper and it seems to me, if I were going to interfere I would not put it in writing.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, I made the statement, as the minister has stated, that the Government had not interfered with the management of the Board in any way and I will say so now, and I want the honourable gentleman to take my statement. He has no business suggesting that because there is nothing in writing that it was done personally.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing the record of the Gardiner Government. I am discussing the policy of the Farm Loan Board under the Provincial Governments from 1917, about which the past Provincial Treasurer knows nothing.

Mr. Gardiner: He knows as much as you know!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I have some documentary evidence here and you will know a little bit more in a minute. Let me quote from the auditor's report:

"The inspectors advocated a very queer policy during the earlier years of the Board, in recommending loans. An inspector would recommend a loan for a given amount, and then in his remarks set forth that the applicant could not meet his payments or that the loan would not assist him in any way, and, although he recommended the loan, in his remarks there is occasionally found the word 'decline.' Nevertheless the loan was granted."

Mr. Weston called this matter to the attention of the inspectors and that inspector told him that during the earlier years of the Board, he had received verbal instructions from each member of the Board, that whenever he thought the borrower had a chance to pull through, no matter how small the chance, he was to recommend the loan. The auditor told the inspector that these instructions meant that he was to gamble with the province's money. The inspector admitted that this was the situation now.

Now, I am going to give one illustration to show you what I mean by outside influence, and the honourable members present can read between the lines, and to show that it was outside influence primarily which brought about the diversion in the Board's policy. Loan number 3119, 480 acres, nine miles from Davidson: The date of the inspection is October 20, 1920. The farm is situated near the town of Davidson. Davidson is in the provincial constituency of Arm River. The inspector's valuation of the land was \$10,700; the valuation of the improvements was \$1,300.00; and the inspector's character report — well, there is not any. The purpose of the loan was to retire existing mortgages, all in arrears. Now, here is what the inspector said: "I recommend that no loan whatever be granted." The Board granted a loan of \$5,500.00; standing of loan at foreclosure (1928) \$13,935.16; and the standing of the loan last year was \$14,488.11. here was a special investigation made in May, 1928, and the valuation of the land was \$6,150.00 and improvements \$1,050.00. Now, here are the remarks of the auditor:

"On the original application I note a memo, in the Commissioner's handwriting, as follows: 'Sent in by George A. Scott, M.L.A., wants inspector to see him.'"

Mr. Scott is a former honourable member of this Legislature.

"Wants inspector to see him."

Those words, the auditor says, appear on the application. That seems to me to be very significant. That is what I mean by outside influence. The auditor remarks further:

"The inspector reported the land chiefly light sandy loam. He states: 'This land is badly drifted in places, and a branch of the Arm River flows through one quarter.' On the inspector's report I find a memorandum in pencil, 'Mr. Scott says white clay except where the buildings are.'"

Now, I do not think it necessary to pursue this report. It is evident that one calamity has succeeded another in connection with this particular loan.

Mr. Davis: What is the date of that one?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: It was in 1920.

I come now to the next criticism of the auditor. This is the "*Board's lack of proper collection policy.*" Mr. Speaker, any loan company has two main functions:

1. To loan money on good security.
2. To collect this money with interest when due. Failure to do either can only result in large losses. The auditor advises me that he interviewed the chairman of the Board about the Board's collection department. The chairman told the auditor that the Board's secretary was in charge of this department. The secretary denied that this was the case. He pointed to the Board's procedure with reference to loans to have been as follows:

"If a man wrote in for an extension or asked the Board to pay his taxes, or asked to retain the Board's share of the crop, each of these letters was referred to the Board. Owing to the great volume of business, the Board is required to make an instantaneous decision in a great many cases of which it cannot possibly know the circumstances. No one is permitted to reply to the letters except to say that the matter will be referred to the Board. After the request is granted the mortgagor is advised that the Board is pleased to do so and so."

The land mortgaged to the Board was never checked up against the lands advertised for sale in *The Saskatchewan Gazette*, except by accident. No trained collection clerks were employed to keep the files checked up. No collection letters of importance could be written without being first referred to the chairman for instructions to any of the inspectors as to how to proceed. In one case a man wrote a letter asking for time. The secretary wrote a letter stating that payment must be made. The borrower went to the bank, purchased a draft, and pinned the draft to the secretary's letter. As the chairman insists on opening all correspondence, he saw the letter and advised the secretary that if he ever again wrote such another letter, he would be discharged.

Needless to say the secretary did not offend again. In short, the Board has not such a thing as a collection department. The following may be cited to show the loss arising from the lack of such a collection department.

| | |
|--|------------|
| "Loan No. 1026. | 320 Acres. |
| Cultivated—90 acres. | |
| Uncultivated—230 acres. | |
| Inspector's valuation—land— | \$6,300.00 |
| Inspector's valuation—improvements— | Nil |
| Date of inspection—September 17, 1918. | |
| Purpose of loan—Retire mortgages. | |
| Character report—Keen business man. | |
| Inspector recommended loan of | \$2,000.00 |
| Board granted loan of | \$1,600.00 |
| Date of foreclosure—1924—Outstanding | \$2,828.67 |

Remarks: This loan was made to a wealthy Saskatoon man, who made one payment and permitted the Board to foreclose."

There is owing on this property \$4,001.62 and interest from September 27, 1924. This borrower is widely known as well-to-do and should have been compelled to pay under the covenant.

It would appear that this borrower sold this land to the Board for the amount of the loan.

Auditor's Notes:

- The Board's claim is nearly the original valuation of the land.
- The Board never pressed for payment, although I personally know the borrower was able to pay.
- The file shows the Board is unable to sell the land for what is against it.
- I do not believe the land was properly inspected.
- I believe the borrower's influence with the Board is one reason he was not pressed for payment.

This loan was revalued by Board's inspector at \$3,000.00.

The second illustration is loan number 748.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Loan 748. | 480 acres. |
| Cultivated—325 acres. | |
| Uncultivated—155 acres. | |
| Inspector's valuation—land— | \$10,620.00 |
| Inspector's valuation—improvements— | 2,100.00 |
| Date of inspection—April 26, 1918. | |
| Character report—Probably good. | |
| Purpose of loan—To pay all debts. | |
| Inspector recommended loan | \$5,550.00 |
| Board granted loan of | 5,500.00 |
| Standing of loan—Current | \$8,425.63 |

Remarks: In his application (which was made out by the inspector on the date of his inspection) the borrower stated that his debts totalled \$5,300, and would all be paid from the proceeds of the loan. There is no report on the outcome of the crops until the fall of 1921, when his debts were \$6,000 in addition to his mortgage. Either the inspector was misinformed in the first instance or he was over-anxious to obtain the business. It is not possible to follow the course of the account closely, as some interviews were arranged by a member of the Board in Saskatoon, and are not reported upon in the correspondence.

It is evident that the borrower has no intention of suffering personally from lack of funds. The Board has given the lease to the sheriff for collection for several years until this year. Although the crop around Saskatoon was very fair this year, the borrower's crop returns submitted by the inspector would indicate practically a failure. The Board has given the borrower permission to feed his crop to some hogs, and the proceeds from the sale of forty hogs next spring are to be applied on the loan. The Board's solicitor is endeavouring to obtain a chattel mortgage on the pigs to protect the interest of the Board; but as the borrower makes a practice of ignoring all letters, it is not likely that the solicitor will have any success. This matter should be arranged by one of the inspectors in Saskatoon. A search of his chattels reveals that he purchased a new car in 1928.

This man is obviously not playing square with his creditors; and the Board should commence foreclosure proceedings before its equity in the security has disappeared—that is, if it is still possible to do so.

The land is not worth the inspector's valuation. In his first report, the inspector stated that one quarter was light and decidedly sandy at the west side.

There is nothing on file to indicate that any taxes have been paid since 1926, when the Board redeemed the property from tax sales.

Revalued by the Board's inspector at \$9,600.00."

The Auditor's comments are as follows:

- "(a) The lack of intelligent collection methods is strikingly evident in this loan.
- (b) The member of the Board did not report the result of his interview with the borrower.
- (c) The Board was compelled to redeem the property from tax sale in 1926.
- (d) Nothing has been paid on the principal of this loan since it was granted.
- (e) \$2,914.34 has been charged to this loan and taken into Revenue."

So, the conclusion that the auditor has come to is that the Board has never had a proper collection department up until the time when the old Government went out of office. I do not know whether any changes have been made since that time.

The Board is criticised by the Auditor for "*Lack of Careful Management of the Board's Properties.*" Here the auditor supports that criticism by specific cases, but I will pass over them.

I come now to the "*Board's Faulty Foreclosure Policy.*" I may say that Mr. Fraser, the Chairman of the Farm Loan Board, told me that the policy of the Board was as a rule, not to foreclose lands until the mortgagor had abandoned his property. There were exceptions to this rule, of course. I mention this in passing because it shows the duty of the Board with reference to this phase of its activities. No matter how much value procedure such as this might have from a political point of view, it is manifest that such procedure is not good business. No line loan company would stay in business very long with a similar policy. A greater duty is imposed on the commissioners of a Provincial Farm Loan Board. They are trustees of the people's money, which the people have paid into such a scheme.

The next criticism of the auditor has to do with "*The Board's Bad Sale Policy.*" You might say this: "After going through the affairs of the Board and finding so many criticisms there must be a deficit of some kind, because no Board operating as this Board has operated can show a surplus." This is the truth. The auditor has found that, as a result of incompetent management and of outside interference (with the suggestion that the Government must have interfered), the Board today is faced with a deficit of \$2,526,729.10. Now, this is made up—

Mr. Spence: What is the amount?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: \$2,526,729.10.

Mr. Davis: Have all the assets been valued?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Yes. I shall endeavour to explain for the information of honourable members how this amount is arrived at.

THE BOARD'S DEFICIT

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Loss on foreclosed lands owned by Board..... | \$ 281,954.90 |
| Loss on agreements for sale | 163,899.99 |
| Loss on current loans | 2,500,000.00 |
| Cost of re-organisation of Board | 25,000.00 |
| Cost of re-inspection of lands | 75,000.00 |
| Total..... | <u>\$3,045,854.89</u> |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Against this figure the Auditor shows that on December 31, 1929, the Board's books showed a real estate reserve of....\$ | 175,000.00 |
| A surplus of | 344,125.79 |
| Total..... | <u>\$ 519,125.79</u> |

Taking this reserve from the above deficit leaves a net
deficit of\$2,526,729.10

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask how they arrived at this deficit?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I am explaining that right away.

I shall endeavour to give you the basis on which the auditor works out his calculations. First of all I shall consider the "Loss on foreclosed lands." The Board's inspectors recently revalued all of the Board's foreclosed lands, by the inspectors who have been with the Board for a number of years. They have revalued these foreclosed lands which were in their own particular districts. The total value which the inspectors have placed on these foreclosed lands is \$268,941.00. As at December 31, 1929, there is outstanding against these foreclosed lands \$550,895.90. This makes a loss on foreclosed lands of \$281,954.90.

Mr. Gardiner: On what authority did they revalue that land? How did they value those lands?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The inspectors, who have been with the Board many years, revalued them. They visited these lands many times. An inspector has a certain district, and he knows the lands in that district. After the old Government went out of office, we asked the inspectors to give their honest opinion on the actual, present-day value. They had been over these lands half a dozen times and they had their own reports and on that basis—because they could not make an immediate personal inspection in every case—they placed this valuation. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to refer this whole matter to the Public Accounts Committee, when any honourable members will have the opportunity of questioning the inspectors themselves about the whole thing.

This brings me next to the "Loss on lands sold by the Board under agreement of sale." On December 31, 1929, there was due the Board on these loans \$564,249.99; the Board's inspectors have valued these lands \$400,350.00; and the loss on these lands therefore is \$163,899.99.

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): If I might ask a question: If these old inspectors were making the valuation, what were the special inspectors doing?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We had special inspectors go out and they inspected about seventy parcels in twenty days. It snowed then. The special inspectors only inspected foreclosed loans to find out the valuation of those lands.

I come now to the "Loss on Current Loans" which is \$2,500,000. This is the major loss to be considered. I should like to point out here that sale values of a piece of land and loan values are two entirely different things. No loan company is in the real estate business primarily for the purpose of selling lands. It wishes to loan money on mortgage sufficient to give it a guarantee that loss will not be incurred to the lender. From the period of a great many years' experience, loan companies have established the principle that, to get a reasonable guarantee that the loan will be paid with both principal and interest at maturity, then at the time the loan is made the land should have the value of twice the amount of the advance. I believe than any experienced loan manager will confirm this statement. The reason should be apparent. The mortgagor may be a poor personal risk. There may be droughts. There may be frosts or floods. The mortgagee may have to pay taxes to protect his security. He may even have to advance money for seed. Spread over a large number of loans, the law of averages works as it does in the life insurance business. Even with land possessing a value twice that of the loan, loan companies suffer losses. If, therefore, the actual value of the land in question at the time of the loan is less than twice the amount of the loan, then, if this condition prevails as a general rule the mortgage company must suffer loss. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if as a matter of policy the inspector has valued land securities one-third too high, then the mortgagee will lose one-third of his advance. This is a well recognized truth.

The auditor, after an exhaustive analysis has come to the conclusion that 25 per cent. of the loans of the Board are unsatisfactory loans. That is to say, he has come to the conclusion that the amounts standing against these lands equal the value of the lands as the guaranteed loans outstanding by the Board total approximately \$10,000,000. Then, by the auditor's estimate two and a half million dollars advanced, are secured on lands worth only two and a half million dollars. On this basis only \$1,250,000 should be owing against these lands. This means that the Board will have to face a loss of \$1,250,000 on this portion of its security.

The auditor finds further that half of the remaining loans will continue satisfactory. He finds that the other half will turn out to be unsatisfactory. Recently the Board's inspectors (all appointed by the old Board) revalued 10 per cent. of the property covering the Board's current loans. It is true that these lands revalued, possessed loans which were in arrears. They found that such lands which were revalued had been over-valued at the time the loan was made by one-third. Since the land possessed a value but two-thirds of its original valuation, the auditor finds that the Board will lose one-third of its advance on such loans, as the auditor finds that one-half of the balance of outstanding loans will be in this class, that is unsatisfactory. He estimates that a one-third loss will have to be borne on half of \$7,500,000 of money loaned. That is to say, there will be a loss on this portion of the Board's loans of \$1,250,000. This makes a total loss to be assumed by the Board on current loans of \$2,500,000. This is how the auditor arrives at the figure of \$2,500,000 on foreclosed loans on lands which have been sold under agreement of sale and on current loans.

Now I come to the item: "Expenses for re-inspection of lands" which the auditor places at \$75,000. The auditor recommends that all properties of the Board should be re-inspected and re-valued. He estimates that it will cost on an average \$15 for the inspection of every loan. As there are between five and six thousand loans, he places the cost of re-inspection at \$75,000.

With regard to the reorganization of the Farm Loan Board office, the auditor estimates that it will cost \$25,000 to engage the services of skilled collection correspondents to read all the files of the Board and to put them in proper condition.

Totalling this again, the auditor has found that the net loss on foreclosed lands, lands sold, and lands covered by current loans, plus cost of inspection and further auditing to be \$2,526,729.10. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the light of the data which has been disclosed by the auditor's report, this loss will be found to be on the conservative side. I believe that, were the managers of line loan companies in Saskatchewan to be placed in possession of the figures to which the auditor has had access, they would certainly suggest that the amount be increased. I accordingly suggest to any honourable members who are skeptical at all as to this report, to discuss this matter with any manager of any reliable loan company in Saskatchewan and bring back to this Assembly his findings.

Owing to shortage of time I shall not here discuss the auditor's finding with reference to the matter of handling of insurance and with reference to the methods of auditing and accounting. These will be discussed and taken up in detail in the Public Accounts Committee later on.

An investigation of any concern or organisation by a chartered accountant cannot be of very great moment unless, after giving his criticism the auditor can make some recommendations. The recommendations made by Mr. Weston with reference to the operation of the Farm Loan Board in order to clear up this affair, and in order to put this Board and its office into the shape it should be, are as follows:

- (1) "The services of a competent loan manager should be engaged immediately. This man should be a strong executive with a thorough knowledge of field work, office routine, loan finance and correct collection methods.
- (2) "A Chief Inspector should also be secured whose duties should be to follow up the various inspectors and report to the Board as to the competence of the inspectors and the value of securities. etc.
- (3) "There is also required a collection manager and at least two trained collection correspondents. The latter will be required for several years, at least until all the files are checked up, the accounts of the Board are whipped into shape, the lands re-inspected, and the losses definitely ascertained.
- (4) "A first stenographer who should have charge of all girls and files should be engaged. We notice several girls appear overworked, while others appear idle.
- (5) "The Board, in addition, should engage an insurance clerk, who would check up all the insurance policies of the Board and keep them in proper order for audit.

(6) "A competent accountant, who would have charge of all records and book-keepers should be employed. The present accountant apparently knows nothing of the office routine, nor does he seem to understand how the books are kept.

(7) "Such inspectors who have made such palpable errors in inspections, as I have pointed out, should be discharged and replaced by good men with a sound knowledge of correct farming methods as well as correct loaning methods.

(8) "I do not, of course, know what the future loaning policy will be, but if the Legislative Assembly decides to advance further sums for Farm Loans, then trained collectors should be added to the staff at the discretion of the commissioner or manager. I would also recommend that, in the future, there be printed in the Sessional Papers of the House each year, the Auditor's Report on the Farm Loan Board in detail. The method which has been adopted in past years has been to print the Balance Sheet only. This is meaningless. I firmly believe that had the Deputy Provincial Auditor's reports been printed in detail in previous years, facts that remained hidden would have been common knowledge long before this.

(9) "If the future policy of the Board is to continue to assist agriculture as set forth in the Act, I believe the Board should not be permitted to make large loans to well established farmers. If a large farmer is tied up with a bank or mortgage company, to loan him money to pay off his creditors of this nature is of no advantage to the province, no matter how much it may help the borrower. These large loans do nothing to increase the productivity of the land, as in most cases it is already under cultivation — or at least nearly all that can be brought under cultivation. It would appear that the legality of the Board's action in granting these large loans on large farms all broken up, and to pay off existing encumbrances on such lands, can be called into question. I cannot believe that it is the intention of the Act to loan these large amounts in the manner in which they have been loaned in the past."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say this, that in presenting this report, I have tried to give the findings as presented to me. The conclusion that I have come to and I believe the conclusion that all impartial observers will come to, in the light of this report, is, that the serious situation in which the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board finds itself today in having a loss of more than two and a half million dollars of our people's money, is that politics combined with men on the Board who were not strong enough to resist pressure from outside sources, together with bad business methods and an incompetent Board, brought about the state of affairs which is disclosed in this report. I use the word "incompetent," Mr. Speaker, because it was incompetent in the first place in that no competent business man would have run his own affairs in the same way, and too, because outside political influences damned it from the start.

The ideals which conceived this rural credit scheme back in 1917 were of the best. The farmers of Saskatchewan, who are citizens first of all, want this scheme to succeed, and those farmers include men who borrowed money from this Board; but, Mr. Speaker, the project was never given a decent chance to succeed. The entry of politics into its administration and the lack of proper business methods adopted by the Board, as I have just said, damned this project at its birth and the Government which was defeated last June and its predecessors in office must take their share of the blame for the position which this Board finds itself occupying today. It is true that sectarian influences in our public schools was perhaps the major issue which defeated the former government last June. But there were other issues, and one of them was that politics contaminated almost everything that the late government touched. The people said, "We have had enough of this kind of thing," and the Government was ousted from office. And, Mr. Speaker, the late Government and the party that it represented is going to stay out of office until it is purged and completely purged of that idea of doing business in the old political way.

We propose reorganising the Board on a proper basis. We propose looking carefully into the Federal Farm Loan Scheme. Other provinces have taken advantages of that scheme. British Columbia has, Alberta has, Manitoba, Quebec and New Brunswick have, and today, although this scheme has been operating for a number of years, they have only loaned \$3,000,000 in the Province of Alberta. And what we propose to do is to give the farmers of Saskatchewan a fair opportunity whereby they will continue to get money on the security of their farm lands free from petty party politics and I believe that in this way and in this way only, can any rural credit scheme succeed as it should.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

MR. J. M. UHRICH, M.D., M.L.A.

(*Rosthern*)

TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11 AND 12, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to contribute in an humble way to the debate on the motion that an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, let me first of all extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations upon having been selected by this Assembly to the high position of Speaker of this House. I am quite sure that, in the discharge of the duties and responsibilities which attach to the exalted position you now occupy, your attitude will always be fair and unbiased, and I am equally certain that every member of this Assembly will consider it his bounden duty to assist you in every possible way in the discharge of those duties and responsibilities and in maintaining a high standard as far as the dignity and decorum of debate is concerned.

Let me also associate myself with speakers who have preceded me in this debate in congratulating both the Mover (*Mr. Eades*) and the Seconder (*Mr. Taylor*) of the Motion on the very able manner in which they have discharged their duty. As has been remarked many times, it is always a somewhat trying ordeal to speak in the Legislature for the first time, yet, in referring to the manner in which both the member for Morse and the member for Wadena accomplished their task, considerable credit is due them. They have displayed ability which might accomplish considerable for the Province if the hope could be entertained that they might be persuaded to direct their ability in the proper direction.

Whatever opinion one may entertain of the remarks of the honourable gentleman who now has the honour of leading this House (*Premier Anderson*), one thing is very apparent, that his temper is not as genial as one might expect from a man who has suddenly been elevated to a very high position of power and prominence in the Province. From the manner and remarks of my honourable friend it is somewhat noticeable that there are happier families than the one which surrounds him on the treasury benches. My honourable friend might say that it concerns him not whether or not the personnel of the Cabinet satisfies the Opposition, but a more serious question is: Does it satisfy all the followers of the honourable gentleman himself? I need only refer to the remarks of certain leaders of some of the groups which form my honourable friend's Co-operation Coalition to show that all is not satisfaction and that he has fallen far short of satisfying even his own followers; perhaps the senior member for Moose Jaw City (*Dr. R. H. Smith*) thinks likewise. It may be said that this is none of my business, but I hold that every elector of the Province has a perfect right to express himself freely upon the personnel of the Cabinet or any individual member of it. It is common knowledge that there is considerable disappointment among my honourable friend's own followers, and what impresses the onlooker most profoundly is the seeming evidence that the Premier has not been a free agent in the selection of his ministers; that he has been shackled in some way, the particulars of which may never come to light, but the evidence of which is very apparent. The Premier would have difficulty to convince anybody that the personnel of the Cabinet is the result of his own choice. Some came to the Council of the Province not through the process of natural selection. They are the work of some organisation who said: "Stand and deliver," and the Premier, instead of resisting, as his political followers expected him to do, held up his hands and delivered. He might say that all the Ministers entered through the front door. I ask: "How did they find the door open?" Is it not true that certain influences with a battering ram on their shoulders came to the door and smashed the bars?

Premier Anderson: Tell us all about it!

Dr. Uhrich: Do not worry, my friend, I shall tell you all about it later on.

Scarcely had this Conservative Government been sworn in when some of the Ministers gave interviews in the newspapers among them my honourable friend, the Provincial Treasurer (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*) of "brick" and other fame. I believe his first official act, however, was to have his picture enlarged and hung in his office. After that important piece of official business had been done with due deliberation, he gave an interview to the newspapers. He gave out the startling news that there was a deficit in the Provincial Treasury, that the Government was heavily indebted to the banks. He conveyed, or at least sought to convey, the impression to the citizens of this Province that he had inherited a financial problem of great difficulty from his predecessor and that the Treasury was in a bad way.

Some few days afterwards, he came out with a second interview in the papers. He announced that the Province had sold \$2,000,000 of Saskatchewan 30-year, five per cent. debentures to a group of bond dealers at the price of 98.937.

The sale of provincial debentures at this satisfactory price is proof positive that the Province, at that time, was in a sound financial position. Its credit was good with the bond dealers and the investing public. One must, therefore, conclude that the financial world discounted the Honourable Provincial Treasurer's statement heavily, evidently having been aware, as he was not, that a book deficit in September, when the spending half of the fiscal year had elapsed and the non-spending half was still to come, is a normal state of affairs and indicates no loss of financial stability.

A Conservative Government, co-operatively named, has now been in power for some five months. When it took office, there might have been a few people in Saskatchewan who had a lingering doubt in their minds just what this Government really was; but that doubt has been permanently dispelled since the famous trip east by the Premier, the Attorney-General, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister from Hanley (*Hon. Dr. Stipe*) on that now-famous mission of how to get the natural resources. I believe, however, I owe the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture (*Hon. Mr. Buckle*) an apology. He was the John the Baptist who was sent forward to prepare the way, and he effectively prepared it at a Conservative banquet at the "Royal York" at Toronto to celebrate the Provincial Conservative victory. He was one of the principal speakers on the toast list. He brought greetings from the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan, told them how delighted he was to be present at a Conservative banquet, and, assuming the role of prophet, he predicted that, at the next Federal election, Saskatchewan would return at least six or possibly seven Conservatives to support Hon. R. B. Bennett's tariff policy.

After the ground had thus been effectively prepared, the triumvirate consisting of the Premier, the Honourable the Attorney-General and the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, chaperoned by the Honourable the Minister from Hanley, solemnly, sedately and, certainly, soberly, made their way leisurely towards the east. This time the Three Wise Men did not come from the East but from the West—to offer gold, frankincense and myrrh at the shrine of Conservatism in the City of Toronto; and indeed they did it well, if we are to judge by the *Toronto Mail and Empire* of December 10, 1929. I find here an interview given by my friend, the Leader of the Government, to the *Mail and Empire* staff writer at Ottawa. It is published under the heading: "FEDERAL LIBERALS TO LOSE IN WEST":

"The Liberal party will lose heavily in Saskatchewan in the next Federal Election" said Hon. J. T. M. Anderson, Premier of that Province, who is here demanding the return of the natural resources to Provincial control. "At present, there are 17 Liberals and four Farmer members from Saskatchewan in the Federal House. After the next election, the Liberal group will be smaller than either the Conservative or Farmer Groups."

We also find my friend, the Attorney-General, giving an interview to the same newspaper. He says:

"Saskatchewan has claimed the right to pass on the settlers coming into the Province" said Mr. MacPherson, the Attorney-General. "This was never admitted by the Federal Government until it was sought to embarrass the Conservative Government in Saskatchewan . . ."

That is, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General is reported as having referred to this Government as "The Conservative Government in Saskatchewan." Now we have the proper name for this Government. I suppose I may take it that it was a legal opinion given by the Attorney-General himself? In the *Toronto 'Mail and Empire'* of December 10, he pronounces it a "Conservative Government."

Then we have the interpretation put upon it by the Leader of the Government himself, speaking at Moose Jaw, to members of the local branch of the Teachers' Alliance in convention recently. He says:

Premier Anderson: Is that the *Moose Jaw Times*?

Dr. Uhrich: I have it over here.

Premier Anderson: That explains it all.

Dr. Uhrich: I am quoting exactly what his interpretation is:

"The Conservative Government (he says) was also pledged to help in the reduction of the cost of text-books throughout the Province . . ."

Again, "the Conservative Government." So, Mr. Speaker, we have it on the interpretation of the Attorney-General and of the Leader of the Government that it is a "Conservative Government." We furthermore find that, after giving these interviews and deriving considerable prestige therefrom, they were reminded, presumably, by their chaperon, that they had come east to look after the natural resources, they wended their way to the Capital and there attended another Conservative banquet at which they all were speakers. I hold here in my hand a copy of the *Ottawa Journal* of December 11, 1929. In it, I find, this time, my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works, becoming very prominent:

"Hon. J. F. Bryant, Minister of Public Works and Telephones for Saskatchewan, said he was a school teacher at Richmond 30 years ago. He was a Conservative then and a Conservative now . . ."

And the Minister of Public Works had this to say:

"The people of Saskatchewan want to be closely associated with the people of Ontario in the interests of the Conservative party."

So here we have another interpretation by the Minister of Public Works as to what this Government really is, this was given at a banquet before they met the Federal Government on the resources . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Might I correct the honourable gentleman. The banquet was held after we had met the Federal Government. Not before.

Dr. Uhrich: That makes it worse, Mr. Speaker. I also find the Attorney-General quoted thus:

"Saskatchewan had a diversity of population. The foreign-born voters had supported the Conservative party."

Will the Honourable, the Attorney-General deny that report?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Might I correct the honourable gentleman? What I referred to was the "Co-operative Government." I was careful to do that on each occasion while in the East.

Dr. Uhrich: Then you state you were wrongly reported in the *Mail and Empire* and *Ottawa Journal*? If so, I must take the Honourable Minister's word for it, but it will take more to convince me that the foreign voters supported the Conservative party. Nor is that the view of his great ally, the *Regina Daily Star* which he so closely and so fondly pressed to his bosom while in the east.

The Star in its issue of June 7, 1929, published a little biography of the Honourable, the Leader of the Government, which in part reads:

"For four years he presided over a little school in an Icelandic community, north of Gimli, on Lake Winnipeg, and mastered the language . . ."

I would like to bring that point "mastered the language," to the attention of the honourable member for Wynyard (*Mr. Paulson*). Further on, it says:

"His first school in Saskatchewan was in the Yorkton district in 1908, where 40 to 60 pupils knew no English, but used six other mother tongues. He learned to express himself in practically all of these languages."

What a linguistic gymnast my honourable friend must be! I now come to another phase in this particular "mutual admiration" business, in the same issue of *The Regina Star*. It is headed: "Dr. Anderson pays Tribute to The Star":

"The following message has been received from Dr. J. T. M. Anderson, Leader of the Conservative party in Saskatchewan:

"I hasten to express personally, and on behalf of the Conservative party of Saskatchewan, my sincere thanks and appreciation to The Regina Daily Star for the great part it has played in this campaign, and the great assistance it has given in bringing about this province-wide expression of the popular will.

"For many years, the public of Saskatchewan were at the mercy of a press monopoly. They were permitted to learn only one side of any public question.

"The Regina Daily Star in its public spirited campaign of education and enlightenment and its appeal to the forces of decency in our Province, has been a great boon to all those who have been fighting for the public rights.

"May The Regina Daily Star continue to prosper and shed the light of knowledge throughout Western Canada. It has earned the gratitude of the people of Saskatchewan and vindicated its position as an independent press."

My honourable friend forgot to add: "Eastern papers please copy!"

And here in the *Regina Daily Star* of December 5, 1928, following the Arm River by-election, I find the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer has a eulogy of the Star in practically the same terms:

"We were given such publicity as we never had before. The Star is responsible for the great wave of enthusiasm and enlightenment that the people of Saskatchewan are experiencing, and also for the spirit of sweet reasonableness that now marks the course of the consolidated press of the Province."

He also, Mr. Speaker, forgot to add the words: "Eastern papers please copy!"

But if my friend the Attorney-General has any doubts whether or not the people of foreign extraction voted for the Conservative party, I would refer him to an editorial which appeared in *The Regina Star* of the issue of August 26, 1929 under the heading: "Frightening the Foreigners," and purporting to be an "analysis of the general election results by racial lines." It says:

"An analysis of the general election results by racial lines confirms in ample detail all the implication given by an analysis on lines of latitude. It shows even more convincingly that what measure of support the defeated Premier received was almost entirely from the foreign settlements . . . It shows that his support is not intelligent support . . ."

(Rather significant, I think!) Then it goes on:

"Seats represented by 43 members of the Legislature are predominantly English-speaking . . ."

And in spite of what my friend from Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*) has said about his seat being the most cosmopolitan constituency in the Province, I find it listed here among the "predominantly English-speaking" constituencies. Then comes a list of twenty constituencies which are "very largely non-English," and in this list I find that Yorkton is classified with the "non-intelligent" class. Going on, the article states:

"It is significant that out of the 43 English-speaking constituencies, Opposition candidates won 34 seats; the Government only nine. And it is even more significant that out of the 20 largely non-English speaking constituencies, the Government received 19 and the Opposition only one."

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that, had the Attorney-General read this particular article in *The Regina Daily Star*, he would not have made that statement in the City of Ottawa. Then it goes on:

"The next Government must disabuse the minds of the dwellers in the foreign settlements . . . and bring them to the full status of Canadian citizens . . ."

That means, of course, to bring them to vote Tory at the next election.

If there is any lingering doubt in the people's minds as to whether this is a Conservative or a Co-operative Government, let me tell them that it is a Conservative Government. Why do I say it is a Conservative Government and not a Co-operative Government? Because, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives absolutely dominate the cabinet formed. I think that statement is true. No resolution, separate or combined, of these three groups, testifying that they have changed their names from those with which they went to the people, can possibly add a scintilla to the new order politically, without re-endorsement by the voters who elected the 35 members comprising the so-called co-operative group. The Government is in no way co-operative, except by word of mouth and not by the sovereign voice of the electorate. Simply political manoeuvring brought it into existence. Seven of the eight major portfolios are held by Conservatives. More than this: At least six out of the seven Conservatives entering the Cabinet, have for years been active opponents of the Liberal Party in Federal politics, and no manner of wriggling at this time of day can get them into a position where this feature of the situation will be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, as it is now pretty late, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Resuming on Wednesday, February 12, 1930, Dr. Uhrich said:

Mr. Speaker,—When I adjourned the debate yesterday evening, I was pointing out to the House the efforts made by the Honourable the Premier, the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and the Honourable the Attorney-General when on their trip East to procure the natural resources, to impress Conservatives in Ontario that Saskatchewan would do its share towards the return of the Conservative party at the next Federal election. Then, I understand, after having handed their demands on a little typewritten paper to the Federal Government, and after the Honourable the Premier had knocked at the door of the Parliament Building and demanded in a stentorian voice with all the outraged dignity at his command, to know where the Honourable Mr. Dunning stood, they turned round and wended their way homeward, their mission completed. I am sure my honourable friend from Hanley breathed a sigh of relief when he had them safely west of the Great Lakes, when they were again running true to Saskatchewan Conservative-Co-operative form.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with regard to Civil Service Reform as outlined during the last campaign. This Conservative Government, co-operatively named, which has been in power some five months, has been particularly active and alert in the reform of the Civil Service and in political manoeuvring, and its activities along these lines have been noted with interest by the citizens of the Province. It has given a demonstration of partisanship such as the Province did not expect from the Conservatives pledged to the reform of the Civil Service. This reform has meant removing Liberals and putting partisan Conservatives in their places. This Government has hired and fired civil servants during these five months on the old-fashioned principle that to the victors belong the spoils, a principle expressly repudiated by the Premier and some of his supporters in their pre-election speeches during the campaign. Then the cry was for an independent Civil Service Commission—*independent of any political influence whatsoever.*

What has been done?

A so-called Civil Service Commission has been appointed with the Honourable the Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) as a member—and it would take a rather wide stretch of the imagination to consider him as independent or non-partisan. I think he is the prosecuting attorney, the judge and the Lord High Executioner all in one person and at the same time, on the Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were led to expect that a Civil Service Commission, independent of politics, would be appointed to investigate each and every case and where a civil servant was proved to have acted in a partisan political way (I beg pardon—a partisan *Liberal* way, for Conservatives go unmolested) during the recent campaign, he would be discharged. That was the pre-election talk of the Premier and some of the Ministers supporting him at the time. But no impartial tribunal is allowed to pass on the cases. The Government swings the axe and off go the heads; and in the meantime the Commission proceeds with its investigations and, in the meantime, the Government continues to hire and fire on that old-fashioned principle I have already mentioned—to the victors belong the spoils.

The Government is dismissing men on alleged partisan grounds, and the records to date indicate that it is hiring purely on partisan grounds, active party workers. In fact, the more active they have been the better their chance of obtaining jobs. That is how this Government is taking the Civil Service out of politics.

Conservative committees have been set up in every constituency . . .

Premier Anderson: Not in Rosthern.

Dr. Uhrich: No, Mr. Speaker, he would find some difficulty in finding enough Conservatives in Rosthern to form a Conservative committee. Let us put it this way: Conservative committees have been appointed in various parts of the Province (and are now at work) to tell the Government who are to be dismissed and who are to get the jobs. They pass on the question who are fit and proper persons to be members of the Saskatchewan Civil Service. The job-hunters are on the Government's trail, the pressure becomes too strong. The Government throws its pledges to the wind—Grits have to go to provide work for Conservatives.

While the Commission appointed by the present Government—this independent Commission with the Minister of Public Works as one of its members—to enquire into the public service of the Province with a view to making recommendations relative to the classification of the staffs and the fixing of grades with a minimum and maximum salary, the political guillotine works unceasingly at its task of chopping off the official heads (that is the expression of the Attorney-General himself) of present Government employees in order to provide jobs for the ever-increasing horde of Tory workers who are insistent upon their pound of flesh, their reward without delay.

Scores of appointments have been made not through the medium of the Civil Service Commission (one member of that Commission found it necessary publicly to state in the press that the Commission as a body was not responsible for the hiring and firing) not on the grounds of merit and efficiency established by competitive examination upon which they insisted so loudly during the election campaign, but solely because of political affiliations and party activity of the appointees.

Let me direct attention, Mr. Speaker, to the pre-election platform of my Conservative friends in regard to the Civil Service. But before reading that platform again, I would refer to other pertinent statements. In the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* of May 14, 1929, there appeared in certain articles under the heading "Views of the Parties." As all members know, certain of our newspapers in the Province have been accustomed to grant the different parties guaranteed space in which to set forth their views for the benefit of the electorate, and to state their various policies between which the people have to judge. The article to which I refer appeared in that section of the allotted space devoted to the Conservative viewpoint. He starts:

"A Non-Political Civil Service"—"A civil servant is a servant of the citizens. Although nominally appointed to office by the Government of the day, his salary is paid by the people who contribute their taxes to the public treasury"

I would remind my friend, the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that his salary also is paid by all the people of the Province. Later on, he says:

"Let us refer to the Conservative Platform. Item 25 reads: . . ."

Hon. Mr. McConnell: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question?

Dr. Uhrich: No! you may not! I never interrupted you during the whole of your address in this debate, and I would remind you that that courtesy was never extended by the Premier to the Leader of the Opposition.

Premier Anderson: Go on!

Dr. Uhrich: Item 25 reads:

"Whereas it is common knowledge that employees in the Provincial Government Departments are habitually used as political agents, often against their wishes, in order to maintain the Liberal Party in office, and whereas appointments are made under the system of patronage and on the recommendation of duly appointed chairmen of Patronage Committees or Liberal members of the Legislature,

"Be it resolved that this convention goes on record as favouring the appointment of Government employees by the Civil Service Commission only

and advocates the principle that all selections shall be made on merit and efficiency and not by reason of political affiliations, by introducing the competitive examinations as a test of fitness for those who wish to enter the service. It further protests against the use of Government employees as political agents and workers by the Government."

And further on it is stated:

"Under this system what will happen when a vacancy occurs in the Civil Service? The Civil Service Commission will call for applications to fill the position. The applicants will be examined by the Commission and the best qualified will be chosen. Those who thus enter the service will be the very best procurable and no political qualification will be asked for."

Now that was the platform, Mr. Speaker. In the *Star-Phoenix* of May 29, 1929, I find a report of a meeting at which Liberals and Conservatives spoke from the same platform—a joint meeting. At one point it reads:

"Speaking of the Civil Service, Mr. McConnell said that the civil servants might well be compared with any. They were men and women of high calibre. But he objected to the method of appointments in vogue since 1905. He stated that men were appointed by political influence; that men had been asked to take part in political campaigns.

"I say that is wrong' added the speaker. 'We are going to establish an independent Civil Service Commission and have examinations. Is that wrong? We have wanted it for 24 years.'"

I further wish to quote from the *Regina Daily Star* of May 28, 1929 where it reads:

"A Civil Service governed with a firm hand by a commission that had not the taint of politics was promised by the Conservative Chieftain."

That was by the present Leader of the Government in a meeting at Saskatoon. Then in the *Regina Daily Star* of May 17, 1929, the Leader of the Government, again speaking at Saskatoon:

"Declared that the time had come for the immediate institution of a Civil Service Commission the separation of the service from politics and a system of entry by examination and promotion on merit."

Again, you will note, the stress laid upon "examination." I find in the *Regina Daily Star* once more, on February 27, 1929, the following statement:

"A Civil Service Commission would be appointed by the Conservatives if they got into power, stated Dr. Anderson, that would have charge of all the civil servants in the Province. This body also would be free from party politics. They would show a preference for returned soldiers, who, Dr. Anderson declared, were not getting a square deal from the Government."

I find another, here, this time a statement by the present Provincial Treasurer. This is from the *Star-Phoenix* of February 20, 1929:

"Concerning civil service reform, Mr. McConnell said the Conservatives had consistently advocated better pay for the civil servants. They urged a definite system of salary increases for the years worked. They had suggested promotion from within the ranks of the civil service; and, finally, they had insisted that the civil service be taken out of politics and that admission to the service be made possible after passing a competitive **examination.**"

Again, Mr. Speaker, "competitive examination" springs up. Then last, but not least, we have the present Minister from Moose Jaw City (*Hon. Mr. Merkley*) speaking in Moose Jaw, as reported in the *Regina Daily Star* of May 30, 1929:

"We are prepared to go on record as favouring appointment of government employees by civil service commissions only and advocate the principle that all applications and selections be made on merit and efficiency,' said Mr. Merkley. He also stated that the Conservatives stood behind the returned soldier in the matter of appointments to the civil service. 'We charge without fear of successful contradiction' said the speaker, 'that the Gardiner Government has been a derelict in its duty in this regard.' Mr.

Merkley stated that scores of instances could be cited where the Government had refused positions to returned men, which later were given to political favourites."

Now, Mr. Speaker, these should be sufficient reasons to convince every member of the House what the pledges and the policies of my friends opposite were in this regard, during the election campaign. I find another item here, a statement of the Premier at Moose Jaw, reported in the press of November 9, 1929:

"In a re-adjustment there is bound to be some misunderstandings, and we want you to come and tell us about them if you think we are at fault. We are not concerned whether the civil servant likes us personally or not, but we are insisting that they be loyal to our policies. We must have loyal workers around us and if any of those who have been dismissed can show that they have been non-partisan in elections, we will gladly re-instate them."

I would like to ask the honourable gentleman if that is the Anderson Government's idea of British fair play to throw the onus of proof on the civil servant who has been dismissed; to tell him that if he can prove he was non-partisan he will be re-instated. That, evidently, is the attitude of the Leader of the Government.

I was rather surprised, yesterday, to hear the Honourable Minister refer, with a great deal of gusto, to the questionnaire sent out to the school inspectors of the Province. I hold in my hand a copy of that questionnaire and I find on it a few questions which must prove illuminating to the members of this House. I find he has a definite attitude on immigration—at least so he is quoted in the various newspapers. I find, too, under Question No. 2 in this questionnaire, the school inspectors are asked:

"Are you in favour of additional immigration to Saskatchewan at the present time?"

"Are you in favour of more Mennonites being brought in at the present time?"

Now, I would like to ask honourable members and the Premier himself if that is a right and proper question to ask a civil servant when the matter of immigration has been made a Government matter? I would like to ask the Minister, when he asks a civil servant to answer a question which has become a political question through his own actions, if that is taking the civil service out of politics?

My honourable friend the First Minister has a definite attitude on the problem of immigration to Saskatchewan. What right has he then to ask that question of a civil servant and expect that civil servant to give an answer to it?

The Honourable Premier during the last few months has expressed himself very definitely towards immigration, particularly Lutheran and Mennonite immigration to the Province. A request was made some weeks ago for a group of Lutheran and Mennonite people, refugees in Russia, to come to this province, their friends and organisations here definitely undertaking that these immigrants would not become a public charge and would conform to the laws of the country and province. These guarantees were all forthcoming from the Lutheran and Mennonite people in the Province, but, in spite of that, this Government could not see its way clear to allow these people to enter the Province. The reason given was that the Government is faced with a very serious unemployment situation. I have the statement here:

"We have a problem on our hands with the Mennonites here now who have been allowed by former governments to settle in segregated districts, and we are determined that this situation will not be allowed to rise again. In our message to Hon. Mr. Forke on Saturday, we are going to ask him if his government is prepared to help bear the cost of looking after Mennonites brought in here last year."

That statement was made after the honourable gentleman knew that this Government would not have to contribute a cent to their upkeep. Their own organisations were prepared to take care of them, as always. But he goes on to say:

"We already have expended \$500,000 on relief work for these men since we have been in power."

Now, Sir, assuming that the guarantees offered in connection with the proposed admittance of these Lutheran and Mennonite families can be relied on (and there can

be no question that they were *bona fide*, and I claim not a man on the opposite side of this House would deny that) I fail to see in what way their admittance would have added to the difficulty of the unemployment situation in this Province.

These Lutheran and Mennonite people come in and begin farming. At once they add to the consuming public of the country. They will buy land, or assume an obligation to buy it. They will need horses, implements, vehicles, furniture, and all the articles necessary for even their humble homes. All these outlays will mean business orders and employment for workers in cities and towns. They will produce cattle and grain and these will have to be transported to market and sold again, adding to the demand for labour. In what way, I would like to know, are they going to take bread out of the mouths of Canadians, native-born or otherwise? I am surprised the member for Morse (*Mr. Eades*) did not take up the cudgels for these people.

There may be those who think that the increase of agricultural production due to their presence, will operate to the disadvantage of the producers already here. But can anyone convince himself by any study of economic conditions, that the prosperity, progress and happiness of this country can be forwarded by a policy of restriction of production?

We have, this year, the involuntary reduction of the wheat harvest to half its normal proportions. Is anyone better off because this has happened? If this is to be our policy, steps should at once be taken to prevent any further settlement in the Peace River country, where grain production is going ahead by giant strides; and our cities should plan for a future of very slow growth.

The whole future of Western Canada, and in a measure of Eastern Canada as well, is tied up with the steady enlargement of our area of tilled land and an increase in production within these areas due to better methods. To renounce this is to admit that our policy of national growth through western development has been a blunder.

If these Lutherans and Mennonites—given the necessary guarantees that they will go on the land and stay there and that they will not put themselves above the laws of this country—are to be taken as non-suitable immigrants, then it can only be said that the people of Western Canada have changed their minds on what was, in the past, a universally-accepted viewpoint, namely, that the great need of this country is a steady supply of industrious, law-abiding, agriculturally-minded settlers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on another matter of which mention is made in the Speech from the Throne. I may say that I am very glad to see reference to any matters pertaining to the public health. May I, as Minister of Public Health in the past administration, say a word or two in that connection. My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer, true to type, was not at one with the rest of the members on his side as regards the administration of that department. He was inclined to be critical, but as I said last year, "he is an engaging old dear. His stuff has all the potency and kick of a bottle of sarsaparilla." In contradistinction to his criticism, we have the statement of the honourable member for Hanley (*Hon. Dr. Stipe*) when he sat on this side. We have also the public statement of Dr. Tran, then Leader of the Progressive party in the House, and then we have the Leader of the Government himself in the Arm River by-election, though in the next word he did brand me with the stigma that I was the greatest menace to Canadianism in Western Canada. So I do not take the criticism of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer very seriously.

I would like to say to my successor that any new field he may explore, any new effort he may make in the interests of public health, will have my unqualified support and hearty co-operation. We know that Public Health is a progressive science in which new fields are opening up every day, and I assure the Honourable Minister that I am prepared to co-operate with him in every effort he may make towards betterment of health conditions in this Province.

We know that prevention of disease has long been considered one of the chief duties of government, and it has long been recognized as the basis of the health and happiness of the people; and it is an administrative science all its own. Disraeli once said: "The care of public health is the first duty of a statesman," and he was right, because any law which is inimical to the public health is a mischievous law for the reason that it is detrimental to a country's greatest asset—its people, and there is none other of equal importance to it. Lloyd George saw that clearly when he said: "You cannot make an Al Empire out of a C3 population." So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that in any effort he may make for the betterment of health conditions in this province, the Honourable Minister will have my hearty support and the support of all members on this side of the House.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in the reference made in the Speech from the Throne to the cancer problem in this Province. During the last regular session of this Assembly, those who were members of the House then will remember that, in speaking during the Budget debate, I made distinct reference to the prevalence of cancer in the Province and made particular mention of the fact that the Department of Public Health has spent considerable time and money in tabulating the morbidity and incidence of the disease in the Province. The information gleaned was assembled in a pamphlet outlining this work, and a copy of this pamphlet was sent to every practising physician in the Province and it was placed also on the desks of every member of the Legislature.

To refresh the memory of the members who were here at that time, and to bring it to the attention of those who were not here then (my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Health, for example) I beg, Mr. Speaker, to read from the Sessional Papers just what I said upon that occasion. This is on page 205 of the *Sessional Papers* of the 1928-29 Session:

"My honourable friend, the junior Member for Regina (*Mr. MacPherson*) in the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne made reference to the situation with regard to cancer. This disease is the third greatest killer in the Province among diseases. Heart disease produces the greatest number of deaths. In this connection let me point out that there is a definite relation between heart disease and bad teeth. The latter form a continuous cesspool from which toxic matter enters the system, ultimately playing havoc with the intricate musculature of the heart. During the past year the dental profession, in conjunction with the Canadian Dental Hygiene Council of Canada and the Department of Public Health of the Province, conducted a province-wide campaign for better teeth and cleaner mouths. Dentists all over the Province have given their time and services in promoting this splendid work, holding dental clinics and examinations with the result that thousands of school children and adults have benefitted thereby, and I wish publicly to express my appreciation and gratitude to the dental profession of the Province for their splendid, unselfish efforts along this line. With the medical, nursing and teaching profession, they form the "shock-troops," as far as public health is concerned, and in no province in Canada do we find finer co-operation and more unselfish enthusiasm among the members of those professions in the matter of public health than right here in Saskatchewan.

The menace of cancer is a world problem affecting more or less alike all civilised countries. Old countries have somewhat higher death rates from this disease than new countries, as a result a higher proportion of aged persons in the population.

Cancer, as a problem of prevention and control, demands at the outset a thorough grasp of its incidence on the basis of information derived from a painstaking study and careful analysis of vital statistics.

During the past few months this investigation and analysis has been made by the Department of Public Health, as far as this Province is concerned. I am sure my honourable friends will be interested in the pamphlet I placed on their desks. The information it contains is the result of an exhaustive study and careful analysis of the incidence of cancer in this Province. I may say that this is the first investigation of its kind made by any province in Canada and must show that we are fully alive to this particular problem.

I think my professional colleagues in the House will bear me out when I say that cancer prevention, in a strictly technical sense, is at the present time practically impossible, except in the case of certain occupational types of the disease, in which the indirect causative factor is thoroughly understood. For example, occupational cancers directly attributable to X-ray exposure are, of course, readily preventable by the employment of necessary safeguards. Other occupational cancers, found among cotton spinners, aniline dye workers, etc., are also within the preventible group. Any theory of disease prevention must necessarily rest on a sound conception of causation. Cancer is not a self-limiting disease which runs its course, like pneumonia or typhoid. The direct cause of cancer is not known, though I may say that the greatest medical scientists all over the world are concentrating on this problem. Millions of dollars are being spent on it by the Rockefeller Foundation and similar organisations on cancer research. We do know many

things that cancer is not. We know that it is not due, in the sense that infectious diseases are due, to a parasite. It is not communicated from one person to another. Virchow was the first to propound the theory that the cell is the unit of life. All life comes from the cell. Cancer consists wholly of the parasitic cancer cell, with subsequent uncontrollable proliferation. The sum and substance of the problem may be stated in the remark that the principal cause of cancer mortality is delay on the part of the patient to seek qualified treatment.

In its last analysis the problem lies in the hands of the general practitioner of medicine. He is consulted first by the cancer patient, and then only too often after countless delays which frequently prove fatal.

I claim that the principal cause of cancer mortality is delay on the part of the patient in seeking qualified treatment. Delay in cancer means death. There is nothing surer than that.

In the light of our present understanding of the cancer problem, no other conclusion can be justified than that radical surgical treatment, amplified by radium and X-ray, offers the only genuine hope of a successful cure.

Let me add a word of caution. The saddest phase of the cancer situation is the increased activity of those who prey upon the public, distributing medicines for its cure, or offering other cures, which have no substantial basis or facts for their support. It is a paramount duty of the state and the medical profession to suppress the cancer quack who has never been more active than at the present time. No specific cure for the disease, in the technical sense of the term, has been discovered, but it would be most unfair to the medical and surgical profession if attention were not drawn to successful forms of control, without which the cancer death rate would reach alarming proportions. Anyone familiar with medical and surgical experience knows full well that thousands and tens of thousands of people who have been operated upon are alive today. This is an unanswerable argument in favour of the statement that in the earliest qualified treatment lies the only hope for cure."

That, I submit, Mr. Speaker, must show that considerable attention was being paid at the time to the problem of cancer.

My honourable friend the Minister of Public Health and my other professional colleagues in the House know that it is only within the last few years that cancer has been considered a Public Health problem. In Europe, the Scandinavian countries of Sweden, Norway and Denmark have taken the lead in this work followed by England, France and Germany. On the American continent, including Canada, the State of Massachusetts has of late done considerable work in this connection. The old attitude evidently was due to the fact that cancer is not an infectious disease, and also due to the popular notion that it was not preventable and to the fairly well-grounded feeling that the disease was incurable.

We know now that some of the major forms are distinctly preventable owing to improvement in treatment and diagnosis. My opinion is that the most potent weapon we have against this disease from a Public Health standpoint, is publicity and education of the public on the subject of cancer. In this way, many fallacious ideas will be corrected. This is the first and most necessary step to reduce the great and often unnecessary mortality from this disease, for until the patient of his own accord seeks medical advice, no steps can, of course, be taken towards making a diagnosis or applying the proper treatment.

Much yet remains to be done in the way of the education of the public, not only in the more rural districts but in the towns and cities as well. But right here, I wish to express a warning. This must be done wisely and temperately, not by a continuous shouting on every possible occasion. It must be done without producing so great a fear of the disease as to alarm people unnecessarily. In those countries where some of the finest work has been done, in some of the European countries which have concentrated on this work like England, France, Germany and the Scandinavian countries, they do not do any publicity of this sort or, at least, their efforts are very modest. You find very little information about the signs of cancer in the European public press; they realise they must be careful not to alarm the public. We also learned that lesson in the epidemic of influenza in 1918. However, it is the knowledge that the disease can be cured by radical treatment, either surgical or by radium, in its earliest stage which must be disseminated amongst our lay people.

Cancer mortality is increasing over the whole world, not in Saskatchewan alone, or in Western Canada alone. My honourable colleague knows that our mortality is not unreasonable in comparison with other provinces of Canada and other countries of the world. This is probably due to the fact that our population contains a less percentage of older people among whom the incidence is much larger, and a greater percentage of a young, active type.

I have here statistics giving the mortality for some of the larger cities in the United States, where their facilities have been developed to a much greater extent for treatment by radium. These statistics are for the year 1922, giving the cancer mortality per 100,000 of population:

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Albany, N.Y. | 162 |
| San Francisco | 161 |
| Boston | 145 |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 141 |
| Topeka | 137 |
| Los Angeles | 132 |
| Spokane | 136 |
| New Orleans | 125 |
| Cincinnati | 120 |

Here, too, are some statistics of cancer mortality in the Provinces of Canada for the year 1926, again per 100,000 of population:

| | |
|------------------------|------|
| Ontario | 99 |
| Quebec | 71.8 |
| Nova Scotia | 93.3 |
| New Brunswick | 81.6 |
| Manitoba | 65.6 |
| Alberta | 57.9 |
| British Columbia | 92.6 |
| Saskatchewan | 45.2 |

And the provincial statistics of cancer mortality for the year 1928 show Saskatchewan with a rate of 55.2 per 100,000; in other words, out of a population estimated at 836,000, a total of 470 deaths in Saskatchewan.

When we look over mortality statistics of the province, we find that cancer is fourth among the death-dealing diseases. Heart disease heads the list with 67.1. Then come:

| | |
|------------------------|------|
| Still births | 66.2 |
| Pneumonia | 62.9 |
| Cancer | 55.2 |
| Injury at birth | 53.1 |
| Accidental death | 48.2 |

Another interesting table is that which gives the cancer mortality in the major cities of Canada for the year 1924. Montreal, with its large hospitals and many facilities for coping with the disease had 83.5 deaths per 100,000 of population in 1924. Others ran:

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| Toronto | 112.5 |
| Quebec | 67.2 |
| Ottawa | 105.9 |
| Hamilton | 105.5 |
| Halifax | 135.3 |
| Edmonton | 144.4 |
| Calgary | 78.9 |
| Regina | 84.0 |
| St. John | 102.7 |
| Saskatoon | 70.6 |

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| Vancouver | 149.4 |
| Victoria | 175.4 |
| Winnipeg | 88.8 |

This is an average of 98.1 for the cities as compared with 55.2 for the Province of Saskatchewan.

The general increase in mortality is so much more significant when it is considered that the operative results are now more successful than in former years; but as long as patients continue to come to operation in a practically inoperable condition, the present situation will not undergo any material change. There is no doubt that cancer is more frequent in the larger cities than in rural districts, and there is no question but that it is more common among the well-to-do and the prosperous than among the poor. In this respect it differs from tuberculosis which, though it frequently affects the rich, more frequently affects the poor.

The first essential in procuring prompt treatment of cancer cases is that the lay public should be educated to understand, as they have been educated to understand in regard to appendicitis, the need of early operation and other forms of treatment and the importance of early recognition of the disease. Early treatment and early diagnosis should be stressed. We live in an age of publicity and medical matters are coming to be recognised as one of the subjects in which greater public knowledge works for the common good.

The American Society for the Control of Cancer has done a great deal by circulars, public lectures, by Civic and State Committees to promote this work. Urban and rural Board of Health and individual health officers in many districts have contributed the help of their official positions to this work, and newspapers and magazines have given valuable assistance.

But again, let me emphasise, it is upon the family physician that the duty finally rests to inform, to correct misapprehensions and obsolete ideas, and to teach the people the early and significant ideas of the disease. I want to preach today, as I have preached during the last four years, that much of cancer mortality could be avoided if the habit of annual medical examinations were developed and more generally practised. Periodic examination would lead to the discovery of the incipient organic lesions of the growth, and thus make early treatment, the essential treatment, possible. After all, Mr. Speaker, we get our automobiles overhauled every year, so why not this most complicated mechanism—the human body.

After all (let me repeat) it is the family physician who must bear the responsibility; his duty to instruct and do away with that fear in the public mind, and so contribute his share towards reduction of the mortality from cancer.

As far as treatment is concerned, we know that 20 per cent. of all cancers are stomach cancers and of these not one per cent. are saved today. It is nearly 100 per cent. fatal. In Saskatchewan, 33 per cent. of all cancer cases are stomach cancers, and it is a significant fact that Dr. Ewing, Professor of Pathology at Cornell who is also Director of Cancer Research at the Memorial Hospital in New York City, said, in 1929: "There is no early *specific* sign of cancer of the stomach." It is only by accident that really early cancer of the stomach is recognised, and he goes on to say that it is of little use and not good to tell the public of the *early signs* of gastric cancer, since they are lacking in *specific* features. So here is one problem among the many difficult problems to be considered in instituting any well-laid, province-wide plan of educating the lay people about the major forms of cancer.

Radium treatment has been developed largely during the past few years, and with considerable success. We know that is true because of the larger number of cures effected today than a few years ago. But the solution of the problem so far as treatment is concerned, is not by radium alone, to which, as we know, some forms of cancer readily respond, but by highly-trained surgeons working in combination with fully competent and well-equipped radiologists. The day of cancer surgery has not passed. Indeed, there is more need today of intelligent surgical skill in the cancer field than there ever was before. The well-trained radiologist and the careful surgeon must co-operate with proper facilities and opportunities for a deliberate choice of treatment or combination of treatments, and this will result in greater benefit to the cancer patient. Thus can the status of cancer service only be brought up to the highest possible standard, and there will be less excuse for the indifference and fear of the patient.

As I shall have an opportunity, later on when the Budget comes down, of discussing some other phases of public health, I shall leave the subject for the time being.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on another subject which has been of considerable interest to me particularly, and which I am sure has been of interest to some other members of this House.

Thus far in the debate we have heard several echoes of the late general election which culminated on June 6, last, but it is significant that neither in the Speech from the Throne nor in the speeches from the Government side of the House has there been any echo heard of the racial and religious issues that were deliberately raised by certain members of this Government and by their supporters on the platform and in the press for the express purpose of setting race against race, and creed against creed in order that, in the resulting turmoil and strife, they might snatch a lease of power and so gratify ambitions that set a higher value on attaining public office, no matter how secured, than upon the promotion of national unity. The seed of distrust and hatred was sown wide and deep; the crop will not be of this year's harvesting nor of the next, nor, in my belief, will it be garnered within the present generation.

During the by-election in Arm River a year ago and during the general election last June, the Honourable Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) was smitten with a severe attack of a disease which in some quarters may have been designated a "border-line case" which, for lack of a generic term, and with apologies to medical nomenclature, I may describe as "Papalophobia" with a complication of "Quebecitis." On practically every platform on which he appeared, and during almost every speech which he made, severe symptoms of this disease were discernible. Immediately after the election, however, at least the outward symptoms of the disease disappeared, perhaps due to the soothing influence and the cajoling suggestion of my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Health (*Hon. Mr. Munroe*). But, lo and behold! when he went east with his colleagues, the Honourable the Attorney-General and the Honourable the Premier, on that famous mission of getting the natural resources, he again had an attack of this malady, this time in the City of Toronto. An immediate change of environment was advised and, proceeding to Ottawa, the malady had disappeared, at least no symptoms were in evidence when he spoke at a Conservative banquet there, with some French-Canadians in attendance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to bring out the fact how badly the honourable gentleman was smitten, let me quote some of the statements made by him during those campaigns to which I referred. I find, for instance, speaking at Penzance on October 24, 1928, the honourable gentleman said this, according to the *Regina Daily Star*:

"The issues in this campaign were not made by the Conservative party. The issues in this campaign were not made by the Liberal party. They were made by the Church of Rome and I thank God tonight that He has given me clear vision to see the issues as they really are."

I go on and find a further statement made by my honourable friend:

"There has been no clearer issue on the page of history. The Liberal party at Ottawa and the Gardiner Government in Saskatchewan have lined up with the forces of the Church of Rome in this struggle for supremacy."

These statements are all made at Penzance. He goes on:

"The hidden interests influential with the Canadian Government are the interests of the Roman Catholic Church. The 'interests' are 'hidden' because the work is being done behind the scenes in secret conferences with the officials of the Church.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, if an attitude like that becomes general throughout Canada, we may despair of the future of this great Dominion. Is not Canada an integral part of the British Commonwealth of Nations? It is so because of that very French-Canadian race that seems to act like a red rag on a bull on the mind of my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works, for we know very well there was a time in the history of Canada when that race had just passed over to the Union Jack when temptations were held out to them to join the thirteen colonies, and, if they had not been true to their new-found allegiance, if their loyalty had not been impregnable against the seductions of Franklin and others, Canada would not be a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations today. Let my honourable friend be just if he cannot be generous. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works says that the Roman Catholic Church dictates the immigration policy of the Canadian Government. He said that, in the statements

I have read, during the campaign. Now let me say this: Does any man in his senses suppose that, when, in 1759, after the conquest when French-Canadians only numbered 60,000, if they had not been dealt with with that wisdom, moderation, and generosity that England has practised regarding all races, with few exceptions, with which she has come in contact in building up her Colonial Empire, they would have remained loyal?

This is the policy which the honourable gentleman has offered to his countrymen. I denounce this policy as anti-Canadian; I denounce it as anti-British; I denounce it as being at variance with all the traditions of British Government; I denounce it as a political statement, the consequences of which are not pleasant to contemplate. When my honourable friend incites national and religious passions, he is making a dangerous experiment. He is opening the flood-gates to passions which, once aroused, are very difficult to restrain. Whatever may be his motive, whatever may be his end, his statements cannot be characterised by any other language than that of a political crime. In this country, we have two different races, geographically united under the same political allegiance, but separated by numerous ethnological features. In Saskatchewan, with our cosmopolitan population, the problem presents even greater difficulties. With those conflicting elements, it is the object of the honourable gentleman apparently (it is the object of us all, I believe) to form a nation. How shall we proceed to solve this problem? The honourable gentleman has given us his method, the Tory method, and he has once more demonstrated that Tory methods never proceed from the nobler, higher, instincts of the human heart and the human intellect, but always from the dread, the diffidence and the distrust which has marked the Tory party wherever it has held sway. It seems to me that the honourable gentleman must feel that the policy which he is championing is weak and inferior. Any policy which appeals to class, creed or race, or which does not appeal to the better instincts to be found in all classes, in all creeds or in all races, is stamped with the stamp of inferiority. Impartial history will pronounce it as vicious in conception, as it is mischievous and wicked in its tendency. We are here a nation, or we want to be a nation, composed of the most heterogeneous elements, Protestants and Catholics, English, French, German, Irish, Scottish, Scandinavians and Slavic races, everyone, let it be remembered, with his traditions and his prejudices. In each of these, what may seem conflicting elements, there is a common spot of patriotism, and the only true policy is that which reaches that common patriotism and makes it vibrate in all towards a common end and common aspirations.

We find my Honourable Friend, the Minister of Public Works, inveighing bitterly against a certain race and a certain denomination in the province. I find here, in the *Regina Daily Star*, speaking at Penzance during the Arm River by-election, the honourable Minister makes the following statement:

"The French Catholics of Saskatchewan express their readiness to work for the defence and restoration of the Roman Catholic Church which, in this struggle, aims at temporal rather than spiritual power, which is now starting to renew the religious struggles of the past in an endeavor to gain complete temporal ascendancy for the Catholic Church throughout the world. In that struggle for the restoration of the Church, the French in Saskatchewan express their readiness to work in union with the other groups of foreign origin, but of the same religion, with entire and respectful submission to the will of the bishops!"

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my honourable friends opposite if they subscribe to that statement. I would ask the honourable the Minister of Agriculture if he subscribes to that statement. I do not see the honourable the First Minister in the House, but were he here I would ask him if he subscribes to that statement. I would even go so far as to ask the honourable the Minister of Public Works himself to say whether or not he subscribes to it.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I will show the Honourable Member for Rosthern that it is his own opinion, and I will read from the documents to prove it.

Dr. Uhrich: I would say further, Sir, that I feel it is but due to my fellow citizens of French origin to declare here, on their behalf, that they are not, as a people, the intolerant bigots and fanatics that some people in certain quarters suppose them to be, judging them, as they unfairly and improperly do, from the intolerant utterances of excited politicians, or the intemperate writings of certain fanatical newspaper people. French Canadians are devoted to their church, loyal to the traditions of race and family, and attached to their country in a manner and degree which others well might emulate. They are peaceable, industrious, law-abiding, moral. They were the first Canadians for

200 years who wrestled with the terrible privations of early settlement, who built cities and established a civilisation, before a British war-drum was ever heard north of the St. Lawrence. Her missionaries can be traced by their blood throughout the vast extent of Canada; missionaries, discoverers, explorers, who take their places amongst the great names of Canadian history; the memory of whose sacrifice and heroism is the treasured possession of every Canadian worthy of the name. They made the sacrifice for conscience' sake—as did the United Empire Loyalists.

I want to say another thing, Mr. Speaker. We have some Canadian writers I would recommend to the Honourable Minister of Public Works, among them and one of the most outstanding, Frechette, who has given some excellent advice in this respect. He says:

“He, whose glance governs the universe, in His Wisdom, gave this fruitful soil to the various nations as a Father's free gift. Christian feeling should maintain the equilibrium of peace among all the children in this common cradle. The twig has become a great tree and spreads itself afar over the plain. Evil be to those serpents, whose baleful breath spreads throughout its branches, pestiferous breathings of hatreds, conflicts and rivalries.”

Let me say this: Catholics in this province are no different from other people. They resent, and rightly so, the efforts of their enemies to divide Canadian citizens into two groups, one patriotic the other unpatriotic, and classify Catholics with the unpatriotic. They resent, and rightly so, the charge from some quarters that there is a halting between their religious fealty and their national fealty. But let me say most emphatically (and I want the Honourable Minister of Public Works to note this) that, like Protestants, they owe civil allegiance to their country and spiritual allegiance to their church. They hold that patriotism and loyalty to country are not only civil but also religious obligations. I would like to tell the Minister of Public Works that we do not need his advice. There are some who constantly hand out advice gratis to a certain religious denomination in this Province. To them I say: A plague upon your academic discussion. We have been academically discussed long enough and psycho-analysed until we are nauseated. We resent your attempt to put the stamp of inferiority upon us, simply because we belong to a Church whose organisation you do not approve. To my honourable friends opposite, but particularly to the Honourable Premier and the Honourable Minister of Public Works, I would say most emphatically:

Protestants and Catholics together settled Canada, and, particularly, Western Canada. Together, they cleared the forests, drained the swamps and plowed the land. They stood side by side in the conventions and congresses that secured the liberties of the people. Why should they now suffer self-seeking men to betray them into hatred for one another?

Side by side they faced the toil and danger of pioneer life. Province after province they carved out of the Great West. City after city arose. Railroads crossed the broad wastes and bridges spanned the deep streams. It was the joint work of Protestants and Catholics. There is no Province but where they live together, do business together, vote together; no city but where their churches together lift their spires toward the same Heaven; no railroad, telegraph, express, and hardly a mill, factory or mine but where their monies and their interests are joined hand in hand. They have been living together as neighbours and friends for years and years. Surely love is better than hate. Why permit this friendly relationship to be disturbed by uncharitable, un-Christian and un-Canadian appeals to prejudice, passion and ill-feeling!

Tomorrow, as today, and for generations to come, Protestants and Catholics will live together as neighbours. Shall it not also be as friends?

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion.

MR. R. J. M. PARKER, M.L.A.

(Pelly)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1930.

(In Part)

Mr. Speaker,—Let me first of all, in rising to contribute a few remarks to this debate, congratulate you upon your election to the high and honourable position of Speaker of this Assembly in this your first term in the Legislature. I am confident that, while you occupy that position, you will perform the duties attaching to it with the impartiality, the fairness and with the dignity with which the Speakership has come to be associated throughout the British Empire.

I wish also to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to His Honour's Gracious Speech, upon the manner in which they acquitted themselves of the task assigned to them. I desire also to congratulate the honourable the Prime Minister in having succeeded in forming a Government. His task was somewhat more difficult than that of former Prime Ministers in the Province of Saskatchewan, up to the present time. Theirs had been a comparatively easy task because of the fact that the party they represented always enjoyed a comfortably large majority on the floor of the House. The present Leader of the Government, however, found insufficient numbers in his own group to form a Government and he has succeeded in forming what they are pleased to call a "Co-operative Government" by gathering together the component parts of the former Opposition and, by persuading men of different political faiths from himself to accept office, he has been able to form his experimental Government.

Dr. Arthur: He did not have to persuade them.

Mr. Parker: Possibly not. I desire also to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) because so much was said during the election campaign, derogatory to the Leader of the Liberal party. I do not think there is anybody in this House, who listened to what he has had to say in the two speeches he has made, but must have been impressed with his sincerity, his outstanding ability and his obvious desire to do everything he possibly could to further the interests of the people of the province. I hope he will long be spared to lead the Liberal party in this province and I sincerely hope that the time will come at no far distant date when he will again sit on the Government side of the House leading an administration pledged to the policies for which he has fought for so many years.

I listened to the speech of the honourable Minister of Public Works last evening, and was surprised and sorry that a Minister of the Crown should have seen fit to lower the dignity of this House by alking reference to conditions which he claimed existed in the Weyburn Mental Hospital and in the gaols of the province, basing his statements on the evidence and in the language of gaol-birds. It completely wiped out the fine impression he had made upon me when, with impartiality and with fairness, in spite of his well-known adherence to Tory principles, he had made a very capable and efficient Speaker during the short session of the House and had, thereby, maintained the dignity of his position and of the Legislature. I was sorry, therefore, to have that impression removed yesterday. As I listened to the speech of the honourable Minister, it was interesting to note the attitude of certain honourable gentlemen opposite as he read declaration after declaration. The Prime Minister, for instance, busied himself with writing letters or something of the kind, while the honourable the Attorney General seemed to be wondering what in the world was coming next. Now, I do not wish to be understood as implying that the Minister of Public Works,

in connection with the matters he has seen fit to introduce here, was speaking with the voice of the Conservative party or even of the Government. I think many things were said that did not have the support or approval of the other Ministers of the Crown, and I think the expressions which he read and the language which he quoted from these documents has lowered the dignity of the House as never before, and as I never expected it would be. Matters were brought forward by the Minister which, in my opinion, should have been brought before the Courts of the province instead of in the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Do you want them brought before the Courts?

Opposition Members: Certainly! Of course, we do!

Mr. Parker: The speech of the honourable gentleman apparently was made up of a bunch of clippings which he had been saving for many years just for this opportunity

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I would inform the honourable gentleman that I only used one clipping. To hear him talk, he needs a pair of glasses.

Mr. Agar: It would need a pretty big pair.

Mr. Parker: I would remind honourable gentlemen opposite that the Liberal Administration had been in office for twenty-four years and during that time it had built up a Civil Service of some 1,600 employees. It was only to be expected with that large number of employees that not every member of the Civil Service would measure up to 100 per cent. It is only natural that during that long period of years men in the employment of the Government should have made mistakes. But it seems to me significant that the declarations read by the Minister of Public Works were taken from men who had been dismissed by the former Government and that charges were brought by men who had been in gaol.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: On a point of order: I deny the allegation and in reply would read an answer given on January 11, last, by the late Attorney General with reference to a question asked by the present Provincial Treasurer (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*): "Was former Inspector Taylor of the Swift Current Division of the R.C.M.P. granted a gratuity of \$2,000 or any other amount"

Mr. Gardiner: The honourable gentleman is entirely out of order. The honourable member for Pelly did not say that Taylor was dismissed by the last Government.

Mr. Parker: I thought I made it perfectly clear that the declarations were taken from men who had been in gaol and also that the minister read from charges made by men and spoke of men, who had been in the employ of the Government and removed from their positions by the last Government.

Being a new member, Mr. Speaker, I came here with the idea that it was not the function of a member of the Opposition to bring a lot of mean and carping criticism into the House, but rather to co-operate with the Government in all legislation which is in the interests of the province and to bring forward any constructive criticism which he thinks may be necessary. I may say that I am prepared to co-operate with the Government in all legislation which I believe to be of benefit to the province as a whole, and I hope that when I find it necessary to criticise that my criticism will be of a constructive character.

As a member of the Executive of the Saskatchewan Rural Municipalities Association, I may say that it is our intention to co-operate with the Government in regard to the measures affecting the municipalities of the province and particularly with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Highways in connection with relief measures necessitated in certain parts of the province as a result of the drought of last year. We, as an organisation, are willing to co-operate with the Department of Highways in every way possible, but I sincerely hope that the minister in the new policies he is framing, will not embark on so large a spending programme as to increase the public debt to a point where increased taxation will be the lot of the farmers. I believe the best road policy to follow is the policy of the old Government which was to build roads just as fast as the people were able to pay for them. I respectfully urge the minister not to pay too much attention to the demands of the many deputations that wait upon him, largely made up of people who pay very little towards the revenues of the province.

Now, with regard to the Department of Public Health, to which reference is made in the Speech from the Throne, I think every member will agree that its administration in the very capable hands of the former minister (*Dr. Uhrich*) has made that department a credit to Saskatchewan. The provision which was made for the free treatment of tuberculous patients is an outstanding piece of work and as a result of the other efforts of the department in the direction of preventive medicine and free issue of vaccines and anti-toxins and so on, Saskatchewan today has the lowest death rate of any country in the world. Splendid work has been done in the past and a great work, it is admitted, still remains to be done. We, on this side of the House, are prepared to co-operate with the present Minister of Public Health (*Hon. Dr. Munroe*) in maintaining the excellent record of service achieved by the late Government in that department.

I am rather sorry that so little has been heard in the course of this debate in regard to the Department of Agriculture, but I do hope the present Minister (*Hon. Mr. Buckle*) will be as successful in his administration of that department as were the former ministers, notably the Hon. Mr. Motherwell and Mr. C. M. Hamilton. These two gentlemen have been instrumental in having the World's Grain Show brought to Regina in 1932, when a further opportunity will be given to demonstrate the high quality of the grain grown on Saskatchewan farms which already has won many prizes in international exhibitions. I am very pleased to note that the present minister recognises the seriousness of the weed problem, but it appears to me that too much stress has been laid and too much spent on theories which work all right as regards grain grown on experimental plots under ideal conditions, but do not apply very well on the average farm. I would advise the Government to get hold of three or four of the dirtiest farms in the province and experiment there in the eradication of the weeds so that an example might be made of how to clear such farms of weeds and how they can be made to pay under ordinary farming conditions.

I believe also that serious consideration should be given by the Government to the question of interior storage elevators. At the present time the Pool members have not received their final payments for the 1928 wheat crop and the reason, I believe, is to be found in that fact that a great deal of the low grade wheat taken out of the province and stored in elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William has not been sold. I believe that, if the interior storage elevator system was increased, it would help to create a better condition. The wheat now going east should go west. Much of the wheat in the past year or two has found a market in the Orient, and every fraction of a cent saved in transportation costs on this class of wheat means the difference between a sale and otherwise. Now, I suggest that if there was an increase in the interior storage elevator system in the province, much of the low grade wheat could be held in this province instead of being shipped east and then could be shipped north (as we hope it will in the near future), west to the Orient, or south, as occasion demanded, and so make a considerable saving in transportation costs which would give us a better opportunity to dispose of our low grade grains. At the same time, too, it would eliminate the possibility of these recurrent blockades and the embargo which naturally follows put on by the railways. In the near future, a great deal of marketing will be done by trucks (much is being done now) and in a few days the local elevator facilities are all used up. In the past, this operation took two or three weeks, which gave time and opportunity to clear the grain making room for more. If adequate storage facilities were provided in this province, freight cars could make two or three hauls a week.

The Speech from the Throne indicates that there is going to be an amendment of The School Act. Now, I trust that any alteration made will be truly for the benefit of the education of the children of the province and that it will make for harmony by taking into consideration the rights and interests of the minorities which it is the state's right to protect. We must recognise that people have come here from practically all countries of the world and, in the interests of the non-English speaking peoples who have come to our province at the invitation of the different Governments of Canada, our school laws should be designed and framed with that toleration which is essential to the production of the highest type of citizenship.

The Provincial Treasurer (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*), the other day, tabled the auditor's report on the Farm Loan Board, following which he made a speech based on the report. Now it does not take very much intelligence to reply to the statements of the Provincial Treasurer. I regret to say that, in my opinion, the speech was made purely for political effect and, from the red headlines in the so-called "Independent Press," it would appear that he had accomplished all he set out to accomplish. From some of the statements made by him, I really would be afraid to be on trial for my life before a court with him acting as the Crown Prosecutor. I am afraid he would twist words and statements

to such an extent that my life would be in danger. As a prelude to his action, the Provincial Treasurer started off by dismissing two of the members of the Board and then appointing an auditor to make an investigation. I do not question the auditor or the minister, but I think the situation is quite easy to understand and will be understood by the people of the province, taking into consideration the admitted fact that the money was loaned by the Board at times when land values were high, crops were good, prices good, and when there was pressure being brought to bear upon the farmers to increase production. I think every reasonable person will understand that there would be some difficulty in reconciling values of today, following a period of poor crops, with those that obtained at the time when the majority of the loans referred to were made. The minister has declared that more money was loaned by the Board than was recommended by the inspectors and says that this was done for political reasons. Nothing of the kind. I can cite him cases of the same kind involving private companies. In one case, for example, the private company agreed to a loan of \$8,000 when their inspector recommended only \$7,000. That is business, not politics; and I am convinced that when they investigate the situation, the people of this province will come to the conclusion that there was no mismanagement of the Farm Loan Board and that the minister's speech and the auditor's report were nothing more than a partisan effort to bring discredit upon an institution which was created by a Liberal Government.

There is reference also to the Throne Speech to the question of the return of our natural resources. I have been wondering what part in the negotiations was played by the President of the United Farmers who accompanied the Ministers to Ottawa, and I would really like to know how much time was actually spent with the Government there in presenting Saskatchewan's case. I cannot understand why there has been this delay in getting our resources back, for the people are tired of this long-distance governing. I also cannot understand why it is that Saskatchewan is holding off in the matter of settlement when the Governments of Manitoba and Alberta have closed negotiations with the Federal Government.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Are you willing to accept the terms given to Alberta?

Mr. Parker: We will have an opportunity of discussing that later on.

Now in regard to the Civil Service, a Commission was appointed to go into the matter, consisting of the Minister of Public Works, Alderman Coldwell of Regina, as Chairman, and Mr. A. Hayworth representing the employees. We had the greatest confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Messrs. Coldwell and Hayworth and their attitude during the public hearings justified that confidence. It would be hard, however, to make the people of Saskatchewan agree as to the impartiality of the Minister of Public Works. They would find it easier to believe that he was acting as though he were the Chairman of a Conservative Patronage Committee.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I challenge the statement. I do not belong to any patronage committee of any association. I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Parker: I cannot withdraw a statement I have not made. I said, or I thought I made it clear, that it would be difficult to make the people of the province believe that he was not acting as though he were a member of a "patronage committee" of the Conservative party.

The question would be asked as to why certain men who were in the employ of the Government for many years have been dismissed, especially in the case of those who were returned soldiers. When the country needed these men, they offered their lives for their country and I suggest that a thorough investigation should have been made before any returned soldiers were dismissed merely because they voted Liberal.

The question will also be asked if it is not a fact that there is an organisation that takes place of a "power behind the throne," or if there is an "invisible Government" in existence in Saskatchewan, which is pressing the Government to dismiss men because they belong to a certain religious faith . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: No person has been dismissed because he belonged to any particular religious faith.

Mr. Parker: All I am saying is that the question will be asked and have to be answered as to whether there is this "power behind the throne" which is responsible for the hiring and firing of civil servants.

We are told we have a "Co-operative Government," and I may say that in changing its name from "Conservative" to "Co-operative" it has succeeded in doing what has never before been accomplished in any British parliament. It call itself "Co-operative" although not a single member sitting on the Government side of the House was elected as a "Co-operator."

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Did you ever change your political name?

Mr. Parker: I am a Liberal now and find myself in the midst of a party of men who do not have to change their name.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Did you not run as a Conservative some years ago?

Mr. Parker: I did. Certainly

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Was the honourable gentleman not appointed an inspector of rural municipalities before he ran as a Liberal?

Mr. Parker: I think that, for about five days, I did do some work for the Municipal Department. I would suggest that the Government look at the honourable members for Redberry (*Mr. Cockburn*) and Saskatoon County (*Mr. Agar*) and see how happy they are sitting here in a congenial environment.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They are back where they belong.

Mr. Parker: They are happy to be among their Liberal friends backed by large majorities from their constituencies.

The composition of the new Government is such as to cause a certain degree of wonderment among the people of the province. At the first of the year, in what may be called a "New Year's Honours List," a number of K.C.'s were appointed including certain members of the Government. I do not think they did that with any desire for self-aggrandisement and I only cite the fact that it demonstrates a contention which we have made, that this is a professional Government. Three of the Ministers write "Dr." before their names, and four of them write "K.C." after their names, and thus the contention is proved that the farmers of the province have very little say in the Government at the present time, although they pay about 80 per cent. of the taxes and comprise about 80 per cent. of the electorate. I maintain that, in a province of this kind, the farmers should have proper representation, Mr. Speaker, and with those remarks, I shall conclude. I may say in closing that I do not propose to support the motion.

MR. W. J. PATTERSON, M.L.A.

(Pipestone)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to contribute a few remarks to the Address now under consideration, I desire to associate myself with those speakers who have expressed satisfaction on the return to health of His Majesty the King. In expressing that satisfaction, Sir, I am not only expressing the sentiments of the Legislature but of every citizen of the province irrespective of political affiliation or racial origin. I presume, Sir, that you, and the mover and seconder of this Address are by this time somewhat tired of hearing the flattering remarks made concerning you, but I wish to concur in the congratulations extended to you and to the mover and seconder. I can even concur with those speakers who congratulated the members of the Government on the position they now hold, though I am not entirely satisfied that their appointments are in the best interests of Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Speaker, I wish them well in their efforts in the direction of giving good government to the people of this province. I cannot say that I was not surprised at their victory at the polls on June 6, last. They were themselves surprised; in fact, their victory was so unexpected that their first act was to appoint a commission to examine the mentality of the people of Saskatchewan.

Premier Anderson: Yes, and they were found perfectly sane.

Mr. Patterson: Now, Sir, no individual or group of individuals enjoys defeat, and I may say that in that respect the Liberals of Saskatchewan are no different from other people. But it is possible for a loser to accept defeat gracefully, and we have tried to do that. It is just as essential for the winners to accept victory gracefully. We bow to the will of the people though we are not satisfied the people got what they expected when they voted on June 6. But we accept the result and we are here to do our duty as members of the Opposition. It is rather difficult for us to maintain an attitude of good sportsmanship in view of the fact that Government speakers generally have opened their remarks in this debate by taunting us with defeat and conclude by giving us good advice and requesting us to co-operate with them. Such tactics, Mr. Speaker, do not tend to encourage co-operation. But I assure you, Sir, (and I speak for all on this side of the House) that we have come here with but one object in mind and that is to unite in support of all those things which we believe will tend to advance the interests of Saskatchewan. I must say, however, it is a little difficult to enter into co-operation with honourable gentlemen opposite in the spirit we would like, when we have two responsible ministers of the Crown making bitter partisan attacks on public servants, and taking up a great deal of their time getting information for the sole purpose of condemning public servants who are without an opportunity of defending themselves. Today, Mr. Speaker, I propose to confine my remarks to the attacks made on one particular group of public servants. I refer, of course, to the report of Mr. Weston on the Farm Loan Board which was tabled in the House on Tuesday afternoon. On the same evening (Tuesday evening), the Provincial Treasurer addressed this House and he virtually read that report to this Legislature. There was a remarkable similarity between the expressions in the speech and those in the report, and some people are wondering who wrote this report—the Provincial Treasurer or Mr. Weston. So close was the similarity between the wording of the speech and the wording of the report that it cast some doubt in the minds of many people as to who was the real author of the report.

This report purports to be an "auditor's report," but I claim, and will substantiate my claim, that it is merely a piece of political propaganda and marks the first entry of politics into the affairs of the Board in its thirteen years of operations.

Hon. Mr. Stipe: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Patterson: The responsibilities and duties of office, the effect of which is apparent on some members of the Government, apparently have had no effect in subduing the honourable member for Hanley.

Before dealing with the Weston report, I would like to refer to previous attacks made upon the Farm Loan Board. The Board for some time has been the subject of criticism throughout this Province, many of the statements made in attacking it have been unfair, and many have been entirely untrue. For instance, on November 13, 1929, in addressing the Arthur Meighen Club of Regina (I sometimes think it should be called the "Misinformation Club") Colonel Keenleyside brought the Board under criticism. He is reported as saying this:

"With the old Liberal Provincial Government the farmer was always given first consideration, despite the fact that well over 120,000 people, that formed an important part of the Province's population, live in the three leading cities."

The Gallant Colonel can rest easy now. The cities certainly are coming into their own. Between attacks on the Farm Loan Board and the creation of Bryant Island in the beautification of Wascana Lake, the citizens of Regina are not going to be neglected.

"He explained the Farm Loan Board of the old Government in brief, stating that they had borrowed money from loan companies and loaned the money out again to farmers at a smaller rate of interest than that which they paid the loan companies. Much of this money, he claimed further, had been lost through faulty and unsympathetic manipulation."

"We went to the loan companies and borrowed money at high rates and lent it to the farmers at low rate," a statement which is not the truth. That is one kind of criticism. Here is another. Addressing the East Side Conservative Association in the Ukrainian Hall, the present Provincial Treasurer spoke of Mr. Colin Fraser, Chairman of the Farm Loan Board, as an "estimable gentleman" and a "good citizen of Regina" but "Mr. Fraser is becoming an old man."

That is the kind of criticism we have had in the past. Now we have the "Weston Report." Another thing that struck me in connection with the report and the speech was the repeated expressions of regret at having to say anything to hurt our feelings. There are continual references to "disagreeable tasks," "unpleasant duty." But that sort of thing is characteristic of the present Provincial Treasurer. His kindheartedness is continually getting him into trouble. When he wanted to dismiss the two former members of the Board he did not want to hurt their feelings so he telephoned to the Commissioner and asked him to dismiss them. His pious protestations of regret remind me of the quotation "He was the mildest mannered man that ever scuttled ship."

Hon. Mr. Bryant: You admit then that the ship has been scuttled?

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, this speech of the Provincial Treasurer is the most expensive speech ever delivered in this province. The Government paid between \$12,000 and \$13,000 to have this speech prepared for the Provincial Treasurer, and what is supposed to be a serious and exhaustive study of the conditions in a large and important Government institution is filled from cover to cover with tittle-tattle, office gossip, petty criticisms and unwarranted inferences. I contend that this report is political and was made sufficiently political to form a speech for the Provincial Treasurer. It was not enough for him to quote occasional paragraphs, he quoted page after page, read them word for word, made no statement of personal opinion, and made no charges on his own responsibility as a member of this House.

I also claim this report is political because the auditor admits that he never asked the Chairman of the Board for any explanations. On page 17 of the report he makes the statement: "I have not asked the Board why it did all these things and therefore have received no explanation." As former Minister of this Department, I would have appreciated the courtesy of receiving a copy of this report, but as it happened I had to depend on the courtesy of the Clerk.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I would say to the honourable gentleman that, had he required a copy of the report all he need have done was to come to me. As a matter of fact, the former Attorney General (*Mr. Davis*) got a copy of the report.

Mr. Patterson: That is quite true, Mr. Speaker. The former Attorney General did get a copy of the report from another member of the Cabinet, but it was not complete.

Several important portions were left out. I say this report is to be condemned for the reason that the auditor, on his own admission, never asked for any information from the Commissioner or from Members of the Board. The report is filled with petty criticism, repeated time and again, and then magnified many times again, yet no explanation is asked from the Chairman of the Board, although it is quite evident that many of the things referred to would have a very simple explanation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, although this report is dated February 1, up to the present time, the Chairman of the Board, the man who is largely condemned under this report has not received a copy of it and has to depend for information as to the accusations made against him on copies of Regina's "Independent Newspaper." And further still, when I went down to discuss the matter with Mr. Fraser after the charges had been made public, he advised me that he had instructions from the Provincial Treasurer not to give me any information.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: That is quite true and proper. These are matters for the House not for any individual.

Mr. Patterson: Is it perfectly right and proper that the Chairman of the Board should be condemned in the eyes of the public without being given the opportunity of defending himself?

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Two members of the Government have said it is perfectly right for them to have information from the Chairman of the Farm Loan Board. I would inform them that the Farm Loan Board is responsible to the Legislature and not to the Government alone.

Premier Anderson: On the point of order: There is a recognized way of securing this information. We will grant that the members of the Legislature have a perfect right to information concerning the affairs of the Farm Loan Board, but we do not grant that the former Provincial Treasurer, or any other member, has the right to ask for information from officials which should be obtained only through the House.

Mr. Patterson: Which information might be used in defence of a public servant whom the Government has condemned unheard.

This Auditor makes incorrect statements throughout the report, draws faulty conclusions and suggests improper inferences, examples of which I shall give later on, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, this Auditor has drawn faulty conclusions which might have been avoided had he sought explanations from the Commissioner or other members of the Board. Altogether, after perusing this report, it looks to me as if the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer had said to the Auditor, Mr. Weston, "Go and find a nice large deficit and it does not matter how you find it so long as you make it large enough!"

Hon. Mr. McConnell: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: May I say the only instructions given were the instructions given by the Provincial Auditor himself to Mr. Weston. All I said to him was "We want you to be conservative in your statements. I had nothing whatever to do with the writing of this report. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw his remark.

Mr. Patterson: But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to withdraw: I said it looked like that. I did not say he had given such instructions. I cannot withdraw that. I accept the Minister's statement.

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

Opposition Members: Sit down!

Premier Anderson: I do not intend to sit down until you tell me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I say the former Provincial Treasurer is trying to cast a reflection on the present Provincial Treasurer and I think there should be a withdrawal.

Mr. Patterson: I cast no reflections on the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: I would say there has been a withdrawal. The honourable member has accepted the Provincial Treasurer's statement.

Mr. Patterson: In spite of the partisan preparation of this report, in spite of its political objective, and in spite of the charges of gross mismanagement contained in it, this salient fact remains, Mr. Speaker: After thirteen years, handling millions of dollars, there is not even the suggestion of one dollar improperly taken either directly or indirectly, by way of commission, gift or otherwise by any member or employee of the Board. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker: After thirteen years, handling millions of dollars, there is not even the suggestion of one dollar improperly taken either directly or indirectly, by way of commission, gift or otherwise, by any member or employee of the Board.

The Provincial Treasurer told the House something of the qualifications of the auditor engaged to make this report. So far as that goes, I say he may be correct; he may be all the Provincial Treasurer says he is. But, Sir, the majority of the people of this province do not go by what the Provincial Treasurer thinks of his auditor. They remember the auditor as the man who, after making an investigation in Saskatoon, was required to sign and publish a public apology for the statements contained in his report. I would say, further, that, were it not for the fact he has the backing of the Government, he would have to take the same course in this case.

This Auditor had associated with him as special inspectors in preparing this report, T. A. Anderson, a man who has condemned the Farm Loan Board from every platform in Saskatchewan. He was formerly a loan inspector but at the time he was engaged by the Government he was no longer employed by the company which formerly employed him—and there is a good reason for that! The other special inspector associated with Mr. Weston and Mr. Anderson was J. H. Curry who, not so long ago, was Conservative candidate in the constituency of Vonda. These are the men who condemn Colin Fraser and those who have been associated with him during the past thirteen years. It should not be necessary for me to tell this Legislature the qualifications of Colin Fraser. The Provincial Treasurer himself has only one cause of complaint against him and that is that "he is getting to be an elderly man."

Mr. Fraser has spent his whole life in the farm loan business. When he accepted the position—and I say that advisedly as he did not ask for it—he was working for a company which was content with his services and in a good position with that company. He was asked by the Government of the day to accept the position of Commissioner when the Farm Loan Board was organised, and, as I say, he gave up a good position to do so. Mr. Fraser has not taken the position as a sinecure. He accepted the chairmanship, has worked hard and faithfully, and I am satisfied Mr. Fraser would welcome a fair and just investigation into the affairs of the Board for today he rests serene, conscious of his own integrity and rectitude. He had associated with him two business men, Messrs. Hettle and Grayson, of whom the same also is true. They also are known as men of rectitude. Yet they were dismissed practically without notice and without cause. They have to stand the condemnation of this report without having an opportunity as yet of refuting the imputations made against them.

When I come to investigate this report, I find it difficult to answer point by point because it is so disconnected. It jumps backwards and forwards from one feature to another; it repeats itself and contradicts itself and is exceptionally hard to follow. However, the criticisms it makes against the Board may conveniently be divided into two main parts: First, its references to office or internal management; second, its loaning methods.

Before dealing with these criticisms, let me say that I do not want any member to think I am trying to claim that this Board has made no mistakes or that improvements could not have been introduced. Nor am I going to say that the Board has not made some poor loans. I have made poor loans myself, some as small as two dollars. But while admitting imperfections, while admitting that poor loans have been made, I most emphatically deny that a fair, just and impartial investigation will reveal incompetence or irregularities. This, I can assure honourable members, is not an impartial report.

Dealing first with the criticisms with regard to office methods, Mr. Weston says that the Provincial Auditor never made a proper audit. I cannot speak regarding that because I am not an auditor. I only know the Provincial Auditor annually submitted to the Government of the day a report to the effect that the books had been audited, and that certain results were disclosed by his audit. I am quite prepared to admit that the Provincial Auditor never did prepare a report of the Weston kind—which is greatly to his credit. But even auditors differ in their methods, Mr. Speaker, and I am convinced that 75 per cent of the auditors of the Province will agree that Mr. Weston has no proper conception of what an audit should be.

The auditor criticises the Board because all the mortgages and securities were not lodged in the office of the Provincial Treasury. If this were done, the Chairman of the Farm Loan Board would be required to send up to the treasury office in this building for the necessary documents every time foreclosure proceedings were instituted, or in case a mortgage was required by officials of the Board for any special purpose. But in all cases where it is possible, the mortgages are kept in the vaults of the Provincial Treasurer's department.

The auditor makes a great deal of fuss about fire insurance. He charges that the fire insurance on buildings on which loans have been made has not been kept in proper order. That, Mr. Speaker, is always a difficult matter, and the private loan companies have difficulty in keeping this branch of their work in good order. The auditor says the conditions in the Board in this respect are deplorable, but I doubt very much if they are as bad as Mr. Weston suggests. This is one of the difficulties encountered in the loan business. Borrowers will make changes in their buildings—they will build additions to their houses, or tear down an old barn, and not send in the information. It is almost impossible for a loan company to keep track of all this. Mr. Weston apparently has forgotten a most important feature in this connection—the mortgage clause, which protects the mortgage or loaning company from discrepancies of this kind.

For many years suggestions have been going through the Province that members of the Board have participated in commissions paid by insurance companies, but I am glad to be able to say today that this partisan auditor in his report does not even suggest that any member of the Board benefitted, directly or indirectly, by a five-cent piece by way of commission or otherwise though they have handled this insurance from the inception of the Board.

The auditor also complains that expense vouchers prior to 1928 had been destroyed. His statement is apt to convey an entirely wrong idea, without any foundation. He goes through the expense vouchers for 1928 and 1929, and it is a strange fact that, although he finds nothing wrong, nothing to criticise in connections with these vouchers, he jumps at the conclusion that there must be something wrong prior to that date because the vouchers have been destroyed.

Then he says the Board should not have kept inspectors in its employ if it had no confidence in their recommendations. The Board does not do that. One of the inspectors has been in the employ of the Board during the whole history of the Board, some of the inspectors, formerly in the service of the Board, have gone to work for other loan companies and some have come to the Board from other companies. In the early years of the Board, that is during War time, the Board found difficulty in getting competent inspectors, but those who are now employed by the Board have been employed for a number of years and are competent, efficient men.

Then this auditor says that the Board paid too much attention to detail; in other words, that they took their work too seriously. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this cannot be charged against members of the Board as a fault? I think members of the House will agree with me that it is the reverse or, at worst, a commendable fault.

Then he criticises the Commissioner because he opens the mail himself. It may surprise members of this House to know that Mr. Fraser has made it a practice for many years to reach his office at 7.30 in the morning. On the way to his office he collects the mail, and opens it so that when his secretary arrives he is ready to go on without delay, instead of having to wait while the mail is being opened. He is criticised for that!

Then the charge is made by the auditor that in one instance there had been an over-expenditure of \$96 for seed grain that would be a loss to the Board. Now there might be some simple explanation of this; perhaps the Board would admit that a mistake had been made, but the auditor never went to any member of the Board to find out. There is also a good deal of criticism of the collection methods of the Board, but this matter I shall deal with more fully later.

On these petty criticisms, Mr. Speaker, this man condemns the whole office management of the Board and declares the Board to be hopelessly inefficient; but I would like again to point out that there is not anywhere in the report a single suggestion that, during the thirteen years the Board has been in existence in which period fifteen or sixteen million dollars passed through its hands, a single cent has been lost to the people of the province by reason of dishonesty on the part of those responsible.

I think the criticism of the operating methods—the loaning policy and collection methods—of the Board the more serious of the criticisms made, and I, therefore, pro-

pose to deal with them at a little greater length. But before proceeding with that, it might be just as well for members to have a little fuller knowledge of the Board's history. Certain information not contained in the report is essential to a clear understanding of conditions.

The Farm Loan Board was organised in 1917 (thirteen years ago) and during the time the scheme has been in operation total advances made from the Provincial Treasury have exceeded \$16,000,000 and that does not include the interest which the Board collected from its borrowers and returned to the Treasury. During the time the Board has been operating, 5,133 loans have been made, the number of loans by years being as follows:

| | |
|------------|-------|
| 1917 | 122 |
| 1918 | 893 |
| 1919 | 1,024 |
| 1920 | 990 |
| 1921 | 663 |
| 1922 | 101 |
| 1923 | 109 |
| 1924 | 77 |
| 1925 | 37 |
| 1926 | 50 |
| 1927 | 101 |
| 1928 | 322 |
| 1929 | 644 |

That is a total of 5,133 loans made to farmers in this Province by the Board during the thirteen years of its operations; and when members of this Legislature are considering the petty criticisms contained in this report regarding some individual loan, I would like them to remember the service rendered by the Board, the large number of loans made and the amounts involved. In addition, it is only fair to take into consideration the conditions existing during the earlier years of the Board's existence, when half of the loans were made. There is no person in this Legislature who does not remember the conditions existing in 1917-18-19 when "Wheat and more wheat!" was the cry, when everybody was optimistic as to the possibilities of farming and everyone was anxious to go on the farm and produce more wheat for the Empire. Wheat was worth \$2 a bushel and hopes were it would reach \$3. Crops were good particularly in 1915 and 1916, land values and everything else were going up, and everyone was going into farming. What followed? A period of poor crops, lower prices and financial depression, with the result that many farmers were forced out of business and abandoned their farms. This was the condition the Board had to face and in consequence it had to revise its valuations of the lands on which loans had been made and even good loans might be forced into the doubtful class. It is not surprising then that an inspection made in 1929 does not agree with one made in 1919, and yet about half the criticisms of this auditor are based on the fact that the inspector who went out this last year did not find the same condition as the inspector who had been out in 1919. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you are secretary-treasurer of a municipality, consequently, you will understand and appreciate the position in which the Board found itself. In certain sections of the Province, the whole character of the land has changed in that time. The member for Morse will know: there is an area in his constituency which at one time was excellent for farming and had good crops in 1915-16 and '17 but today it is of little value. It is true also of other parts of the province that land good in 1917 had little value in 1929, but fortunately in some areas the reverse is true. The member for Elrose also will know the land south of Hughton used to be successful farming land, but with the advent of several dry years, the complexion of the land changed and a farm that was a good farm thirteen years ago is not valuable today. We have all heard of William Darnborough of Laura. A few days ago, a gentleman told me that land near his farm had changed so that little could be made of it.

Mr. Givin: I think it is the land north of Tessier, the honourable member is referring to. That was land which blew; but today it is in as good shape as a few years ago.

Mr. Patterson: I do not dispute that. I am glad he gave me that information because it is going to prove a statement I am going to make a little later on. But the fact does remain that considering the general change which has taken place since 1917, with the changes that have taken place by reason of soil drift, weather and other conditions, some of the criticisms contained in this report in connection with inspectors' reports are most unfair and superficial. In fairness to the Board it should be pointed out that during

all the bad years the Board had confidence in and stood behind any borrower who made an honest attempt to stick on the land; it paid his taxes, and bought his seed grain instead of foreclosing, and I submit, Sir, the results have justified that policy.

When the Board was established in 1917, its policy was well-known. The auditor states it himself on page 4 of the report:

"Its policy of giving the preference to applicants for small loans to be used for increasing production, particularly to those who were remote from railways, and who, on that account, could not secure loans from the regular loaning institutions."

The Board adopted during those year 1917-18-19-20, a policy of giving preference to this class of loans, to assist the small farmer and to help the man the private loan companies would not assist. The purpose was to secure increased production. This policy was no secret and was not criticised. Every additional fifty or sixty acres brought under cultivation was an important contribution to the War resources of the Empire. That it was the correct policy then is proved by the fact that even this Auditor does not criticise it today.

After a lapse of ten years, it is true, the files of the Board do disclose a number of poor and doubtful loans, but the surprising thing to me is the comparatively few poor loans the Board has made under the conditions then and since. Obviously, when the Farm Loan Board commenced operations, it did not get the choice loans. These, of course, went to the companies, because the Board was organised to help those who could not get help from the private companies. But even with this choice of business, the private companies lost money on some of the loans made in those years.

In 1921, when the demand for greater production was not so urgent, the Board decided upon a change of policy to meet the requirements of a majority of the farmers, and has followed from that time a policy which was deemed to be in the best interests of all the farmers of this province. The Board decided to consider applications for loans on the basis of desirability which meant, of course, going into active competition with the loan companies, the main object in view being to effect a steadying of interest rates in the province. Every member will appreciate the fact that, so long as the Board was taking the loans which the loan companies did not want, it could have no effect on the interest rate charged by loan companies, but, when the Board started out to loan in the better districts and got business which the loan companies desired, it was only natural that the loan companies would be affected.

It is not surprising that serious criticism of the Farm Loan Board started when then the Board entered into active competition with the private companies, and members can decide for themselves why criticism has been so vociferous and frequent since that time. I think it will be admitted that the change in policy adopted by the Board was the best policy for the development and growth of our Province and the same applies to the earlier policy when the Board went out to help those who could not get help elsewhere. In my opinion those policies were sound and proper policies during the respective periods in which they operated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the interest rate mean to the farmer? The honourable member for Kindersley (*Mr. Whatley*) told us the other day that farm mortgages in this Province were estimated at a total of \$200,000,000. That means that a reduction in interest of one-half of one per cent would mean a saving to the farmers of this province of \$1,000,000 a year. Anyone who knows anything of the farm loan business will remember that before the Board was organised the interest rate on farm mortgages was always at least eight per cent, and quite frequently nine or ten per cent, but nowadays the rate ranges from seven to eight per cent. Every reduction of one-half of one per cent means an annual saving to farmers of \$1,000,000 a year. The saving to farmers who borrowed directly from the Board has amounted to over \$1,000,000, and while it is impossible to compute exactly what saving, indirectly, has been made to the farm industry generally, the reduction in interest rate effected by the Board alone would justify its activities and policies.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker! This audit was made in 1929, which admittedly was a difficult year for the farmers of this Province. Conditions were most unfavourable, and everyone knows that interest payments were not so good, tax payments were not so good, and most people got behind in their payments, particularly in those sections where drought was experienced. I would ask members of this House and the people of this province, when considering this auditor's report, to keep in mind that the Board has made 5,133 loans, the large majority of them under the peculiar conditions of 1917-18-19; to remember the changes in conditions that have occurred in the interval,

to remember also the loaning policy followed by the Board at its inception and after 1921, and the exceptional conditions that existed when this audit was made. Any person who has studied this report will have noticed that practically all the criticisms made by the auditor refer to loans made in 1917-18 and '19. He does criticise some, but very few, of the later loans.

What are his criticisms, Mr. Speaker?

He says, of course, "political influence." That has been the hue and cry of the Tory Party for several years. I think we can all be satisfied that when this political auditor began his work he examined every nook and corner for evidence to confirm the charge; in fact, he says on page 29 of his report "an exhaustive analysis has been made of all the loans." And what did he find in this "exhaustive analysis?" He found two cases out of all those 5,133 loans and that convinced him that "political influence" had been at work in the Board's operations!

He found one application (Loan 3119, page 12 of the Report) sent in by a gentleman who was at the time a member of this Legislature and who said that soil was of a certain kind—white clay. In the other instance (Loan 387, page 14 of the Report) years after the loan was made and the Board had foreclosed on the land, a certain member of the Legislature wrote in and recommended that the land be rented to a certain farmer. The Board did not do what the member recommended but the auditor suggests it should have done so. Had the Board acted on the recommendation, the auditor probably would have blamed it for doing so.

After making (as he says) an "exhaustive analysis of all the loans," this auditor finds these two cases of so-called "political interference" out of 5,133 loans. Well, Sir, if the present Government keeps political interference down to that percentage, there will not be much criticism from this side of the House. It is said that a drowning man will clutch at a straw and this is the straw on which our Tory friends hope to float to political success in this Province. I have no doubt the auditor made an exhaustive search for evidence, and I will say for Mr. Fraser, that he has not removed one document from the records in any attempt to cover up or protect the actions of the Board. Even Mr. Weston himself realised he had not made much of a case for political interference so to bolster it up he digs up four cases in which the Board made loans against the recommendation of the inspectors. (Loans 511, 3888, 611, 103). This makes the percentage a little higher; a grand total of six cases of alleged political interference out of 5,133—or one in every thousand, approximately. If he is satisfied that this establishes his case for "political interference," he is easily satisfied. There is an old saying "One Swallow does not make a summer" but apparently six cases out of 5,133 establishes a case for "political interference" in the mind of the Provincial Treasurer. I deny most emphatically, that there ever was any political interference with the operations of the Farm Loan Board. The Government of the day approved the general policy of the Board but never interfered or attempted to influence the decision of the Board in connection with any individual loan. We hear a lot of talk about "big loans" and "friends of the Government" and "I know of cases in my own constituency!" but there is nothing to any of it.

I want to make this point, too, for the Farm Loan Board: The farmers who borrow from the Board are typical of the average farmers who occupy farms in this Province. Some are good farmers, some not so good; but, as I say, they are typical Saskatchewan farmers, and I want the House to remember that fact when I analyse some of the auditor's findings, later on.

At one time we heard the criticism that German farmers were getting more than their fair share of loans. The Board checked up on this and were quite surprised (although after all, it is but natural) to find that the Scotch got most loans from the Board. I want to say this, also, in fairness to the farmers who have large loans: The large loans generally are proving very satisfactory and the so frequently referred to loan of \$25,000 (the borrower was not a friend of the former Government) is in first class shape. As I said before, the farmers who borrow from the Board are not of any peculiar type. They are typical Saskatchewan farmers and I know, from my own knowledge, that many of them are Tories; and I wish the members to keep that in mind.

One thing that struck me in perusing this report, was the number of headings under which the auditor had listed his criticisms. There are something like twelve headings, where two or three divisions would have been quite sufficient. My opinion is that this was deliberately done for the purpose of making the report seem more impressive to its readers.

The auditor cites nine cases in which he says "loans were granted on bad inspections," and he bases this on the ground that an inspection made in 1929 did not agree with an inspection made in 1917 or 1918, arguing from this the original inspection was faulty. Most of these nine loans were made in districts where a change in conditions has occurred as I attempted to outline a few minutes ago. The surprising fact is that after making this "exhaustive analysis," of these 5,133 loans, the auditor has discovered only nine cases of this kind.

Then he goes on to say that there are six cases in which "it is doubtful if any inspection was ever made." There is no authority for that statement. It is merely suspicion on the part of the auditor and I may add that this gentleman appears to be a Past-Master in the art of suspecting. In connection with Loan 246, for instance, there appears to be a report on file signed by the inspector, and I would think the inspector, if he signed a statement to the effect that he had inspected a piece of land on a certain date, actually did inspect it. In any event, there is absolutely no evidence produced to show the inspection was not made and the only thing indicated is that a report made in 1929 did not agree with a report made in 1917 or 1918, as in the preceding case, and if that is so what is the necessity for having these under separate headings? The two classes should be under the same heading.

The auditor complains that certain loans were made to old people, and here again he apparently accepts the view of the Minister that old people are not to be given any consideration. He cites four cases of loans made to elderly people, but the auditor does not tell us anything about the family conditions, and I have an idea that if this matter were investigated further it would be found that these people had grown up families, probably grown sons at home who would be responsible.

Then the auditor lists five cases in which the Board advanced more than the inspector recommended, and he is very suspicious of that—he excels in being suspicious. Now there are a dozen reasons why this might happen. The member for Pelly (*Mr. R. J. M. Parker*) gave one the other day, and there are several I can furnish from personal knowledge. Very often a company accepts a mortgage and afterwards discovers that they have to increase the amount in order to get a clear title. I am sure if the auditor had examined thoroughly, he would have found in every case that the increase over the inspector's recommendation was made for a proper and sufficient reason. Even if the Board did loan say \$2,200 instead of \$2,000 as recommended, it is good business if it improves the borrowers' position, and enables him to pay up all his other liabilities.

The Provincial Treasurer had a great deal to say about the inspectors being the "eyes" of the Board. That is true, but something more than eyes are needed in this or any other business. There must be brains and intelligence as well. Mr. Fraser has been many years in the loan business and has, in that time, gained considerable knowledge of land values, also there are many other sources of information available to the members of the Board in addition to the inspectors' reports. If the Board is going to do exactly what the inspectors recommend, what is the need of a Board? Why not let the inspectors do it all? It is true the Board occasionally has declined to accept the recommendations of the inspectors; and in a number of cases, the Board has increased the loan over the amount the inspector recommended, but I am satisfied that a proper investigation would reveal ample justification for every such action of the Board. Who after all has the final say, Mr. Speaker? Who is responsible? Is it the Board or the inspectors? Obviously, Sir, the Board is responsible. The Board must make the final decision.

The auditor finds he must have more to complain of so in three cases he criticises the Board on the ground that it had failed to see that the money loaned had been expended for the purpose for which the loan was made. Really, Mr. Speaker, he expects too much. In three cases, all in 1918 when some 900 loans were made, he finds the borrower had not spent the money for what he got the money. I would submit that if, after thirteen years, the Board has been remiss in three cases only, it is proof of their competent management. I have to doubt that, like private companies, the Board in some cases did not pay out all the money but retained a part of the loan until certain improvements were made, and apparently the Board has been successful in following up the expenditure of this money in all except three cases.

The auditor cites eight cases in which he claims there is lack of a collection policy. I am not going into these at the present time, because I intend to deal at length, a little later, with the Board's collection and foreclosure policy. But even in these eight cases, specially selected, there can be honest difference of opinion as to what has been done. In the handling of a difficult loan, three men might decide to follow one method, and three others an entirely different method, yet both be quite honest and capable.

The auditor, however, did not see any room for difference of opinion. But even these few isolated cases are not sufficient to substantiate a general charge of incompetence taking into consideration the volume of business transacted by the Board, the length of time over which it has been operating, and the conditions under which some of the loans were made.

Then the auditor says there was "lack of careful management," and he discovers four cases to support this allegation. Now, Sir, I leave it to you to say whether a Board that has been in the loan business for thirteen years, has a thorough knowledge of conditions, knows the history of each individual loan, has the reports of its field men, and knows everything that has happened since the loan was first made, is in a better position to decide what is best to be done, rather than an auditor from Saskatoon who steps in with the avowed purpose of finding something to make political propaganda. Suppose the Board has a poor quarter section miles removed from any other land in which it is interested, how often should the inspector visit it and how much money should be spent to see that the windows are boarded up, or if sparrows have built under the eaves. It is highly unfair and unworthy of an auditor to pick out four isolated cases and on these base a general charge of lack of management against the Board.

The Provincial Treasurer referred to two cases in which the loans granted were in excess of 50 per cent of the inspector's valuation, but only one case is mentioned by the auditor. The Provincial Treasurer, in dealing with the matter treated the House to some characteristic "heroics." He told us he might be compelled to take action to recover from the Board. I do not know what explanation there is for these cases, but I am satisfied there is some quite reasonable explanation. To remove the impression from the minds of the public that this is a very serious condition, I may say that these two loans were for the sum of \$500 apiece. I might remind the House also that the auditor did not trouble to ask the Board for an explanation of these loans.

The Provincial Treasurer has been saying that there are other criticisms pertaining to current loans, and I will now deal with them. In the back of the report twenty-six current loans are dealt with, and in many cases it is hard to say just what the auditor's complaint is because he wind up his remarks concerning them with "Appears to be O.K.," "Appears to be good," etc. Two or three times in thirteen years the inspectors have valued the land at more than did the farmer applying for the loan and the auditor says this is unusual. It is so unusual that he found only three cases out of 5,133 loans! In other cases he finds the loans "O.K.," but most of these are loans made in the later years of the Board's activities. At that I am prepared to admit that some of the loans made in 1929 will ultimately prove to be bad loans. Taking everything into consideration I would say that the current loans, as a whole, are quite as good as those held by any private company doing business on the same scale. The borrowers are just the same kind of people, no class or district is favoured and I think, in fairness to them and in justice to them, we must admit that. A reflection on the Board's borrowers is a reflection on all the farmers in Saskatchewan. What is the result of three months' "exhaustive analysis" (to use his own term) of the affairs of the Farm Loan Board in which the auditor employed a large staff and was assisted by "impartial" inspectors? The net result despite a search of every case in an effort to locate wrong doing and establish a serious situation out of which to make political capital, is a report divided into eleven or twelve groups where three or four would do, in which this auditor criticises seventy loans out of a total of 5,133 and in no case was the Board given an opportunity to make any explanation. These seventy cases are the net result of this auditor's investigation, and on that he and the Provincial Treasurer base their whole argument of political interference and incompetency in the management of the Board's affairs. Is it any wonder that men are reluctant to accept positions of public responsibility where they are made targets for irresponsible attacks of this nature without being given the opportunity of defending themselves?

Now, Sir, I come to the Board's collection policy. The auditor criticises most harshly but he follows the old practice and tells only half the story. He suggests that the Board repressed the staff when they were anxious to go after collections but this suggestion is based on the strength of one piece of office gossip. It is true that the staff had charge of routine collections, but the Board passed on all applications for extensions and for advances for seed grain and decided on foreclosures. In each and every case these matters were decided by the Board itself. The auditor suggests that there should be a "keen" collection man who would write sharp letters to the borrowers. Mr. Weston's view is the typical city man's view, but I want to say that to a man on the farm striving to keep a home for his wife and family, matters such as an extension of time, a supply of seed grain or foreclosure are matters of supreme importance. The decision of the Board decides whether he is going to keep his home or lose it, whether he is

going to win through or lose all, and, consequently, he expects his application to be considered by the Board itself and considered fairly and sympathetically. But the auditor says "let us have a keen collection man, and take our losses and get out of the business." The Board itself dealt with those cases and dealt sympathetically, but Mr. Weston favours collection by means of sharp letters. He forgot to tell the public that the Board also employs its field man to handle the difficult cases. All loan companies do that, and it is the practice which the Board followed.

I am quite willing to admit this Board has been lenient. I am willing to admit that it advanced money for the purchase of seed grain in doubtful cases where many would have advised against it, and I am quite prepared to admit that it showed reluctance to foreclose borrowers. It endeavoured to treat its borrowers as human beings and is there anyone here who would suggest that any other policy should be allowed? I approve of that policy. After all, this is not a cold-blooded institution organised to make money out of the public. This is an institution organised and created to develop and increase production in this province, and to help all the farmers of Saskatchewan secure a lower rate of interest on their farm mortgages. In view of those facts how can any public man censure the Board because it has been more lenient and more sympathetic towards its borrowers than the loan companies!

The auditor complains that the Board did not make sufficient foreclosures. On page 6 of his report, he says:

"A very undesirable aspect of this Board's policies is becoming apparent at this time, viz: 1921, owing to the fact that the Board was not foreclosing on farms unless the farms were abandoned."

It is within the recollection of every member of this House that, in 1921, the Government of the day made appeals to the creditor classes, impressing on them the necessity of being lenient and giving consideration to their debtors, and yet this auditor says the Board should have been actively foreclosing! Not only did the Board not foreclose but it did everything it could to assist the farmer who was making an honest attempt to work his farm and get out of his difficulties. The Board's policy in 1921, and in every other year was not to foreclose where a man is on the land, is making an honest effort to work it and appears to have a chance of success. I think every one will approve of that policy—everyone except the present Provincial Treasurer. I want to ask the farmer members on the Government side of the House if they approve of that policy. The members on this side approve it and I think the people of the Province, generally, approve it. There used to be an old story that loan companies wanted to foreclose to make profits on resale of the land. I must say in fairness to private companies, that I never knew a case myself and I certainly would not wish to have the idea applied to any Board I was connected with. I would like to ask the Government is it going to adopt Weston's suggestions and foreclose 50 per cent of the farmers who are borrowers from this Board? Let me give you the number of foreclosures for each year since 1922:

| | |
|------------|----|
| 1922 | 19 |
| 1923 | 40 |
| 1924 | 72 |
| 1925 | 84 |
| 1926 | 65 |
| 1927 | 56 |
| 1928 | 31 |
| 1929 | 18 |

That is, Sir, a total of 385 in these eight years. It is the result of the policy which the Board followed in 1917-18-19-20 and it demonstrates that fact that, so far as foreclosures are concerned, unless we have a period of poor crops, the worst is past. But there is another feature about it. Every foreclosure which the Board makes unnecessarily or unjustly, is just another incentive to the private companies to warrant their dealing more sharply than at present with their borrowers; and that would be one indirect result of following the auditor's advice. What is the Government going to do about it?

In regard to the alleged losses—and most of them are alleged—the auditor has worked out a grand total of \$3,000,000. As I said before, he went out with the intention of making it large enough. I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that he grossly overshot the mark, as our Tory friends have a habit of doing, and the results, eventually, will be the opposite of what was expected.

The losses are placed in three classes in the auditor's report, and I wish to explain this division of the accounts. In the first place, the Board from time to time foreclosed on certain lands. These foreclosed accounts are divided into two sections, the first comprising those lands subsequently disposed of for which the Board holds agreements of sale; and second, those lands for which the Board has not yet secured a purchaser. Many of the foreclosed lands which have not been resold are rented by the Board to parties who may become purchasers. Then there are the current loans; these are loans which are being carried in the usual way and the borrower is still owner of the land. I may say that in the press reports the term "guaranteed loans" was used. That is a typographical error. It should have been "current loans." Now I hope the members will understand what is meant by these three terms—"agreements for sale," foreclosed loans" and "current loans."

Dealing first with "agreements for sale," the Board has resold to purchasers 330 quarter sections of land, which it had obtained by foreclosure, for a total of \$742,314.82, and on these the purchasers have paid \$185,946.55, so that there is still owing the Board by these purchasers the sum of \$556,368.27. On these lands, which the Board has resold to farmers, it has lost approximately \$16,000 of the cost of these lands to the Board.

The auditor says the Board is going to lose \$163,899.99 on these transactions. On page 25 of his report, we read:

"In other words, these agreements are inflated in numerous cases to a figure far in excess of the original valuation of the land."

Without any authority for saying so this auditor states that the Board got men to buy land at an inflated value and boosted the price of the land far beyond its value, and then he alleges that the loss will be over 25 per cent. The implication here is that half of the purchasers will default and that the land will come back to the Board and be resold for half the purchase price. There is another implication—that the Board made fictitious sales in order to improve its accounts. That is absolutely false. Every agreement represents a *bona fide* sale to a *bona fide* purchaser for an amount which the purchaser has agreed to pay. I am not going to say that every one of those will make good. There would be no object in saying that—even the Conservative Party is not 100 per cent good! Many of these resales were made on the crop payment plan, and it is surprising how many farmers have paid for their land on crop payments. But the auditor says the prices were inflated—purposely inflated to improve the Board's accounts. Well, Sir, the value of these agreements is dependent on the industry and integrity of the purchasers and I am not prepared to admit that half of the farmers who have bought land from the Farm Loan Board are not honest, and industrious—that they have signed agreements which they are not prepared to live up to. I have more confidence in them than that, but I want all farmers who have bought land from the Board to note that the Provincial Treasurer (on his own statement) expects that out of the 330 more than half are not expected to pay for their land; in other words, that they will default.

Coming to "foreclosed loans," the Board has 250 quarter sections representing a total of \$550,089.90. Now I am going to be frank and am quite prepared to admit that the Board is going to take some loss in this branch of their business—this is foreclosed and unsold land—for it is true that much of the land is in poor condition and, as a result, cannot command the top market price. There is no doubt many of these quarter sections are of little value for that reason and for reasons which I stated before. But future crop conditions will have an important bearing on the ultimate loss. No person can say what the loss is going to be because no one can say what crop conditions are going to be in the future but I contend, Sir, the loss arrived at by the auditor is altogether too high. Loan companies recovered large sums in the southwestern part of the Province, following two good crops, which they considered bad debts a few years ago. It is not possible for any person, under the conditions, to ascertain the loss definitely. The Provincial Treasurer says the loss is going to be over 50 per cent, but I am not going to agree with that, and even re-inspection next spring by inspectors like T. A. Anderson and J. H. Curry, who are determined to condemn the Board, will not settle the matter. I still have more confidence in the Board than I have in party "heelers." The auditor has placed the losses on the agreements for sale and the foreclosed loans at \$440,000, but the figure is away too high. I am prepared to admit some loss, but something between \$250,000 and \$300,000 will, in my opinion, cover the loss on this section, unless we have a protracted period of poor crops. The auditor himself admits that the Board, up to this time, has created reserves to cover even the losses he claims on these two classes.

I come now to the third class—"Current Loans." This is where the auditor gets in his fine work; this is where you can see his "Eyetalian" hand. The total of current

loans of the Board is approximately \$10,000,000. These, as I stated previously, are the open accounts, which are not foreclosed and the borrower is still on the land, in the vast majority of cases. The loans are scattered all the way from the Manitoba to the Alberta boundaries and from the southern to the northern extremities of the settled portion of the province, and, as I stated before, the borrowers are typical Saskatchewan farmers; yet the Provincial Treasurer comes into the House and says that, in his opinion, 50 per cent of those men are going to default on their loans. The auditor says the loss on current loans will be \$2,500,000. I am not going to describe how he arrived at his conclusions that there will be a two and a half million dollar loss on ten million dollars worth of business, but I will discuss what the implications are. In effect, he says that every second borrower (and there are some 4,000) is going to default, and that when the Board repossesses the land, it will sell for only half of what is against it. If it is on a statement like this that the Provincial Treasurer is going to dismiss honest and capable public servants, no power on this side can deter him. I would ask those on the other side of the House who are farmers, who know what it is to have a loan from a private company, to study seriously the implications of that statement.

Why do I say 50 per cent of the farmers who are borrowers from the Board will default? Because the auditor places the loss on current loans at \$2,500,000, that is 25 per cent of the amount on loan; and he also says that the land will sell for only half the amount against it. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, to make this loss of \$2,500,000, 50 per cent of the borrowers must default. The auditor says "one-half will default," and again I would ask the farmers who are dealing with the Farm Loan Board to note the splendid compliment paid them by the Provincial Treasurer—he repeats "one-half will default," and the auditor says "undoubtedly this large sum has been lost" and the Provincial Treasurer, parrotwise, repeats: "Undoubtedly this large sum will be lost."

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I never said that.

Mr. Patterson: Well, the honourable Minister made the statement that the loss would be \$2,500,000.

Premier Anderson: We might lose more.

Mr. Pattersons I would like to investigate what that means. That statement is not only a reflection on the farmers who are borrowers from the Board, but it is a reflection upon every farmer in the Province who has a mortgage on his land, and, judging from the figures quoted by the honourable member for Kindersley, nearly all the farmers in the Province. I would like to ask this question: Is it going to help reduce interest rates on farm mortgages to say that half of the lands in Saskatchewan are no good? And is it going to help the credit of the province to tell the financial interests that 50 per cent of our borrowers are going to default? Yet that is, in plain language, exactly what the auditor's report means. This report may have been intended for political purposes, but again it may have the opposite effect from what was intended.

I am not contending that this Board has not made poor loans. Even some of those made in 1929 will prove poor. I am not denying there will be losses. The early policy of the Board would almost make that inevitable. But I would never dare to express an opinion, even in private conversation, that half of those borrowing from the Board are going to default. Surely there will be losses, Mr. Speaker; but admittedly, the worst days are past—the period of deflation subsequent to the War—the Board has set up reserves which provide for all losses to date and the Board will provide for losses in the future as it has in the past, if it is only left alone to manage its business without the help, and without having to meet the expenses, of special inspectors such as T. A. Anderson and J. H. Curry, and of special auditors like Mr. Weston. I wonder if it is the Government's intention to make this report an excuse for liquidating the Board and of selling out this institution and its business to some of its friends at 75 cents on the dollar! I would like to know if they are going to put in a "keen collection agent" in order to foreclose right and left and sell the lands at half-price to their political friends and charge the loss up to the last Government of Saskatchewan! Stranger things, Mr. Speaker, have happened.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, let me tell the honourable the ex-Provincial Treasurer, that we are not going to do it.

Mr. Patterson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer did say something about investigating the Federal Loan Scheme and, naturally, I thought he had some idea of liquidating the Farm Loan Board's business. Again I would like to ask members

on the Government side of the House whether they be Conservatives, Independents or Progressives, if they are interested in farm mortgages, whether or not they would like to see this Board discontinued. Yet what other purpose can there be behind this report? I would like them also, if they have given consideration to this report, to give equal consideration to the statements I am making here this afternoon.

There are some things the Board has done which the auditor does not report. It has received in advances from the Provincial Treasury for all purposes, a total of \$16,401,606.89 and it has repaid \$6,192,305.42. Now it is true that the sum repaid to the Treasury includes interest and charges on foreclosed loans, which comes to just a little over \$1,000,000, but that means that the Board has actually repaid approximately \$5,000,000 to the Treasury and that, you must admit, Mr. Speaker, is not a bad showing for these "defaulters" and not too bad for those "incompetents" on the Board. Some of the Board's borrowers must be paying up; and that figure does not include the interest collected and repaid to the Treasury—it is only the capital.

Up to December 31, 1929, the Board had advanced \$272,305.61 to borrowers for hail and fire insurance, and all of that has been paid back except \$4,969.71. The auditor criticises the Board very frequently for making seed grain advances to borrowers, but of the \$273,110.55 advanced for seed grain to December 31, 1929, \$262,097.30 has been repaid, leaving only \$11,013.25 outstanding. The Board also paid some taxes for its borrowers to help them along and up to December 31, 1929, had advanced \$816,801.83 for this purpose. Of this amount \$761,239.84 has been repaid, leaving outstanding \$55,561.99. These are some of the things the borrowers of the Farm Loan Board have done. Why did the auditor not tell all the record? Why could he not give the borrowers some little credit for trying, honestly, to repay the Board? Why brand them as defaulters? Although these are the amounts outstanding for insurance, seed and taxes on \$10,000,000 of current loans; the auditor says 25 per cent are now no good, and that another 25 per cent will become no good in a few years' time. Now, Sir, I wish to tell you some other things about the Board which the auditor omitted to mention in this report. The Board gets the money for loaning purposes from the Treasury paying the Treasury 5 1-3 per cent for this money, and lends to borrowers at 6 1/2 per cent. Out of the difference—that is a margin of 1 1-6 per cent—it has to pay operating expenses and, by economic management, the Board has built up reserves of \$519,000 on this margin of 1 1/6 per cent. That is not too bad for an inefficient and incompetent Board! Hardly the result you would expect from reading this auditor's report! But these facts are not included in the report, nor is the fact that the Board has set up reserves sufficient to provide for all losses to date even taking this auditor's figures. The worst period is over now, and I contend, Sir, it is sufficient to prove that, if the Board is left alone and free from political interference, as in the past, it will come through without any loss to the people of the province.

It proves also that the Board has been economical. When the auditor says \$75,000 for re-inspections of open loans—there are 4,000 such open loans—it means something like \$20 for each loan to provide a summer's employment for some of our Tory friends. That is far too much, Mr. Speaker—three times too much. The Board has inspectors of its own, experienced men, who can make these re-inspections at a cost of not more than \$25,000, and we shall get inspections that we can have more confidence in than those made by T. A. Anderson or other political workers.

There are some other things the Board has done. I have already explained that the Board gets its money from the Treasury at the rate of 5 1/3 per cent, and pays that interest to the Treasury whether the borrowers pay up or not. You will be surprised to know that this Board has paid back every dollar of that 5 1/3 per cent interest due to the Treasury to the end of 1929. It has returned every dollar of capital it has collected; it has paid back every dollar of hail insurance, seed grain and tax advances which have been repaid by the borrowers; these "defaulters," these unsatisfactory borrowers, these men who are going to leave this province in the lurch to the extent of two and a half million dollars! And on top of that, this Board has created reserves in excess of half a million dollars. Does that indicate that the Board is inefficient and incompetent? Does it look as if hundreds of those borrowers were not up to much? I do not think so, and if that is the condition at the end of 1929, admittedly a difficult year in the farming business in Saskatchewan, I would say it is conclusive proof of the competence, carefulness and efficiency of the Board and of the honesty and integrity of the vast majority of the Board's borrowers.

We have heard a lot about that loan of \$25,000. Now, Sir, the Board has some large loans, I admit, but, generally speaking, these loans are proving satisfactory and very few of them have foreclosed. I wish to refer to the new, the "Tory," policy of

putting a limit of \$5,000 on loans made by the Board. In my opinion, that is a wrong policy for the Board to pursue under existing conditions in the Province and I do not know why it should be \$5,000 instead of \$6,000 or \$7,000, or why the man with three-quarter sections or a section of land should not be entitled to as much consideration as the man with the quarter or a half. It seems to me that if a man has three quarter-sections and wants \$6000 and the board will only allow him \$5000 then he is going to take his business elsewhere. Of course the Board cannot supply all the farmers of the province directly. The honourable member for Kindersley (*Mr. Whatley*) has said that it would take \$200,000,000 to supply their mortgage requirements, and everyone admits it would be impossible for this province to begin to do that. But, the main purpose, the first objective of the Board, is to steady interest rates and by doing so to gain a little more reasonable interest rates for all the farmers in the Province. To do that the Board must enter into active competition with the private companies, and this Government in its interest for some individuals in this province, has debarred the Board from that, for, to limit the loans it may make to \$5000 shuts the Board out from accepting the choicest loans. Further, Mr. Speaker, it prevents the Board from competing for the business which would have the greatest effect on interest rates. I am quite sure, the Government will hear very little criticism of their policy from the loan companies.

We have heard a little of "political interference," but this is the very first time in which, to gain a little popularity, the whole policy of the Board has been disrupted and the scheme itself placed in jeopardy. Not only the Board has been jeopardized but, at the command and request of a few individuals in this province, the Government has deliberately shut itself out of the very choicest field where it could compete with the private companies to the best advantage of all the farmers of the Province. I want to say again that the Government of which I had the honour to be a member did not interfere with the management of the affairs of the Farm Loan Board. It is true we did have general supervision over its operations—we had to accept the responsibility—but I want to repeat that there was no political interference at any time with the workings of the Board.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to condemn this report because it is partisan and prejudiced, and prepared for political purposes. I condemn it because it condemns faithful public servants without giving them an opportunity to defend themselves. I want to condemn it because it is unfair and unjust to all farm loan borrowers, because it affects their credit and reputation by casting suspicion on their honesty, ability and integrity. And, further, I condemn this report because it impairs the credit of every farmer in this province, who has business dealings with the private loan companies. Finally, I condemn it because it adversely affects and impairs the credit of the province itself.

The Tory Party is always boasting of its loyalty, but in this case it has shown that it has no consideration for individuals, classes or people, when party interests are at stake and I do not know of a single occasion on which that party was not ready to sacrifice the interests of the people or of the state itself for partisan advantage.

I am not prepared to approve or admit the statement that 50 per cent of our farmers are unworthy of credit and are going to default in their obligations. I think we, on this side of the House, still have in our membership two natives of this province (and I am proud of the fact that I am one of them), but there must be many in this House who have lived as long in this province as I have. There must be many here who came to this province thirty or forty years ago. They have seen the development that has taken place, they know the difficulties and trials the settlers encountered and came through. They know the results which have been obtained. Having those facts in mind, and having faith in Saskatchewan and confidence in the farmer on the land, I am not prepared now to admit that 50 per cent of the farmers of this province will default in their obligations . . .

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is discussing the borrowers of the province; we are only discussing the borrowers of the Farm Loan Board!

Mr. Patterson: I tried to make myself clear. The borrowers, whether they are borrowers from the Board or from the private companies, are the same kind of people; they have the same kind of land, and are working under the same set of conditions. They are all trying to make this province a little greater, and each is trying to make a home for his family. There is no difference between them. I would say that, in recent years, the Farm Loan Board has secured a very desirable type of borrower and, knowing what has been done in the past, knowing that the Board has created reserves to cover any losses to date, and realising that the worst period of the Board's activities is over,

I am not prepared to admit in regard even to the 4,000 who have borrowed from the Board and whose accounts are still open, that 50 per cent of them are going to be financial failures.

A great American financier was once asked to what he owed his success and he answered: "I have never sold the United States short." By that he meant that he had never said anything or done anything that would adversely affect the credit of any class or community in the United States and so impair the credit of the country. I propose never, this afternoon or at any time, to sell Saskatchewan short and as this report casts a reflection upon the honesty, ability and integrity of all the farmers of this province, I can not support the motion.

THE HONOURABLE W. W. SMITH

(Minister without Portfolio)

(Swift Current)

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to contribute a few remarks to this debate, I wish to join with others who have preceded me in congratulating you upon the high honour of being elected to the Speaker's Chair in this Legislature. I know, Sir, that you will discharge your duties with every degree of fairness and impartiality and in a manner which will prove satisfactory to all the members.

I desire also to congratulate the mover (*Mr. Eades*) and the seconder (*Mr. Taylor*) of the Address in reply to His Honour's Speech on the very capable and acceptable manner in which they acquitted themselves of the task assigned to them in delivering their "maiden" speeches in this House. I realise the position they were placed in and the difficulty of the task, for this is also my "maiden" speech in this Legislature. My only hope is that I can do as well as they did under the circumstances.

Although I have not been very long in this House, I am beginning to appreciate what is meant by the phrase I have often heard — "the sportsmanship of politicians" — for, having heard the cross-fire and back-fire that takes place in the House, I must admit it is with some degree of astonishment that members can engage in such wordy warfare in the House and still remain the best of friends outside. I suppose it is all part of the game, but I have come to the conclusion that the proper diet for a politician is hard-boiled eggs, for you do not have to be here long to realise that you have got to be "hard-boiled" to be a politician.

I wish also to join with other members in congratulating His Majesty the King upon his recovery from the illness from which he suffered. A year ago, it was thought throughout the whole Empire that his chances of recovery were slight, but, due to his strong constitution and to the fact that he had at his bedside the best of medical skill, he has been restored to health and we all hope and trust that he may long be spared to carry on the good work that always will be associated with his reign.

I also wish to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) who is so well-skilled in the matter of politics, and also the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) who is also a skilled politician. He expressed some very fine sentiments in his speech, which I appreciated, but I must say I disliked his innuendoes and insinuations against members of the Government and those seated on this side of the House. He it was who first of all raised the question of the racial and religious trouble in this debate. He referred, the other day, in an effort to capitalise it for his own political advantage, to an article in *The Regina Daily Star* in which the result of the foreign vote in the election of last year was analysed. He quoted certain passages from that article to try to prove that the *Star* had divided the electorate into British and anti-British and that it had stated that the non-British had voted for the members opposite. He omitted to quote in full the final paragraph of that article which puts a different complexion on the matter and, as it is a very important paragraph, I propose to read it for the information of the members here. The last paragraph of the article in question reads as follows:

"This analysis is not made with a view of labelling the Gardiner following as the representatives of the non-English-speaking minority in Saskatchewan, but to point to the work ahead."

So *The Star* did not suggest what the honourable member for Rosthern says it did. The rest of the paragraph reads:

"The next Government must disabuse the minds of the dwellers in the foreign settlements of the fears planted in their minds by machine workers, and bring them to the full status of Canadian citizens, hating none and fearing none."

That, I submit, is going to be the duty of the Co-operative Government of Saskatchewan — to educate these foreign-born residents of the province, to bring them to the full status of Canadian citizenship. We have got to teach them to hate none and fear none.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is a reflection upon and a reproach to any Government to have been in power in a province or state for twenty-four years and to have citizens who cannot read, write or speak the English language, which is the language of the country. Lots of the foreign-born in Saskatchewan are in that unfortunate position today; and there are some in my own constituency, both men and women, who, though they have lived in this province for many years, still are unable to read or write English and some of them cannot even speak the language. I say it is a discredit to any Government to have allowed a state of affairs like that to exist without making a serious and determined effort to remedy the situation.

Previous to the election of last summer, there were a great number of prophecies made by members of the Liberal party and their supporters, and all these predictions were to the effect that the members constituting the present Government did not have even a fighting chance of being returned to power. I do not need to discuss those prophecies at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to draw the attention of the members opposite to the fact that the view expressed in their pre-election prophecies was not the view held by some competent judges of the situation both inside and outside the province. I would like to quote the views of just one outsider who, members will admit, is competent to judge, and the comments he had to make on the situation in Saskatchewan just prior to the election were these:

"Liberal leaders make light of the opposition optimism. That the electorate should even dream of a radical change is to them incomprehensible and unthinkable. It is seldom that a Canadian province has been dominated for so long a term by one party. As a result there is an inevitable growing force which seeks a change.

Based on the membership of sixty-three in the last Legislature the possibility of a change or even a close run would seem to be rather far-fetched. The Liberals had fifty-three, the Conservatives four, the Progressives four with two Independents. There is not much to cheer about, but the unexpected sometimes happens in politics. The opposition see encouragement in statistics covering the last election. The analysis does reveal a different story. The Liberals polled 54.45 per cent. of the total vote. The opposition accounted for the other 45.55 per cent., but only managed to elect ten members out of sixty-three. Advocates of proportional representation should find here ideal territory. The total Liberal vote was 134,904. Twenty-three Conservatives polled 52,486 votes. Thirty-eight Progressive candidates polled 60,374 votes, or a total opposition vote of 112,860. Several constituencies show small Government majorities. One statistical expert has estimated that candidates in the last election struck this average: Progressives, 1,588 votes; Liberals, 2,277 votes; Conservatives, 2,611 votes.

Figured from that angle the possibility of change does not seem hopeless. It is pointed out that in previous elections the opposition had to conduct a campaign without any newspaper support whatever, against an exceptionally hostile party press throughout the province and a more popular Liberal leader. They now have an aggressive daily newspaper on their side, quite able to hold its own in political battles as they are fought in Saskatchewan."

Now, Mr. Speaker

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): Might I ask the honourable member what that quotation is from?

Hon. Mr. Smith: It is from *Toronto Saturday Night*, and is written by F. C. Pickwell, who is described as "Western Representative" of that paper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to another matter which goes to show the way the late Government had of doing things, or of not doing them.

I consider it a great honour and privilege to represent the constituency of Swift Current in this Legislature. That constituency, as no doubt you will agree, is situated

in the finest and best agricultural area in Saskatchewan, in fact it is one of the banner wheat constituencies of the province of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Davis: I must rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The honourable gentleman has overlooked Prince Albert.

Hon. Mr. Smith: Prince Albert is now represented in the Opposition and so it is only natural that I should overlook it.

Swift Current, as you know, Mr. Speaker, got into difficulties a number of years ago, along with a number of other districts in the province, owing to a series of crop failures in the district and a long period of hard times. But I am glad to say that, with real grit and determination, the people of the constituency have been able to pull through and are now well over the top. The crop statistics of the province of Saskatchewan show that during the war years when other parts of Saskatchewan were enjoying comparatively good times, Swift Current did not get its share of the general prosperity. Nevertheless in any patriotic activity Swift Current was always over the top. Since then, and in more recent times, Swift Current district has been enjoying fairly good crops and the people have been anticipating them and have been paying off their debts. In this district, and including also the adjoining constituency represented by the honourable friend from Happyland (*Mr. Strath*), there have been some excellent crops and they have had the largest crop yield produced in Saskatchewan in the last four years. That has given considerable encouragement to the people living in these districts, Mr. Speaker, because, as you know, we are situated in a part of the province which has been declared practically unfit for wheat growing purposes; but it has proved to be one of the most productive parts of the whole province of Saskatchewan.

Swift Current, however, in spite of its just claims to attention and consideration, has not come in for its proper share of attention from the Government in the past, particularly in the distribution of the public monies. It has never received the amount of public money expended on it to which it was entitled, Mr. Speaker, and I contend that has been due to the policy of the former Government which was to expend the bulk of the public monies in preferred constituencies and districts. In proof of my contention, Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention to the apportionment of the expenditure on public buildings and public works by the late Government. Out of the \$19,000,000 expended in public buildings in Saskatchewan by the late Liberal Government only one-and-one-quarter per cent., or \$250,000, was expended in Swift Current.

In that respect, the city of Yorkton is in the same category as Swift Current; yet in the sections of which they are the centres, almost half the total annual agricultural wealth of the province is produced. Less than three per cent. of the total amount expended on public works and buildings has been expended in these two districts, Mr. Speaker — less than three per cent. Glance at the map, and if you start at Prince Albert and draw a line down the centre of the province, down through Saskatoon, Regina and Weyburn, you will find that the bulk of the money has been expended on buildings in points somewhere on that line. Swift Current and Yorkton are the chief centres in the two great divisions into which the province is divided by that line, and less than three per cent. of the monies expended on public buildings have been spent in Swift Current and Yorkton.

We have had a representative all these years sitting on the Government side of the House, seeing millions being spent in Regina, Prince Albert and Weyburn and I cannot but come to the conclusion that his time would have been better spent in his own business than in politics. I think we might have done even better if we had had a representative sitting on the Opposition side. He could have protested at least and brought the unequal distribution of these monies before the public. I am only sorry that the late Minister of Highways (*Mr. Spence*) did not choose to represent the constituency of Swift Current instead of Maple Creek, for then we would have been sure of getting at least a reasonable share of highway construction. However, the people of Swift Current have had to take their medicine, and are now hoping for better things to come.

Saskatchewan is divided into nine crop districts for statistical purposes. Districts Nos. 1 and 2 are in the south-eastern part of the province, No. 2 taking in the famous wheat-growing area of the Regina-Weyburn plains. No. 3 is the large area of which Swift Current forms a considerable and important part. No. 4 takes in Maple Creek and the district west to the Alberta border. No. 5 is situated in the east-central part

of the province, including Yorkton in its limits, and No. 6 is the centre taking in the Saskatoon and Last Mountain areas. No. 8 takes in the north-eastern part and No. 9 the north-western part of the province. In those districts, taking the 1927 crop statistical returns compiled by the Department of Agriculture, and taking the average wheat crop in the last ten years and basing its value on the average price of grains and livestock over that period, as shown in the said statistical report, you will find this: That the agricultural wealth per annum in District No. 1 during these ten years averaged \$16,000,000; No. 2, \$30,000,000, and No. 2, as I said, takes in the Regina-Weyburn district. Going west to No. 3, which is my own district, the total over the ten year period averaged \$59,875,000 per annum, and that is greater than the combined totals for Districts No. 1 and 2. Then in District No. 4, the annual wealth produced on this basis averaged \$17,000,000; No. 5, \$22,000,000; No. 6, \$38,000,000; No. 7, \$27,000,000; No. 8, \$19,000,000 and No. 9, \$17,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote these figures simply to show that the people of Swift Current are perfectly right in their feeling that the former Government disregarded their just claims to consideration in the distribution of this public money and that they certainly were not getting a right proportion in accordance with the annual wealth produced in the district. They deserved more and had a right to expect more but, as I said, evidently due to the control of these expenditures by the famous "machine," all their protests were ignored and their share allotted to more preferred districts.

Now, in connection with the statement of the honourable member for Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*) that the style of campaign staged in the last election was not all that could be desired, I am inclined to agree with him and I have some evidence here to produce that shows that even the campaign of a former Minister of the Gospel was not all that could be desired. I have here in my hand a bill advertising a meeting for May 25, to be held by Mr. Sykes, my opponent in the constituency of Swift Current and a former member of this Legislature. I notice among other things that they forget to print at the end of it the usual "God Save the King." You will notice that this bill does not set forth the particular political ticket on which Mr. Sykes was running. At one meeting, he was specifically asked the question but evaded the issue; and in some parts of the constituency his supporters told some of the electorate that he was a Liberal, in other parts that he was a Conservative, and sometimes he was described as a Progressive — anything that would best fit the case. You will note that it does not state on the notice what political faith he belonged to, and the people objected to that kind of a bill and so they changed it to read "Liberal meeting in the interests of the Liberal Government." Then at a subsequent meeting, he was asked to declare himself, but again he refused to say what he was — yet he was a member of the Legislature for twelve years sitting on this side with the Government and voting with the Government.

Mr. Gardiner: What was on top of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Smith: "Political meeting." This poster was the first one, dated May 25, 1929. The later one, dated June 5, advertised a meeting at which Mr. Bothwell also spoke. You see, my opponent had to send to Ottawa for the heavy artillery to assist him in the constituency. Not only that, but he had the assistance of the customary road inspectors who were as busy in my constituency as in other parts of the province. They went out to the foreign districts and told the people living there that if they voted for Smith they would not be allowed to speak their own language in the schools, in the streets, at home or anywhere and that, if they did use their own language, they would be deported. That famous letter written in French was circulated in some parts of the district.

The honourable member for Happyland has made reference to the Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) living in Regina and going out and running in Lumsden. I want to submit that the former Minister of Highways (*Mr. Spence*) ran in Maple Creek which is not the constituency in which he lives. So there is not much of an argument there, but that is the kind of criticism we are getting from the Opposition.

Now we listened the other day to a defence of the Farm Loan Board by the honourable member for Pipestone (*Mr. Patterson*) in reply to the report of the auditor tabled by the Provincial Treasurer and the speech made by him based on that report. I want to give my experience in this connection. I believe it was the original intention that the Farm Loan Board would give only small loans and principally to farmers in outlying districts where they were not in a position to secure credit through the

ordinary channels of the private loan companies, and that it was also the intention that the loans would be for an amount not more than fifty per cent. of the value of the land. If that is true, I would like to have some explanation as to how it happened that so many large loans, ranging up to \$20,000, have been made, and why loans have been made considerably in excess of the fifty per cent. originally decided upon. Loans have actually been made which were considerably in excess of the value set upon the land by the inspectors, and in one case I know of a borrower himself placed a valuation of \$12,000 on his land and afterwards an inspector from the Board placed a value of \$17,000 on the same land. It seems ridiculous on the face of it; yet it has been stated by members of the Opposition that the inspectors are the "eyes of the Board." That may be but, I submit, some of the inspectors for the Board were about as useful as a glass eye at a keyhole.

Every loan inspector should have first-hand knowledge of the district in which he is working, and every loan company should have a manager conversant with every part and corner of the province so that, in dealing with loan applications that come in, from an office say in Regina, by looking at the map, he will be able to say whether or not it is worth while to send an inspector out to make an inspection of the land. I know of one particular case that came to my attention. A certain farmer asked me when I was going to Regina and I replied "in a few days, why?" "Well," he said, "I am going in to see the Farm Loan Board about a loan which I am supposed to get on a farm which I purchased recently." After questioning him about the matter I found that he purchased three quarter sections of raw land at a price of \$25 per acre to be paid for on a share-of-crop basis, subject, however, to an understanding that, when he got so many acres put under cultivation he was to apply and get a loan from the Farm Loan Board for \$4,500 by giving a first mortgage on this same land, and the said loan was to be turned over to the vendor as a cash payment on the transaction. The vendor in turn was then to take a second mortgage back for the balance of \$7,500 which, together with the first mortgage, totalled the original purchase price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the basis upon which a regular loan company operates. They make loans as first mortgages on farm property but the amount of money so advanced must clean up all a man's liabilities and leave him sufficient to operate with.

Let me cite another case. A man came to my office a short time ago and said he had written to the Farm Loan Board to get a price on a certain quarter-section which adjoined land which he owned. The Board wrote back saying that the land was not for sale. They went further and asked this man for a report on the crop growing on the land and it turned out that the land in question had been abandoned by the original owner some two years before and the property had grown up to weeds during this time putting it in a terrible state of cultivation. The Board apparently did not know that the land had been abandoned and had not been cropped during the space of two years. Surely there are sound grounds for criticism when things like that happen.

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

Resuming at 8 o'clock p.m., Hon. Mr. Smith said:

Mr. Speaker,—When the House rose at 6 o'clock, I was discussing the Farm Loan Board and I had said that the original intention when the Board was first organised was that it should make only small loans in out of the way districts where the farmers had no other loan facilities. Upon examining the ledger, however, I find that certain loans were made in 1929, including one of \$20,000 to one person although it is shown split in two mortgages of \$10,000 each, so as not to appear too outstanding by showing the larger amount in the ledger book as one mortgage. Then there is another loan of \$16,000; one of \$12,000; five of \$10,000 (and one of these loans of \$10,000 was to a lady who lives in California); two of \$9,000; nine of \$8,000; twelve of \$7,000; seventeen of \$6,000 and twenty-six of \$5,000.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, if it were the intention of the Board to make small loans what earthly justification can it possibly have for making loans in these large amounts! All told there are 74 loans here, made in 1929, to the amount of \$464,000, and that works out at approximately \$7,000 to each person. I submit that it would have been much better for the Board to have distributed that amount in smaller loans over a greater number of people. Why, Mr. Speaker — three hundred farmers of this province would have been able to benefit to the extent of \$1,500 apiece from the amount handed out to 74 persons and, in my experience, there is more demand for

these small loans than for the larger amounts. If the Board wanted to make it a little larger than \$1,500 then they could, with the \$464,000, on an average of 320 acres, have lent up to \$2,000, and some two hundred and thirty farmers in this province could have been accommodated from the amount loaned out last year to 74 persons only.

I wish it understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am not stating that the former Provincial Treasurer (*Mr. Patterson*) is wholly responsible for the condition of the Farm Loan Board. The loan business is a pretty complicated business, and he was not in office long enough to learn all the ramifications of the Board. But I do believe, and I do contend, that his defence of the Board in the face of the report tabled in this House by the Provincial Treasurer the other day, was very weak indeed! All the honourable member for Pipestone could find to say in his lengthy address was that the report was nothing more than mere tittle-tattle and office gossip. Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, a loss of \$2,500,000 is a mighty serious thing to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and something which they will not consider as mere tittle-tattle and office gossip. It is a serious thing to the taxpayers of this province, and because of that I am forced to conclude that of all the piffle I have listened to in this Legislature, the speech of my honourable friend will go down in history as the masterpiece.

Time and again, the honourable member made a dyspeptic appeal to his supporters on the Opposition benches and to the farmers of the province on the charitable way the Board had used its borrowers. I wonder if he thinks that other farmers of the province, who could not get loans, are going to take kindly to the fact that men were able to borrow money on stone piles or sand hills! I would remind him also, that if there is any loss in any department of government, the farmers generally are paying for that loss.

In making his comparisons, the former Provincial Treasurer made reference to the conditions that existed fifteen or twenty years ago. But the Board has only been in operation for thirteen years, and consequently it is from the date of its organisation, or during the time it has been in operation, that comparisons should be made. He tried to leave the impression that farm lands had depreciated, particularly the poor land, which has been abandoned and farms that have gone to weeds, and I contend that the late Government was partially responsible for the weed-infested properties in not having a proper weed eradication policy. I claim, and my opinion is backed by long experience in the loaning business, that good farm lands in Saskatchewan have been steadily improving in price in proportion to the improvements placed on these lands, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in my business we possibly do more land and loan business than the entire Opposition put together.

Now, Sir, there are certain well-defined limits and areas in this province known to every loan company — areas where they will loan money and areas where they will not loan money, and no man is fit to manage a farm loan business without thorough knowledge at first-hand of every corner of the province and particularly with respect to these areas. A loan, as you very well know, can only be paid off from the proceeds of the cultivated acreage on the farm; if you give a man a loan, unless he gets sufficient returns from his operations, he cannot possibly pay it off. Yet in some cases, the Farm Loan Board according to the records, has made substantial loans on lands on which there was hardly a sign of cultivation or which had never been under cultivation at all. That is a pretty fair indication that all was not well with the Board.

In my honourable friend's argument, you would think that the Board was lending money to all the farmers in Saskatchewan, but that is far from being the case. As a matter of fact, the Board is only serving about four per cent. of the farmers on the land in the province. It might have served considerably more than that from the money it has out, if it had made smaller loans, but its system of lending in large amounts such as \$10,000 and up to \$20,000 meant that it could not serve a very large number of farmers with the money at its disposal.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the loans made by the Farm Loan Board require much closer supervision and more careful inspection than the loans made by most of the loan companies, for the very good reason that the average loan company lends on a five-year basis and therefore keeps in closer touch both with the security and with the borrower. An amortised loan running for a period of thirty years, in my opinion, is not sound business, for the property can depreciate faster than the loan matures. I cannot tell of any other loan company doing it, although I must admit that one or two large land corporations do sell prairie land on long-term contracts, but when they do, they certainly exercise close supervision and press hard for their

collections. In their case, too, the contract is made before the land commences to produce, whereas the mortgage company is supposed to loan on a going concern.

They (the members of the Opposition) talk of the money as belonging to the Farm Loan Board — but the money loaned by the Board belongs to all the people of the province and was supplied by them in the first instance, therefore, in my opinion, it is the first duty of the Board to safeguard the interests of the people in the money which it has advanced.

They refer to the Chairman of the Board as being a wonderful old man — and I do not doubt he is. The former Provincial Treasurer drew an age analogy between the Chairman and Mr. Edison, but I would remind him that Mr. Edison is one in 120,000,000 people and even this analogy does not hold good because it cannot be demonstrated that Mr. Fraser has been a success as manager of the concern. I believe that the Board would have been more than one million dollars better off today — and, incidentally the people of Saskatchewan would have been that much better off — if a hard-headed, experienced farmer had been put in to manage its affairs ten years ago. I do not believe Mr. Fraser is altogether to blame for the condition either. I believe he was instructed that political expediency was to be his first consideration in making loans and in operating, and I do not think there is one member on either side of the House (if, that is, we are honest with ourselves) who will not admit that many bad loans have been made or that the Board has been managed as efficiently as it should have been. Why, the Farm Loan Board has been a joke in the eyes of the farmers, in the eyes of the line loan companies, and a joke in the eyes of the land inspectors employed by the line companies, for years!

The honourable member for Pipestone has admitted, though somewhat reluctantly, that perhaps there was room for criticism of the Board's affairs. A great deal of criticism from the Opposition has been directed at the selection of the investigator and auditor made by the Government to do the work, but what I cannot understand is that, when the late Government hired a firm of accountants to make an audit of the affairs of the Government, they did not put them to work on the affairs of the Farm Loan Board first, because this was one department of the Government which had been under fire in the Legislature for years! It is also the only department of Government lending money which in turn has been loaned to the Government for a definite purpose by private interests, and I submit that the firm of Price, Waterhouse and Company which, I admit, is a company of high standing and excellent reputation, should have been instructed to audit the affairs of the Board

Mr. Gardiner: Might I correct the honourable gentleman: Price, Waterhouse and Company were engaged to audit all the books of the province, but it so happened that the Government of the day was defeated, in the midst of their activities, and the new Government did not see fit to continue the work of the company.

Premier Anderson: When were they so instructed?

Mr. Gardiner: At the beginning — about six months ago.

Hon. Mr. Smith: In view of the criticism of the Board which had been made in all parts of the province and of which the old Government must have been aware, why did they not start at the Farm Loan Board? Why spend \$17,000 to find nothing? Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favour of a Farm Loan Board such as we have in this province, provided it is handled by competent business men in the interests of all the farmers of the province, and when the loans are made on a strictly business basis and not for political advantage. If it were operated on such a basis, then, I believe, it would be of benefit to farmers of the province, generally.

My honourable friend mentioned the matter of the effect which the operations of the Board was alleged to have had upon the interest rates charged by other loan companies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been twenty-one years in the province and in the loan business for most of that time and I do not believe that the operations of the Board have had any material effect upon the interest rates at all. With the possible exception of a few preferred districts such as the Regina plains which, in spite of its mustard, is still a preferred district, the rates have been pretty well maintained throughout the province, which would seem to dispose very effectively of the argument of the former Provincial Treasurer.

Then he mentioned, also, the bearing which the Weston report would have upon the credit of the province of Saskatchewan, and contended that the credit of the

province would suffer. Nothing of the kind! I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan always will be able to borrow all the money it requires at the going rates for the very simple reason that it is the people of Saskatchewan as a whole who are the security for those loans.

Now Mr. Fraser may be a very conscientious old gentleman. I am not disputing that; but I do know that he has been a veritable Santa Claus to a lot of people in this province as manager of the Farm Loan Board. I would suggest that, as Christmas is now over, we should dispense with his services. I do not say that we should "fire" him; just pension him off. He is long past the superannuation age anyway.

With regard to highways, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell you that "Highways are not happy ways" in the province of Saskatchewan. I cannot understand how the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for North Qu'Appelle, can take such pride in No. 1 Highway running east from Regina. I have some property in the Qu'Appelle Valley and when driving to Fort Qu'Appelle, last October, it took three hours to drive from Balgonie to McLean.

Premier Anderson: How many miles?

Hon. Mr. Smith: Nine miles.

Mr. Agar: Why didn't you walk?

Hon. Mr. Smith: I would have made better time had I walked.

When the honourable Leader of the Opposition was addressing a meeting at Swift Current, he was asked if he did not have the misfortune to get stuck in the mud on No. 1 Highway just west of Swift Current, and he replied "No!" But from information given me from the garage which towed in his car it apparently was correct.

Mr. Gardiner: I do not rise to interrupt the honourable gentleman, but I do not think he wants to misquote me. My car was not stuck in the mud on No. 1 Highway just west of Swift Current.

Hon. Mr. Smith: I stand corrected, although I happened to be speaking to the man who went out and pulled the car in.

Mr. Gardiner: I was never stuck on No. 1 Highway, anytime, anywhere

Hon. Mr. Smith: I seem to be like the Farm Loan Board — getting in wrong. But I submit this: It will take Saskatchewan twenty years to live down its reputation for bad roads. The point is this: Nowadays, the people of Saskatchewan own automobiles, but they cannot even get out on the highway for a little ride, because they have no roads to travel on. In southern California they are displaying signs which read "Beware of Saskatchewan's Roads." In the city of Winnipeg, some time ago, a number of tourists stated that they would never again travel through Saskatchewan because of its roads. Then there was the case of a citizen of Swift Current who had motored to eastern Canada with his family and had occasion to undergo the usual Customs' inspection at Sault Ste. Marie. The customs' officer asked the usual questions and then noticed the Saskatchewan license plate and remarked: "From Saskatchewan, eh? Well, you have come through enough. That's the province with the rotten roads. Drive on!" Saskatchewan is a banned province by the tourists on account of its roads. There is no question about that.

The tourist traffic is becoming quite an item in the Dominion of Canada and in value it now stands second only to agriculture. Every province gets a cut at this traffic, so why should not Saskatchewan get its share of the revenue derived from this source? We have beautiful wheat fields, we have beautiful lakes and just as pretty scenery as they have in any part of Canada. We have the attractions and if we had the roads we could get our share of that traffic.

The highway policy of the late Liberal Government has given this province a "black eye." There was too much politics in it altogether. In my own constituency just before the election in June last, the late Government decided to build a road in a district where the farmers have been looking into each others back doors, but to get there they had to travel approximately thirty miles. The farmers homesteaded the district mentioned some twenty-five years ago and have had a pressing need for the road for several years but, of course, for expediency purposes it was better to wait

until an election year! On this piece of highway a bridge was to be built across the Swift Current creek and the propaganda used in the district was the customary argument that, if the Conservative candidate was elected, the bridge would not be built. However, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I was elected and the present Minister of Highways (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) has supplied the bridge.

The policy with regard to highway construction which has been laid down by the present Minister of Highways seems to me to be the best suited to the circumstances. That is my opinion and while it apparently will not meet with the approval of honourable members opposite, I feel sure it will command the approval of the people of Saskatchewan.

I might refer to the huge amount of money spent on highway construction in the constituency of Maple Creek. I presume the money had to be spent to assure the election of the late Minister of Highways (*Mr. Spence*). I venture to say that if he had chosen to run in Swift Current that the roads in the constituency would have been built up to standard.

There has been some criticism, too, in regard to the natural resources negotiations, but the members of this Government are to be congratulated in having gone East and "brought home the bacon." From some of the remarks made in regard to their visit to Ottawa, I am forced to the conclusion that all the hogs are not in cold storage.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the getting back of our natural resources is a far greater event in the history of Saskatchewan than the granting of autonomy was, as that only gave us the right to govern ourselves but denied us the right to administer our own affairs — like a minor coming of age to whom his trustee refuses to turn over his estate. The people of Saskatchewan are quite able to conduct their own affairs, particularly with this Co-operative Government in power, and I believe that the return of our resources will result in a considerable increase in our industrial development and the expansion of inter-provincial trade with the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba.

A few days ago, the Attorney General of Saskatchewan (*Hon. Mr. MacPherson*) addressed the Board of Trade of Winnipeg and, in the course of his address, he said that, from figures collected by the Retail Merchants' Association of Saskatchewan, goods to the value of \$52,485,000 were purchased in Winnipeg by Saskatchewan merchants, during the year which ended June 30, 1929. Now, Sir, if that \$52,000,000 worth of goods were produced in our own factories, there would be no problem of unemployment in this province, and our boys and girls would stay at home instead of having to go elsewhere to seek work. I am of the opinion that the late Government did very little to encourage industries, except businesses in which their own friends were interested. I at least know of one little industry in which I am interested, which is struggling along trying to develop a natural product and never had a hearing from the late Government at all — no encouragement whatever.

I believe it is the intention of this Government, however, to set up an Industrial Research Department in order to create conditions which will lead to employment of our own people and which will tend to the development of the resources of the province. There is no doubt that the question of unemployment is closely linked with the question of industrial development, and if we try to develop our resources to the fullest possible extent then we shall have gone a long way towards solving the problem of unemployment in Saskatchewan.

This question of unemployment is a social question, and the present situation is due to a condition of society. We are, so to speak, going through a mechanisation era at the present time; it is an age of machines, and the machine is taking the place of labour — we were told the other day of a machine that takes the place of forty men. With all this labour-saving machinery coming into use, the matter of giving employment to the surplus labourers becomes a pressing problem and we have got to give our attention to the matter of industrial development and expansion to absorb it. I had placed in my hand the other day a copy of the *Industrial Magazine* and in it there is an article headed "Why Canadians go South":

"An argument for buying home products has been forcefully put by a writer in 'The Printing Industry of British Columbia.' He declares that since January 1, 1929, no fewer than 21 young boys called at his office to ask assistance in securing positions in the printing industry in Vancouver. To his knowledge only two of the 21 found openings, while he had definite information that at least six went south into the United States. The majority of the boys were born in Vancouver;

their homes were in Vancouver and they wanted to remain in Canada. Conditions forced them out of town, out of the province, to become eventually valuable citizens of a foreign country. What conditions, he asked, forced them out?

"A number of specific instances were quoted of Vancouver institutions of one sort or another importing their printing. During the year 157 samples of printing done for Vancouver business men by United States printers were placed on his desk. As long as this condition existed, just so long would Vancouver boys have to go out of town and out of their country to get jobs in the printing industry.

"We often wonder," he concluded, "why the service clubs of the city do not give some consideration to such matters as these. It is all very well to build up boys' organisations of one kind and another, to feature 'father and son' events, and to exhibit an anxious interest in the youth of the land in a theoretical way. But what the boy most needs is a job when he has finished with school. And if he cannot find a job in his native town, he is very apt to wonder why they showed so much interest in him while he was in school.

"The business men of Vancouver are thus forcing many of our boys across the line — the while the Government brings in bohunks, wops and dingbats from the dark corners of Europe to take their places. Truly it would be laughable if it were not so tragic. Ethical teaching and physical instruction certainly have their place in the life of the boy, but what the Canadian boy wants more than anything else, when he is ready for it, is a chance to earn a living, and there will be a serious lack of jobs for the boys as long as the business men persist in sending their money out of town and out of the country for goods that are manufactured right here.'

"The argument, so ably put by this writer, applies not only to the printing industry but to all lines of 'Produced in Canada' goods."

It seems to me that the Service Clubs of the province could do a good work and be of real service by aiding in the making of a survey of the situation in this province, and so help to solve many of our present day problems.

I am going to deal for a few minutes with agriculture. It seems to me that agriculture at the present time is going through the most critical period of its entire history. The price of wheat is tumbling every day, and that fact is the cause of great concern to the farmers on these prairie lands. I think that, possibly a conference between the Federal and Provincial Governments should be held to find out just why Canadian hard wheat cannot be sold at the present time. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the fact that the old world is turning back to soft wheat, for not further back than twenty-five years ago, hard wheat was not thought of in those older countries. Then Canada came to the forefront with her wonderful hard wheat but, if the people in Europe can buy soft wheat cheaper than they can buy Canadian hard wheat, then it is only natural that they would do so.

Saskatchewan has a wonderful heritage in her prairie lands, offering boundless opportunities to the man willing to work, and there is no country in the world where a free-hold estate can be secured so easily. I remember a man who purchased through us 5,400 acres of land without a dollar down, and in two years grew enough grain to pay for the property.

In my opinion, the Wheat Pool is a wonderful economic institution for the farmer if operated on strictly business lines, but its success depends on management, and the loyalty of its members.

The financial condition of the farmer is not at all satisfactory. I am not saying that production is decreasing. As a matter of fact, I believe it is increasing, but the farming population is getting less. Since machinery has made it possible for farmers to operate on a larger scale than ever before, they are buying more land. We have in our district farmers operating large farms with the latest type of labour-saving machinery and what happens is that they are buying up their neighbours' land and the neighbours are going out to the Peace River country. That condition is spreading all over the prairies, large operators are acquiring lands adjoining their holdings and producing on a large scale. Meanwhile, the farm population is getting less because the economic condition of the smaller farmer is unsatisfactory, and the remedy for the situation as I see it is to develop our industries until we have a home market for our farm products.

Members of the Opposition have been making great play of the statement that the Co-operative Government does not represent the farming interests and that the

old Government was the friend of the farmers. I cannot see how that can be at all. If they were such friends of the farmer, perhaps they will explain to me why the agricultural estimates, that is the grants for the development of agriculture, dropped from \$800,000 in 1920 to \$455,083 in 1927-28! It seems to me that the agricultural estimates in a province like this can be three times that amount at least. How can they excuse the cutting off of the aid to this great industry, reducing it to about half of what it was a few years ago? And what have they to say about the decline of the dairy industry, and of a province like Saskatchewan importing dairy butter? True, they appointed a commissioner to investigate the dairy industry in the province. But we had the Turgeon Commission a few years ago, and all we got out of that was increased dockage. Then there was another commission a few months ago which went throughout the country getting views and taking evidence, and we cannot expect very much from the findings of that commission.

The honourable member for Happyland seems to be perturbed about the future of agriculture under our administration. I wonder if when he is making purchases of his own requirements, he insists on purchasing articles manufactured in those countries that purchase his wheat! I wonder if, for instance, he is aware of the fact that a tannery is in operation in Swift Current where hides can be manufactured into robes, harness, halters, etc., or does he purchase from a catalogue house. How does he account for the fact that there are 120,000 fewer dairy cattle in Saskatchewan today than we had a few years ago, while Canada is importing 35,000,000 pounds of butter from Australia and New Zealand!

It seems to me from the statements made by members of the Opposition, that the "back to the land" movement has been twisted around by them. They apparently want to be known as the "farm bloc," but as far as I can see they do more blocking than farming. I wonder if they realise that boys born on Saskatchewan farms have to go out of the country or at any rate have to leave the farm, to seek for work and earn a living! Canada has 75 per cent. of its wheat to export while the United States has only 25 per cent. and the great difficulty confronting the farmers in this country is lack of a consuming population. Saskatchewan is more affected because Saskatchewan grows more wheat than any other province in Canada, and so, as I have said before, the real solution of the problem confronting agriculture in this province is the development of a consuming population in the urban centres and incidentally that will stimulate development of the rural parts of the province.

The member for Humboldt (*Mr. Therres*) was the next farmer to get on his feet, and the only solution he had was that live stock raising was a tough proposition and that we should all be wheat farmers. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with live stock and some good dairy cattle, farming can be made to pay in districts where wheat growing cannot return a profit . . .

Mr. Therres: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I said that if we all go into the live stock business, we will not get very far.

Hon. Mr. Smith: I admit that, Mr. Speaker, but what I want to point out is that the dairy industry in this province is not what it should be and the live stock industry is demoralised.

Now, Sir, the power situation in this province is the cause of much concern at the present time. I notice by the Sessional Papers of 1928-29, that the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) said as follows:

"In addition to the information obtained in the report already referred to, the Government has had consultation with some of the most outstanding engineers and electrical experts on this continent, and, after the most careful survey, in which the present and future needs of the province have been taken into consideration, the Government submits this measure to the House, the principle of which is Government-ownership in the production, distribution and sale of electrical power or energy at cost, to municipalities, corporations or such other public bodies, organisations or persons as may from time to time come under the provisions of this Act."

Further on he says this:

"There is little doubt today where the province stands on the matter of the ownership of these utilities. On every occasion where the people have had an opportunity to express themselves on the question, they have done so with no uncertain voice, and this question of power has been no exception; for as soon

as the report of the Commission was published — and even before — I find the following organisations have expressed themselves. I read from newspaper clippings making special reference to the subject. I shall read only the headings, Mr. Speaker."

Then the honourable gentleman read off the headings, and I do not propose to read them to you now, but they indicate practically unanimsously the great deal of interest which the people of Saskatchewan had in this matter of public ownership. Then he goes on still further to say:

"The central fact which this Government and this Legislature have to consider is a means of co-ordinating under central control a system that, as time goes on, will avoid the duplication of equipment, overlapping of service and costly cut-throat competition by private companies for which the people will ultimately have to pay. We must provide instead a means whereby our plants, now municipally-owned, can be tied into a comprehensive and province-wide scheme, instead of each being concerned, as now, only with the needs of its own community, each municipality for itself without regard to the larger question of the common good or interconnection where the same is practicable."

And still further on:

"Here, in Saskatchewan, we are starting off with a policy of Government ownership on a virtually 'clean sheet.'"

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker:

"Here, in Saskatchewan, we are starting off with a policy of Government ownership on a virtually 'clean sheet.'"

This was said by the honourable gentleman during the 1928-29 session, but yet, during the year 1928, the same honourable gentleman issued permits for the construction of 1,000 miles of transmission lines by private companies. Then he goes on:

"There are no vested rights in sites or power plants in any great amounts other than what is now publicly owned, and I would say that it would be the part of wisdom for the cities not to part with their plants or franchises to private companies. It is up to all of us to work in the closest co-operation so that we can lay the proper foundation for a province-wide scheme of Government ownership for the production, transformation and distribution of power at cost. In this way and in no other can we give the efficient service to our rural districts which these districts will demand and have a right to expect."

Now, Sir, I contend that the actions of the honourable member as Minister concerned, are not very consistent with the attitude he expressed in the course of that speech on the power question in the session of 1928-29.

I believe my honourable friend the member for North Qu'Appelle (*Mr. Gardiner*) took exception to the sale of the Moose Jaw plant. Well, I have in my hand the little "Red Book" (*Library Handbook*, 1929) and there I read under the heading "Saskatchewan's Power Policy," as follows:

"The alertness, vigor and aggressiveness which characterise the Gardiner Government were well illustrated in its grappling with the power question."

Then, after stating that the future success and development in manufacturing industries depend largely on cheap electrical energy, it goes on to state:

"The Gardiner Government had, however, been giving serious thought to the question and early in January 1927, it appointed a Royal Commission to enquire into and report upon the economic practicability of generating power at central power plants and water power sites in the province, and the distribution of electric energy throughout the province."

Now, Sir, as had been stated by the honourable member for Maple Creek, we had practically no private power plants in the province at that time, by far the greater majority being publicly owned. But this "Red Book" goes on to say:

"This action by the Government stirred up the Power Interests and almost immediately, and while the Commission was engaged in the task assigned to it, a number of companies, subsidiary to big eastern and United States corporations, and financed by them, began to buy up small privately-owned plants in the province as well as a number of the smaller municipally-owned plants, and to connect these with power transmission lines."

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that it was early in January, 1927, that the Commission was appointed and that prior to that time the "Gardiner Government had been giving serious thought to the matter," but yet it was during the year 1928 that these permits for 1,000 miles of transmission line construction were issued to these private companies.

Then the Commission, having concluded its work, reported to the Government and it states here that the Government accepted the principle of the recommendations of the Commission, which, broadly speaking, was a scheme of Government ownership. Then it goes on to say:

"Premier Gardiner, on behalf of the Government, further announced that it was the policy of the Government to own the long distance power transmission lines throughout the province just as it owns the long distance telephone lines, and thus for all time protect the people of Saskatchewan from any monopolistic control of power."

And again let me remind you that it was during 1928 that these private companies secured these permits for the construction of 1000 miles of transmission lines.

Then he goes on still further and here the honourable gentleman's criticism of the Moose Jaw plant sale jumps right back at him:

"He further announced that the Government was prepared to take over the other city plants, should the cities so desire . . .

This was after the Saskatoon plant had been purchased:

". . . or to buy power from the cities and distribute it throughout the areas adjacent to such cities. The Government, however, had no intention of compelling the cities to sell their plants to the province, unless they so desired. Negotiations are now in progress with several cities which have expressed a desire to have their plants taken over and incorporated in the Provincial system."

You will notice — "The Government had no intention of compelling the cities to sell their plants." I submit, Sir, that in the light of that statement, the same conditions would have prevailed in the case of the Moose Jaw plant as exist today, had the old Government remained in power. The situation would have been exactly the same, and the Government would not have stepped over the heads of the people of Moose Jaw and stopped the sale to the private company.

Mr. Gardiner: I believe the honourable gentleman does not wish to misrepresent, but there is nothing in that statement to say what the late Government would do in the event of the private company getting possession of the plant. As long as the city keeps possession of its plant, that would be public-ownership and it is public-ownership so long as a private company does not get possession. As long as the city keeps possession of its plant we were not worrying, but we were not enabling private companies . . .

Hon. Mr. Smith: Why worry about the private company?

Mr. Gardiner: That is just what I was going to point out. The question of private ownership is a question that only arose after the commission started its work. But private interests were just as prominent in Saskatoon . . .

Hon. Mr. Smith: We would have done very likely what you did in Saskatoon . . .

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask the honourable gentleman what his authority for all this is?

Hon. Mr. Smith: The Liberal Handbook, 1929: "The alertness, vigor and progressiveness which characterise the Gardiner Government were well illustrated in its grappling with the power question." Then it goes on:

"It is now fairly well recognised that future success and development in manufacturing industry rests largely upon cheap electrical energy, and that the country or community which can supply this essential requirement will profit enormously.

"Leaders in finance and industry quickly grasped that he who controls the resources and provision of electric energy would likewise control industry itself. Hence, the organisation of great Power corporations and the fight of financial giants to secure power sites and distribution finances. Then followed, almost

immediately, consolidation of rival companies until most countries, Canada included, were threatened with a gigantic monopoly in control of one of the chief necessities of modern life and industry."

When formulating a power policy, why did they not incorporate a clause providing that no municipality can sell its plant without first submitting the amount to be paid to the Local Government Board thus controlling the sale and regulating the price paid in order to protect the interests of the people? The Government cannot compete with private companies in purchasing power plants. They simply want to give these services at cost price.

I find an article in the *Regina Leader* headed "How Saskatchewan Power Plants are Owned," and in it we find that four-fifths of the power plants are in the hands of private corporations, and I understand this has all happened in the last few years since the Power Commission was instructed to do its work.

Mr. Gardiner: I would ask the honourable gentleman to read the article. There is a question in the last paragraph, I think, in which the price is spoken about.

Hon. Mr. Smith: You mean it is not the number but the price that matters?

Mr. Gardiner: The price paid for the plant at Moose Jaw, as the honourable gentleman knows, is three times as much as the plant would be valued at by those valuing the property. And the price paid for the Saskatoon plant was the amount required in order to retire the debentures.

Hon. Mr. Smith: That makes no difference to my argument. It says four-fifths of the power plants. Not the price of the plant. Four-fifths of the power plants in Saskatchewan are privately owned!

Now, we have heard a lot of criticism about the Civil Service, or rather criticism of this Government's actions in dismissing certain members of that service. There were members of the service dismissed, for good reason — taking part, active part, in politics. They were warned during the campaign as to what would happen. So we were not taking any unfair advantage of them. It was not the civil but the uncivil employees, who were dismissed. I wonder why the conditions that we often find to prevail in the business and professional world do not exist in the Civil Service! They adopt the attitude that, being an employee of the people, nobody can interfere with them. Any person in other businesses can be dismissed with thirty days notice. Then, too, Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of the positions of consequence in the service which might have been given, instead of to some ordinary "party" man or to some relation of a "party" man, to some of the returned officers and men after the close of the War. Have the people of Saskatchewan not got the right to complain of political activity of Civil Service employees? They are hired to do certain work for which service they are paid out of the public Treasury. Here is an article from "A Militant Liberal." It is a letter to the *Regina Leader*, from T. A. Patrick, Yorkton, and here is what he says:

"FUTURE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE"

"A. G. Dexter in the current number of McLean's Magazine quotes John Morley's statement that the greater test of a minister is the ability to surrender office. On the basis of Morley's dictum, Mr. Dexter asserts that Canadian ministers are of a high order, for time and again ministries in Canada have been flung out of office, and yet there has never been a murmur of resentment, nor a trace of a whine. Evidently Mr. Dexter is unfamiliar with happenings in Saskatchewan since June 6. His article inspires one to inquire whether it is not time for us Saskatchewan Liberals to stop threshing old straw and concern ourselves with what we can do, whether in Opposition or in power, to further the cause of good government in Saskatchewan. On the morning after the sixth of June, we should have felt chastened and disillusioned. Having obviously been defeated, we should have promptly handed over the reins of Government to the leader of the largest opposition group. Our hanging on, our endeavouring to coax, cajole and stampede members of the groups elected in opposition to us, however constitutional it may have been, was not dignified and was not good politics. We succeeded wonderfully in consolidating incompatible opposition elements; in leaving a bad taste in the mouths of the electorate; and in creating an impression that we hung on

because afraid to let go. It is poor tactics to impress the electorate with the conviction that our chastening and our disillusionment are still inadequate.

"What can we do to further the cause of good government in Saskatchewan? Dr. Anderson has announced that he will take the Civil Service out of politics. Are we going to try to keep it in? He warned Civil Servants before the election to avoid interference and is abundantly justified in summarily dismissing those who failed to heed his warning. Who among us does not know that active partisanship among Civil Servants was rife in June? These offensive partisans should take their medicine without a whine. Who among us does not know that official pressure was applied to stimulate the political activities of unwilling Civil Servants? These poor devils deserve some sympathetic consideration.

"My purpose is not to discuss the propriety of particular dismissals. The Legislature is the place for that. The purpose is to deprecate the inconsistency of those who, having used the sword, object to others using it. The public is often unable to discriminate between inconsistency and hypocrisy. The warning given before the election was not warning that offenders would be summoned before a Civil Service Commission. It was a plain warning of summary dismissal."

That is what "A Militant Liberal" in the province of Saskatchewan says. With all the complaints about dismissals from the Civil Service today, had the shoe been on the other foot, there would not have been twenty-five per cent. of the Civil Service in office today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with immigration and once again I would refer you to the "Red Book." That is a good book for reference! Dealing with Immigration it says:

"Immigration is primarily a Federal matter, despite the irresponsible utterances of Dr. J. T. M. Anderson to the contrary.

"The Saskatchewan Government cannot function in anything more than an advisory capacity so far as admission of immigrants to Canada is concerned. Once the immigrant lands on Canadian soil, no provincial Government can restrain him from going anywhere he likes in the Dominion. These facts, though they escape the Conservative leader, should be obvious to all. The Government, however, can direct immigrants after their arrival — and that function it is performing through the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries.

"Dr. Anderson's demands for a vigorous immigration policy, the placing of an Agent General in London, and the repatriation of all Canadians now resident in the United States, when analysed, means nothing more nor less than a wholesale duplication of machinery already established by the Canadian Government; a duplication of the work done by Dominion and Railway immigration officials, with all the uneconomic consequences and general inefficiency such duplication entails.

"The Department does concern itself with certain phases of immigration in co-operation with the Federal and Imperial Governments, or both."

We admit that, but we find that, since the Co-operative Government has taken charge of the affairs of this province, immigration is considered by all concerned to be a provincial matter; for we find that, in the very first instance after this Government came into power, the Federal authorities were ready to consult, and did consult, with us with regard to immigration.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time Saskatchewan took stock of itself. In 1905, we had 60,000 farmers and in 1929 we had 120,000, meaning a net gain of only 60,000 in the last twenty-five years. The tide was greatest in the period from 1905 to 1914, and back in 1913 newcomers were coming into the province at the rate of one thousand a day. Saskatchewan needs immigration. The whole of civilisation is based on immigration. It is the estimate of those who are in a position to say, after a study of the question, that the capitalised productive value of an individual to the state is worth between \$3,000 and \$4,000 decreasing to below \$2,900 at the age of fifty. Therefore, if Canada is losing people at the rate of over 100,000 a year, which is what the statisticians at Ottawa say, and if Saskatchewan is losing her percentage of her citizens at that figure, we are losing \$30,000,000 in man power per annum.

Population cannot remain stagnant. You either go ahead or go back. I would suggest that all immigration be held up and only bring in sufficient people in keeping with the development of our natural resources, and with regard to the demands of the farming industry. I believe the action of this Co-operative Government in appointing an Immigration Commission is well worthy of appreciative consideration by citizens

of this province and, in my opinion, is one of the most far-sighted and constructive steps taken by any province in an attempt to find a solution to this vexed question which has been engaging the attention of many of our statesmen and citizens alike for some time.

There are many important issues which will come to its attention, and what we have to decide is whether we need more rural or more urban population. We find Russia's population is 85 per cent. rural and Great Britain's 90 per cent. urban. Saskatchewan we find at present is 30 per cent. urban and 70 per cent. rural. It has been said that the ideal balance of population in a country is one family on the farm to support two families in town. Therefore, Saskatchewan with her present rural population of approximately 600,000, should have a total of 1,200,000 urban citizens. That is one reason, Mr. Speaker, why Saskatchewan is such a great exporting agricultural province. We must have a large home market to consume the products of the farm. The appointment of the Immigration Commission and its findings will help us to formulate a rational policy of immigration in keeping with our peculiar conditions and limitations.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I do not believe that the late Government ever did very much on its own initiative in this province. The Co-operative Elevator Company was formed only after there had been long and insistent demands from the farmers and when the demands grew so loud that the Government had to move. The farmers formed their own telephone companies and political "heelers" had their fingers in the pie every time it was opened. The first scientific and technical school was withheld in the face of repeated demands of the farmers and farmers' organisations. The farmers have been asking for a free consultative clinic, and the Teachers' Superannuation scheme was not put into operation. The Old Age Pensions were demanded by the public. When the farmers formed a Wheat Pool, the Liberal "machine" tried to crush it.

Mr. Gardiner: If my honourable friend will permit me to correct him: He has started out on a list of things that are practically all wrong. The Co-operative Elevators had not been formed by the farmers asking for it. It was formed as the result of recommendations by a Commission which sat on it and was opposed by the farmers. It was set up by the Commission. With regard to the Wheat Pool, I think the honourable gentleman is aware that there is sufficient evidence out with regard to that . . .

Hon. Mr. Smith: What about *The Leader* attack? It was the mouthpiece for the Liberal Government.

Mr. Gardiner: I cannot answer for what *The Leader* has done . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The honourable gentleman is out of order.

Mr. Gardiner: I am never out of order when the speaker sits down. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has just said, or had started out to say to the House now that *The Regina Leader* opposed the Wheat Pool and therefore, the Liberal Government opposed the Wheat Pool. I would tell him this: The gentleman who owned *The Regina Leader* when the attack was made supported the policy of the Opposition when the election . . .

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: And supported you at that time.

Hon. Mr. Smith: Well, I will finish reading the article some other time. It is rather unpleasant for the Leader of the Opposition to have to listen to, perhaps.

The highways are now being, for the first time, built in accordance with the "better road programme." The late Government turned a deaf ear to demands for Civil Service reform when the Civil Service demanded it. Now, if I were asked to answer some of the criticisms which we have heard during this debate from across the floor with regard to the composition of this Government and the criticisms of the actions of some members on this side for supporting this Government, I would say that it was the only solution they had. And while some members on this side, personally, have been criticised, they were all good enough to beat Liberal candidates and, what is more, they can go out and do it again!

Government Members: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Smith: The people of this province were weary of the political scheming as well as "machine politics," and, as members opposite well know, the public revolted and joined in with the slogan "It is time for a change." Here, may I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition and his followers, that, having found themselves in Opposition and not in charge of the affairs of this province, it is their duty to offer sound, constructive, helpful opposition to this Government, its policies and its administration during this Session and throughout the term of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I am, most assuredly, going to support the motion.

MR. E. W. GARNER, M.L.A.

(*Estevan*)

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—At the commencement of my address I wish to join with other honourable members who have preceded me in complimenting and congratulating you upon your election to the position which you hold as Speaker of this House. I realize that, aside from the responsibilities you now have, you are a new member, and that your duties will be perhaps often difficult. I can appreciate the many difficulties that new members have.

Let me also join with other members in complimenting the mover and the seconder of the Address. Though I cannot agree with a lot of things said by the mover and the seconder and a lot of the statements which have been made by the Government members, I do admire the way the mover led off in this debate. In doing so, he was making his "maiden" speech in this House and his task was all the more difficult for that reason.

Before going into the more contentious subjects before the House, I want to discuss an industry that is prominently before the people at the present time, and I also want to tell you of the wonderful possibilities of the constituency of Estevan. At the present time I wish to retain anything I may have to say in connection with power until later in the session. I intend to leave with you an expression of my opinion on the school question in this province and, after dealing with the coal situation today, to discuss some of the political issues that have drawn sparks of fire. I hope to make my contribution to this debate in other matters as well, and in doing so, when dealing with the recent campaign, I shall try to show as good a sportsman's attitude as has any member in discussing that campaign.

Before going into a discussion of those matters though, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the constituency I represent is situated in the centre of the great Souris coalfields of southern Saskatchewan. I should like, at this time, to pay my tribute to the pioneers of the Saskatchewan coal industry, among whom the late Hugh Sutherland takes a high place. The industry has its ups and downs, some of the ventures proving disastrous to those interested, but it is showing real life now. I wish also to pay my tribute in this connection to Mr. Robert Dunbar, who represented the Estevan constituency for a number of years, Dr. Creighton, who for one term represented the constituency of Estevan in this House, and to those men in the city of Regina who have, by burning Saskatchewan coal, given great support to the industry. Mr. Harry Knight, the junior member for Regina City (*Mr. Grassick*), Mr. W. W. Champ and Mr. Bruce McInnis, and to members of the Regina School Board who gave their full support to the use of Saskatchewan lignite in this city. May I also express my appreciation of the assistance of Mr. Baraclough, senior, and the interest of the Minister of Public Works and of the Minister of Labour and Industries. I would also like to mention the name of J. A. Lackey of Estevan as one who has made a contribution to the development of the lignite industry. I was a little disappointed that the Honourable the Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) did not deal with this matter the other day, but I have no doubt he became side-tracked from this subject in dealing with the matters he did deal with. We know that he is interested and we look for results later on.

I would like to draw your attention, too, in this regard, to the action of the former Government when they sent the Provincial Engineer and the Deputy Minister of Public Works to the state of North Dakota to make investigations with a view to installing plants in governmental institutions for the burning of Saskatchewan coal. The knowledge which the Government gained was made use of in installing in the Weyburn Mental Hospital a power plant similar to the one at Washburn, N.D., the first one in Canada designed to burn Saskatchewan coal. In this connection I may

say that the ex-Minister of Public Works, the present member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*), has not had paid to him that credit which I consider his due, mostly because of the fact, I think, that he did not advertise his efforts.

Efforts were made to burn this coal by the installation of special grates in the Regina Normal School and very satisfactory results have been obtained. I would point out that the amount of money spent by the previous Government in conjunction with the Province of Manitoba and the Canadian Government in the briquetting plant in the Estevan field has been justified in the results achieved in connection with the research work done. Installation of plants to burn this coal have been made in Regina and Moose Jaw Normal Schools and in the Estevan, Weyburn and Assiniboia Court Houses by the previous Government.

It has been estimated that Saskatchewan's coal deposits in the southern Saskatchewan coalfield amount to 57,400,000,000 tons and, within the last forty years only 8,000,000 tons have been mined. You will thus see the immense amount of coal Saskatchewan has in that field. The Saskatchewan industry from the start has had to meet overwhelming competition from the United States and from our neighbouring Province of Alberta. In the Province of Manitoba the latest figures show an annual consumption of 2,580,000 tons per annum. Only four per cent. of that came from Saskatchewan, while Alberta fields supplied 26 per cent. and the United States the balance, or approximately 70 per cent. In Saskatchewan, the yearly consumption is 1,717,000 tons, of which 10 per cent. was produced in the province.

In the Province of Manitoba, 80 per cent. of its coal supply was in the form of anthracite and bituminous coals, which have a heat value of approximately double that of Saskatchewan lignite. The coal supply of Manitoba was equivalent to the heat value of approximately 5,000,000 tons and that of Saskatchewan equivalent to approximately 2,500,000 tons of our Saskatchewan lignite. Of this total, equivalent to 7,500,000 tons of lignite, Saskatchewan mines produced 470,216 tons, or about 6.3 per cent. of the coal requirements of the two provinces.

According to statistics, in 1927, the lignite mining industry of Saskatchewan furnished employment to 545 people and there was invested approximately \$4,000,000 of capital. The total value of lignite coal produced in Saskatchewan was \$868,867, of which \$553,082 was payroll.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to a survey of the coal markets open to Saskatchewan coal in this territory (the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan) it is possible to increase the consumption of our coal to 1,800,000 tons. At the present time it is about 470,000 tons, and this increase would mean that no less than 1500 people would be employed in production. In the State of North Dakota, which has an area of approximately 70,000 square miles and a population of about 640,000, the present lignite production of the state is 1,850,000 tons, which figure is equivalent to more than 70 per cent of the total coal requirements of that state.

Now, prices of lignite coal in this province, that is mine prices, compare favourably with those prevailing in the State of North Dakota where the industry is more highly developed. Mine prices, as you will understand, are closely proportional to the heat values of the fuels and the market in which coal can be sold. The more general use of mining machinery and the possible development of strip mining may result in lower production costs, and cost reductions that may be made by these improvements will probably be reflected in improved mining conditions and better preparation of the product delivered to the consumer rather than in price reductions.

Our Saskatchewan lignite area, located in the south-eastern part of the province, is in a favourable position in so far as a market is concerned, being, as it is, at the head of a network of railroads connecting with the more densely populated parts of Saskatchewan and Manitoba where the larger centres of industry and domestic consumption are located. After making allowance for the lower heat content of lignite, it will be seen that it is possible to deliver the fuel to a substantial part of the population of the two provinces with a much lower transportation mileage and cost from the Estevan field than from the present sources of supply, and that must result in an appreciable increase over that 6.3 per cent. now used. And remember, too, that where Saskatchewan lignite is used with the proper equipment to burn it, it has been used successfully.

I hesitate to say much about the domestic use for the reason that so many people fail to apply ordinary mechanical common-sense to the use of the coal. Much has to be done along educational lines to increase our consumption of this coal for domestic

use. In competition with imported coals, the lower cost of lignite at the mine, in proportion to heat value when compared with prices of the imported coals, gives lignite an advantage that, to a large extent, offsets the lower proportionate freight rates on these imported fuels. Where special installations have been put in for the burning of Estevan coal, a saving of as high as 39.8 per cent. has been the result over the use of other steam coals now on the market, and, for that reason, a number of small commercial concerns have installed equipment which will burn this coal. I wish to make the observation here that a plant designed to burn Saskatchewan lignite will also burn any other coal on the market today; but a plant designed for the consumption of the older coals will not necessarily burn Saskatchewan lignite coal. If a plant is equipped so that it will burn Saskatchewan coal efficiently, however, it opens the field for all other coals. Its use would result in the saving of thousands of dollars annually in interior and exterior decorations. It is a cleaner coal to burn in the home and it does not eject soot and smoke in nearly the same quantities. As a matter of fact, as time goes on and measures are taken to prevent smoke and soot being scattered over the cities, this Saskatchewan lignite will come into its own. I wish here also to correct the statement appearing in the three local newspapers of October 7, in connection with the matter that crops up there. I will read the item referred to:

"Two things have militated against the larger use of Saskatchewan coal in the past. The first has been the lack of capital to properly develop the mines.

The second reason Saskatchewan coal has not been used more largely is that nearly all the stoves, furnaces and grates are made or copied from American models for the use of high-grade American coal."

Now, as to the first point, I might state this, that next spring approximately \$900,000 will be spent in connection with mining coal by the newer methods. I also would like to correct a statement that has been made that newer methods have been adopted by American or Alberta miners, and I want to assure you that that will not interfere with the coal industry in that part of the province.

In conclusion in this matter, I would recommend the following: That the Government of this province join in some method of publicity and advertising to further the interests of the marketing of briquetted coal. Further, that a research department be set up in connection with the University of Saskatchewan, for research work, seeking to improve methods of briquetting and processing the coal, and burning of raw lignite coal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will pardon me if I transgress in this case, because I do not know what the rules are. I wish, as a general observation, to make the assertion that I want the honourable members to understand that I do not believe the party to which I belong has all the virtue or the integrity and all the ability in the province — and it is not all on the Government side of this House either. As far as I am concerned, I want it understood that I would not defend any wrong-doers whether they were in the employ of the former Government or not, and I want it made very clear, as far as my personal opinion is concerned, that any one who has done a wrong should receive just punishment and receive it in the proper way. It is the duty of the Government, too, Mr. Speaker, to begin to show the people some constructive policy and to eliminate as far as possible from all the discussion some of the mud-slinging we have had to listen to. I do not believe that in business or social life, it is necessary to be continually "knocking" the other fellow. There is plenty of room in Saskatchewan for the maintenance of a standard of purpose, and I have found in my observation that the men who spend so much time in extolling their own virtues and qualifications are well worth watching. Many of those who are the objects of abuse reveal outward acts of mind and spirit that the best people in the province would do well to emulate, and they have no right to criticise. I would like to make this plea, when we talk about sportsmanship outside the House, that there be no "hitting below the belt" and that we keep our discussions here on a high plane.

I must congratulate the Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) for the scholarly and capable way in which he introduced his contribution to the debate a few days ago. I know he soared aloft on an oratorical flight that we admired (and I think everyone in the House did), and I think that if he had kept the discussion on that level and within the bounds of what I understand as British fair-play, this House today would feel better and the people living in the province would have more confidence in the men who represent them here. If I say something bad about an individual today, I can have it repeated all over in a short time; but if I praise an individual, I am surprised to find that praise does not get the same publicity as the other kind of remark does.

I am bound to say this and I feel it my duty in so wide a field of debate, to say that I feel justified in making the remarks I do or otherwise I would not have begun. I think that the attack on the honourable member for Rosthern was rather severe. I am sorry I cannot quote Latin or I would have been glad to use it. Since that attack was made as it was made, I feel justified in making a few remarks. I would like to liken the honourable member for Lumsden to the angry bull who bellowed and pawed the earth looking at the object of his hatred and, after his anger had reached the point of overflow and his bellowing almost rocked the earth, he shut his eyes for the charge, charged and ran clean through a haystack. I think the honourable member for Lumsden will go down in the history of this House as the "hay man" of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The honourable member for Lumsden is a very capable lawyer — one of the most capable lawyers in the province. He has argued before judges and juries, and he has been successful in many cases. I know that in the course of that wide experience, the honourable member for Lumsden has learned what is evidence and what is not. And I submit and wish to go on record as saying that no statement that has been repeated by one individual from another can be used as evidence in the courts. When I say Bill Jones says that John Smith has said something, it is not evidence.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: There has been no evidence of that kind adduced, and I would ask the honourable gentleman to stick to facts.

Mr. Gardiner: The honourable member has just changed the name.

Mr. Garner: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had all kinds of "rope" judging by the territory that the honourable member for Lumsden took in. I want to say further that when any member of this House, private member or member of the Cabinet of the Government of the province, makes certain statements on the floor of the House, against the character of men who have a reputation in the Province of Saskatchewan equal — yes, equal — to that of any member sitting in the present House, when by some thin thread of imagination these men are dragged in, men who are not only members of this House, but men who are prominent in the Liberal party in the Province of Saskatchewan, when they are dragged in by that same thin thread of imagination, it is altogether unfair and unjust, particularly when all we have to take as evidence of this is the word of men who have served prison terms in the provincial gaols in the Province of Saskatchewan. I do not want to say anything more than has been said about the language used in these affidavits or declarations, because I am not familiar with the rules of this House, but I know how I felt when the language was used, and I imagine a good many felt the same way. I know, too, if what my honourable friend for Lumsden says is true, that there are lots more evidence and affidavits or declarations, and if they are anything like the evidence and affidavits given, then he should consider well before bringing them before the members of this House, and be particularly careful as to the language in which those are clothed.

I want to say that I am not ashamed of the Leader of the Opposition in this House. I am not ashamed of the honourable member from Prince Albert, and I think he has made a very valuable contribution to the public life and to the Government of Saskatchewan and the Province of Saskatchewan, and I object to any minister of the Government being so careless about mentioning something for which the honourable member was blamed that happened six weeks before his appointment. I also note in connection with these affidavits, or one of them, that there was some "mix-up" about a quantity of liquor being cited barrels or quarts, and I want to point out that if evidence is brought before the House in such a careless manner due warning should be given. Every care should be taken in drawing affidavits, and in that particular case either the man who drew the affidavit or the man who signed it, or both of them, must have been careless and they are equally to blame.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, I arise to a point of order. Reference has been made to lack of care in the drafting of statements and in this one case in particular, Sir. I am told, that a barrel is considered the same as five cases. That is all there is to it.

Mr. Davis: No. A barrel is forty cases.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: That is a load!

Mr. Garner: The honourable member from Kerrobert has referred to a pernicious and secret campaign which was carried on in his constituency. I am going to assure you, and ask you to convey to him, that his constituency was not the only one where that sort of campaign was being carried on. And, more than that, Mr. Speaker, I would like, before I sit down and finish my contribution to this debate, to make a plea that better sportsmanship be practised in the carrying on of election campaigns — by both sides, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Hear, Hear!

Mr. Garner: I do not believe that any party in Canada has all the virtue or all the intelligence, and I think that the time has come when elections and campaigns must be just plain presentations of facts and convictions, when men should not tell half the truth and mislead their listeners. If he cannot reveal the whole truth, he should let it all alone. I won in my constituency not because the opposition did not try to defeat me. I want to tell the members through you, Mr. Speaker, that if the men who conducted the campaign against me had had the things that were whispered spoken, I would have thought more of the managers of the campaign opposed to me.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Same old thing!

Mr. Garner: Yes, you are going to hear it. I expected better of the managers of the campaign against me. In a Scandinavian district — Gilbertson is the name of the poll — I found there was something seriously wrong. I addressed several meetings there and later I went back again, but I could not put my finger on the trouble. I finally got hold of a gentleman who knew the language of the people in the poll, and asked him what it was all about. He told me then that the information had been spread broadcast that the present Leader of the Opposition was a Catholic. That is the kind of stuff that was going all over that constituency, and, Mr. Speaker, the people who spread the information knew better.

I went to another poll — at Benson — and I was told that I would not get anything but a Catholic vote in that particular polling division. I want to tell you that we had lots of workers outside of the Catholics. In some of the places where I held meetings I was successful in clearing the air and I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, that one of the harmful influences was a secret organization working in that constituency against me, and that organization was the Ku Klux Klan. I want to tell you further that people in my constituency — people of different nationalities that were friends before the last election — are not friendly today, and we do not know how long it will take to mend that wound or heal it up. Plenty has been said about "harmony" in this debate, and there have been some indirect charges against members on this side of the House in this connection, but the Government could help the situation, and, through the press, that is supposed to represent their side of questions, some of this disharmony could be stopped and the wrong rectified to some extent.

Now, the other day, the honourable member for Bengough (*Mr. Warren*) tried to leave the impression in this House that any recommendations he made for appointments in connection with the Mental Hospital at Weyburn went to Liberals. That does not seem to go down right with me. If I were a Conservative (which I am glad to say, I am not) and were making appointments, the first consideration for a man's appointment would be his ability, the next one had he served well in the interests of the party, and the third was he a Conservative. If I could not find a Conservative with those qualifications, then I would turn to a Liberal applicant. Since I heard of Civil Service reform I have been wondering just what it meant. Judging from a couple of appointments made in my constituency, they were made for the purpose of reform. A number of appointments have been made which I do not think are proper. I do not know whether some of the men were appointed in order to reform those men or not, but that is one of the ideas that runs through my mind.

The honourable member from Francis (*Mr. Horner*) said there were fewer Liberals today than on June 6. Well, I disagree with him. I know of a lot more who are Liberals today who did not vote Liberal on June 6. In an agricultural convention there had been something said of a dual-purpose cow, and a delegate told the convention that there was no such thing — every cow was either dairy or beef. I think he was right; and in politics, Mr. Speaker, a man is either a Tory or a Liberal. I want to tell the honourable member for Francis that today a man is either fundamentally a Conservative or a Liberal in politics, and that he very quickly reverts to either. I want to tell the member for Francis this, that he was put in as a Progressive

and not even as a Co-operator, and I would like to know in what capacity he would go back and face the people in another election. That was possibly a test, and when he picked co-operation with the Conservatives he just reverted to form true to type. The same applies to the other members of the other parties who decided to co-operate. You are either fundamentally a Conservative, or fundamentally a Liberal. You may call yourself a Progressive, an Independent or a Co-operator, but when you get right down to business you are one or the other — Conservative or Liberal — and I would say this, that I do not know but what these Conservatives are looking forward to the day when they can shake off their Progressive and Independent encumbrances and become a real, true, one hundred per cent. Conservative Government. I think that the Government of the country should be either in the hands of the Conservatives or of the Liberals, and I do not take back what I say about the Progressives and Independents in the province when I say they are political misfits. It is just a matter of convenience to the Conservatives to co-operate with these two parties here for the present.

Mr. Speaker, before sitting down, I do not think I would be performing my duties in this House if I failed to say a word or two in connection with the alleged irregularities in the Weyburn Mental Hospital. I think that all the members of the House have business sense, and I think that, if we want to be fair, we will have to admit that in any business institution today there are irregularities among employees. It is much harder, I submit, to conduct departments of Government and control Government employees than it is for business concerns. I want to tell you that if any one was running a business where they were employing the same number of employees as the Province of Saskatchewan, in as many and varied lines of work, that he would be bound to find irregularities, because they are hard to eliminate. Many of those dismissals the public of the province never heard anything about. Why should the Honourable Minister mention the matter of coal when it was part of Dr. Mitchell's pay? The same thing applies to the lumber. Why should that be in the affidavit at all?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: May I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker? I would ask the honourable member if he considers it right and proper that the painter should have been taken from his work and employed for a matter of 82 days, using 15½ pails of paint, all of which was taken from the Government stores, those 82 days being used up on private work for the superintendent?

Mr. Gardiner: The honourable member's question is altogether wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely unfair for him to ask the member to endorse something which everybody knows to be wrong on the face of it. The Honourable Minister might go to his department and get the facts of the whole story.

Mr. Garner: The Honourable Minister has done lots of things that were wrong . . .

Mr. Gardiner: Just on a point, Mr. Speaker — and I may be a little out of order in doing so. It is absolutely unfair on the part of the minister to introduce into this House a statement of the kind. Most of us on this side know that men working in those institutions are entitled to have some work done on their houses. (I do not know about paint, but I do know about coal.) I know they are entitled to have some work done, and here we have affidavits going out to the general public leaving the impression that somebody has stolen something. We are tired of this sort of thing. Let us have the evidence given in the proper place and have it right.

Mr. Garner: The statement made in the House yesterday, that the Minister had a lot material of the same kind, appeared in the *Regina Star* in due course. In my opinion, that statement was made solely for the purpose of getting a little more political publicity in his own paper

Hon. Mr. Bryant: It's not my paper. Might I correct the honourable gentleman — I am not a stockholder in *The Star*.

Mr. Garner: I did not mean to suggest that the Minister had anything to do with *The Star*. The members of the House, no doubt, and the general public as well, will judge fairly as to the motives behind the honourable gentleman's statements.

I would just add, in closing, with regard to his statements, that the character of a man is the greatest asset he has, and I think it ill-becomes the Minister of Public Works to bring in statements damaging to the character of a civil servant, and, unless that man has committed a definite criminal act, nothing should be said. But, in spite

of all the Minister has said, and in spite of all he has intimated he has "up his sleeve," the Minister was not prepared to make any definite charge. I do not think there is a man sitting on this side of the House but is quite willing for all those matters to take their proper course and have the whole thing sent to a Royal Commission consisting of Judges of the Courts of this province. That is the only proper way matters of this kind should be settled.

Mr. Speaker, it will be apparent from what I have said that I propose to oppose the motion.

THE HONOURABLE WAT. C. BUCKLE

(*Minister of Agriculture*)

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In everything said in loyalty to His Majesty the King; in everything said in congratulation to you and with respect to the impartiality and justice you will use in carrying out the duties of your high office in this Assembly; in everything said in respect to the manner the mover and seconder of this Address have acquitted themselves, and in everything said in congratulation to the new Members on each side of the House, I most heartily concur.

I also wish to express my hearty congratulation to the Premier of this Province upon the high honor that has come to him. As one of the old "Corporal's Guard, who sat with him in the rather icy shades of Opposition I can truthfully say that he stood the full force of the attacks made upon him by the late Government and was never downhearted, but was ever ready by force of example to sustain the morale of the troops as it were. He was ready to receive and answer, at all times, the criticisms of the late Government (and some of those criticisms, Mr. Speaker, were not of a very generous nature). He at all times offered suggestions and advice to the late Administration and some of these suggestions and advice you will now find embodied in the contents of the Speech from the Throne. So, Mr. Speaker, after four years of crusading as leader of a small group on the opposite side of the House, he has by merit and worth reached the position he is in today, and I feel confident that the people of this province are going to give him the time and the opportunity to carry out the policies which he has so consistently enunciated.

Mention is made in the Speech from the Throne, and reference has been made by many who have spoken in this debate, to the shortage of crops in some districts of the province during the past season. Unfortunately it is true that in some districts there was a shortage. Fortunately, however, there are some other districts where they had very good crops and the grades have been very satisfactory. It is a wonderful tribute to the people in those districts where they had no crops to speak of, that they are ready and willing to face the future with a happy and courageous heart.

With regard to relief, judging from the correspondence received in my office the people would appear to think that the Department of Agriculture is wholly responsible for its administration, and they even seem to think that we are actually purchasing and distributing hay and other fodder. Those who are at all familiar with the Act governing relief measures know that this is not the case. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we have certain responsibilities in this regard. With an understanding with the Railway Companies whereby the Department and the Railways agreed to each assume half of the cost we undertook to give free freight on fodder supplies. The Department is also acting as a clearing house for the certificates sent in by those asking for this relief and we also mapped out for the information of the Railways the areas that should come into the relief scheme in accordance with data supplied to the Department by the various municipalities affected.

At the outset when the relief measure first came into effect some of the municipalities did not appear to realize the position they were in, and did not apply to be included in these drought areas. There were others such as the one whose secretary is my honourable friend, the member for Arm River (*Mr. Hutcheon*) who, though they knew they did not need the feed at that time considered that later on they might need it and therefore applied to be put on the list, and for that reason those municipalities are not suffering from lack of fodder today.

Other conditions have also crept in. The depth of snow and the exceptionally cold weather have changed the complexion of affairs in many cases and we are having every day, applications from other municipalities to be brought in, and I must say this, that

the Railway Companies have always been ready and willing to co-operate with us and the municipalities in every reasonable request, with the result that two extensions to the drought areas have already been sanctioned by them. There have been some few scattered complaints, only two of which were brought definitely to my attention through press articles, and we had no difficulty in straightening these out. I would like to tell the House how much feed has actually gone into those municipalities in order to show that the Department has been really alive to their needs when informed by those responsible.

Into Aneroid we shipped 60 cars of hay; 5 cars of oats and 2 cars of barley,

Into Ponteix, 55 cars of hay and 2 cars of oats,

Into Gouverneur, 4 cars of hay,

making a total of 128 cars shipped into these three towns in the Rural Municipality of Auvergne, No. 78.

Into the Rural Municipality of Mankota, No. 45, we shipped 109 cars of hay; 1 car of oats and 6 cars of barley, making a total of 116 cars. This was the number that had been authorised for shipment up until about two weeks ago, and since then a great many more cars have been shipped into these two municipalities. The Department, as I have stated before, has received no complaints outside of the two that I have mentioned, but there has been a little technical trouble in that some municipalities have wanted to ship their fodder over two lines of railways when we routed them to ship over one line with the idea of some saving in freight costs, but these matters have been adjusted and everything is going along smoothly at this time.

Now, Sir, down to February 15th, there had been shipped into municipalities requiring relief, 4,803 cars of hay, 155 cars of straw, 707 cars of oats, 309 cars of barley and 11 cars of screenings, making a total of 5,985 cars of fodder, and in addition to that we have assisted in the freight charges on 136 cars of hay baling outfits.

This brings me to the matter of the willingness of the farmers in the Carrot River Valley district to ship to the southern portion of the province practically unlimited quantities of good straw for the bare cost of baling and loading, which would amount to around \$4.00 a ton. The great difficulty seems to be to get a sufficient number of baling outfits up there in order to take advantage of that offer. However, the Department is working on that question now and we hope to ship in a sufficient number of balers in the near future to take care of this situation. I cannot commend too highly the public spirit and practical sympathy shown by the farmers of the Carrot River Valley.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments I would like to discuss weeds. I think everyone is seized with the importance of the weed problem, and no one realizes it more than the Department itself. Members on both sides of the House who have spoken in the debate have referred to it, and have asked what the Department is going to do about it, and I regret to tell them that in this day and generation we have not yet been able to devise any magic wand to wave over the fields and rid them of the weeds. The weeds have been here for some considerable time and, like the human system recovering from a serious sickness, it will take a long period to recuperate from the results of their being here, no matter what we may do. We appear to have arrived at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the general public themselves have begun to realize the seriousness of this problem, but there seems to be a divided opinion as to how this problem should be met. The honourable member for Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*) for example, seems to think that there is no need of more legislation, the honourable member for Willow Bunch (*Mr. Johnson*) seems to think there is. Personally, I think we have enough legislation if it were properly enforced to take care of the situation.

With this end in view I want to tell you now that the appropriations in the Department's estimates, that will shortly be brought down, will show a considerable increase to take care of this evil, and I hope honourable gentlemen on both sides of the House will heartily support this item. In the past the work of the field representatives has been carried out over too large an area. They had to spread themselves out too thin, as it were, to be of real service. With that in mind we are going to reduce the size of the areas and increase the number of field representatives. We are also going to place this work under the direct supervision of a Chief Weed Inspector and his assistants, who will be in constant contact with the field representatives to see that they are in turn keeping in touch with the various municipalities and farmers and discussing their weed problems with them in the greatest spirit of co-operation. In other words, the

Chief Inspector and his assistants will see to it that the field representatives carry out, to the full, the policies laid down by the Department, and also see that the provisions of The Noxious Weeds Act are more generally complied with.

I feel satisfied that we are facing a little brighter era in regard to the weed menace. First of all the municipalities, and in addition business organisations and financial interests, are awakening to the importance of this problem as never before, and have expressed their willingness to co-operate with the department to the greatest possible extent. Formerly, municipalities in many cases I find, have been most reluctant to employ weed inspectors at all, and many that did comply with the law simply told their inspector, after appointing him, to stay at home and forget about it. That condition no longer exists to any great extent, and the delinquent municipalities are gradually coming into line. The Department is also at the present time in co-operation with the Dominion authorities, placing in various municipalities seed cleaning plants. The two Governments bear the cost of the plant and the municipalities supply the necessary line shafts, belts and pulleys and also the truck or sleigh and caboose to transport the plant from place to place. The municipalities also supply the operator for the plant and agree to charge a price that will cover operation expenses and one that will be satisfactory to the Minister of Agriculture. I believe that these seed cleaning plants will do a great deal of good in helping to solve our weed problem, because after all, if weeds are not put into the ground in the first place they will not be seen later on. The Department is also carrying on seed drill surveys to estimate the quality and weed content of grain that is actually being sown by the farmers of this province. This also will be a help in solving our problem.

Another factor which tends to make the future look brighter in this fight against the weed menace is the using of better seed, an idea that is being encouraged and extended in every possible way, so that the greater use of better seed may be confidently looked for with a consequent beneficial result. Another factor for good is the fertilizer experiments that are being carried out by the Consolidated Smelters organisation, and I have just received a confidential report of their experiments of last year, the result of which, I am sure, will prove highly satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. Spence: Will the Honourable Minister tell the House if his Department is conducting experiments now in that connection?

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Do you mean in conjunction with the Company?

Mr. Spence: Yes! In conjunction with the Company.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: They are using our men to supervise the work.

I am heartily in accord with the remarks of the honourable member for Notukeu and others when they say that this would be a better province if we practised a more diversified system of farming to a greater extent than we do at the present time, and I may say that I have preached this creed from every platform from which I have spoken. If the settlers had practised this system in those districts where weeds now dominate the farmer, they would assuredly have controlled the situation, for where you find mixed farming with its consequent crop rotation you will invariably find that the farmer is getting along very nicely with no fear of the weed problem. Those who follow the old system of straight grain raising year in and year out are being beaten, and I, myself, have seen them move north into my own district on account of this particular evil. I am quite prepared to admit that there are districts in this province where, owing to water conditions, straight grain raising might possibly be argued as the best system for that particular district, but taking the Province as a whole it would, in my opinion, be better if every farm in the Province had a few head of good live stock upon it.

I now come to the question of the Government purchasing farms that are badly infested with weeds and cleaning them up. This has been engaging my attention for some time, and an announcement will be made later on in respect to this matter. In a small way this is being done at Drinkwater at the present time where we have sixty acres in plots upon which experiments with wild oats, mustard and french weed are being carried out. I have just received a report on the work that has been done on this land which contains some very valuable information for the public, and which will be passed on to those interested in due course.

At Jansen, also, we carried out experiments for the eradication of sow-thistle by means of chemicals and I have received a report on that activity which will be given out later on. These experiments have shown that some of the chemicals offered for sale

are good, but it has also been demonstrated that some are not so good. The municipalities will be benefitted a great deal by the information that has been obtained.

In connection with the problem of the control of weeds, I am glad to report that I have received the co-operation of the Department of Highways. The Minister of Highways has informed me that his Department will look after the weeds on the Provincial Highways. This has not been accomplished before probably because in the past they were not apparently able to get the right kind of co-operation between the two departments.

Mr. Hogan: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Does that apply to all highways or just to Provincial Highways?

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Just to Provincial Highways. We have not got so far as to include all roads as yet. This will be the end of a situation such as the honourable member for Notukeu (*Mr. Grant*) referred to in his speech, and now when the Department approaches a farmer living adjacent to a Provincial Highway and requests him to attend to his weeds he will not be able to tell us to "first take the mote out of your own eye."

With regard to the educational campaign I may say that very good work is being done and excellent results have been obtained at the various tractor schools held during the winter months. The Department has sent field representatives out to these schools and their lectures have been given much attention. These men report that they are finding the farmers just as interested in methods of weed eradication as they are in tractors, which is not a bad thing. In the final analysis it rests with the individual farmer himself. All that we can do is to secure information to pass on to him and try to educate him to use this information to his advantage and put the best methods applicable to his particular district into practice. I might say that he will have the full support and co-operation of the Department at all times and to that end our best efforts will be bent.

I would like at this point to quote a few figures to show just what weeds are costing us every season in this province. First there is the weed damage to crops. This was a rather difficult matter to get at, so a questionnaire was sent to possibly one hundred representative farmers as to what they considered the weed damage to their crop amounted to. The replies from those farmers made it possible to arrive at an average figure of fifteen per cent. The average value received by the farmers of the province for the past ten years for the crop has been \$287,000,000 per year. Remember that that is after considering this fifteen per cent reduction due to weed damage, so that the amount of \$287,000,000 is only eighty-five per cent of the value; hence the average loss is, roughly, fifty-one million dollars. Then we have to also consider the cost of twine. The average acreage planted during the past five years has been twenty and a half million acres, and fifteen per cent of that amount is around three million acres. The cost of tying three million acres is estimated to be \$860,400. Threshing the dockage on our average yearly production costs us \$631,000. The loss to the dairying industry caused by weedy flavoring is estimated to be \$42,000. Extra cultivation made necessary by the prevalence of weeds is responsible for an expenditure of \$5,000,000 and finally our loss from dockage is figured to be \$2,500,000. Making a staggering total of over sixty million dollars loss to Saskatchewan farmers through our weed problem. Think it over.

I have already stated that I am going to ask for an extra appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the particular work of weed eradication, and in justification for this request I quote these figures. The value of the grain and field crops for 1929—and this information was supplied by the Statistics Branch—was \$248,000,000 and the value of other farm products was \$58,000,000. Now the appropriation for improvement and protection of field crops was \$58,000 on a return of \$248,000,000 and the appropriation for the live stock, dairying and poultry industry was \$157,000 on a return of \$58,000,000. In view of the figures just given—and we must remember that this has been a poor year for field crops—I think I am quite justified in asking that a bigger appropriation be given to the Field Crops Branch in future to carry on their work.

Let us now turn for a few moments to the Live Stock and Dairying Branches. We recently had a convention in Moose Jaw, and I know that it was a most successful one, because I was there, and I may say that the farmers present were quite optimistic and I had a fine and very friendly welcome from them. I might also at this time inform the House that Dr. Misner's report on marketing conditions in the dairying industry will be ready for distribution in a short while, and it is one of the most complete and comprehensive reports that I have ever had the pleasure of looking at.

Dairying in this Province has made great progress and the butter production has consequently increased a great deal. Some contend, of course, that the increase during the past season was due to the poor crop conditions of last year—that because of the poor crop conditions more people made butter. That may be true to some extent, but I fully believe that the farmers of this province are beginning to realize that they have got to farm in a little more diversified manner. During the past year we were told by those in authority that we imported into Canada over 30,000,000 pounds of butter, and I would like to quote a few figures to indicate just what it would mean to the agricultural industry in the Dominion and perhaps more particularly in this province, if we had produced that butter in Canada. The salt, water and solids other than fat in butter, or the "over-run" as it is called in the trade, is around 19 per cent. Nineteen per cent of thirty million pounds would be 5,700,000 pounds leaving 24,300,000 pounds of butter fat. Around three and one-half pounds of butter fat is produced from every hundred pounds of milk which would mean that about 720,000,000 pounds of milk is used to produce 24,300,000 pounds of butter fat. Taking away the butter fat from 720,000,000 pounds of milk would mean that 695,700,000 pounds of milk would be available for the feeding of around 657,000 hogs up to the age of five months, when heavier feed would be necessary, so that this amount of feed from dairying industry would materially assist in bringing 657,000 hogs to market or approximately 80,000,000 pounds of bacon.

It is estimated that during the coming year we shall import into Canada 40,000,000 pounds of butter and if we were producing that amount here we could have 160,000 more milk cows; so it would appear to me that here is a very good argument for a more thorough practice of diversified farming. That 40,000,000 pounds of butter produced in this country would mean that 16,000 farms of 160 acres, supporting 10 cows each on the average, could be in existence and in operation and that practically 2,500,000 more acres would be brought into use for that purpose in Canada, or in other words it actually means that under present conditions 160,000 good Canadian milk cows are not being allowed to "do their stuff." I have suggested to you that this should be done in all fairness I should give you some figures as to where these products could be sold if we produced them. I am going to give you the importations into Great Britain of three articles only: The importation of butter amounted to \$250,746,545; of eggs \$79,320,000; and dressed poultry \$8,760,000 and out of that grand total of \$338,826,545 imported into Great Britain, Canada supplied \$325,000. Out of \$338,000,000 we supplied less than half a million dollars worth. So once again, I say, there is a great reason and a good opportunity for a more diversified system of farming in this province and others, and if we do, it will not be necessary to go outside of the Dominion to buy farm products for our own use, which rather ridiculous procedure we are now engaged in.

Mr. Davis: How is that all accounted for?

Hon. Mr. Buckle: We are not producing it.

Mr. Davis: Not enough?

Hon. Mr. Buckle: No!

As an illustration of what we can hope for in the future let me give the figures of the amount of farm products that one undertaking in our province required. As most honourable gentlemen will know, at Island Falls, last winter, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company had a large gang of men employed for the purpose of building a dam to produce power to be transmitted for use in their own and other mines in the north. Between 700 and 800 men were employed. The only way to get in there during the summer months is by aeroplane or canoe, so it became necessary to haul in enough supplies during the winter months for the summer operations, and I would like to read to you what those supplies consisted of and the quantities required. There was taken into this point: 10 tons of beef; 21 tons of pork; 25 tons of bacon; 4½ tons of ham; 10½ tons of sausage; 10½ tons of lard; 20 tons of butter; 25,000 doz. eggs; 3,000 bags of flour; 1,500 bags of sugar; 400 bags of brown sugar; 6 carloads of vegetables, 342 cases of 5-pound tins of jam; 5,000 pounds of powdered milk; 1 carload canned milk, and 3,000 bushels of potatoes. As stated above these figures will give us some idea of what the industrialization of our Province means and let us hope that we will be prepared to meet that need as it grows.

On March 10th and 11th next there will be a conference in Ottawa of representatives from all the provinces, called by the Federal Minister of Agriculture for the purpose of discussing ways and means of improving agricultural conditions throughout the Dominion, and this conference will indicate in some measure the trend of public opinion

in Canada, and particularly in the Western Provinces, as to the adoption of a more diversified and permanent system of agriculture, and I feel sure we all hope that a great deal of good will come from this Conference.

As another argument for a more diversified system of farming might I quote the census of stock on, or perhaps I should say off, the farms in the Province of Saskatchewan, taken in the last Dominion census. Of the 117,781 occupied farms at that time, 12,230 had no horses; 24,602 had no milk cows; 30,029 had no other kind of cattle; 113,922 no sheep and 52,733 no swine. I was very pleased to hear the honourable member from Notukeu (*Mr. Spence*) pass the remarks that he did in connection with the sheep raising industry, and I think he established the idea that that particular branch of stock-raising is going to be of great benefit to this province. I might also remark here that in driving south from my home in the northern part of the province, I have noticed that the flocks of sheep are increasing in number, which is a very welcome and encouraging sign and it is significant that in 1925 we had more of every kind of live stock on our farms than we had in 1929, with the exception of sheep.

On the activities of the Department in cow testing and herd improvement, dairy improvement work, pure bred sire area work, and eradication of bovine tuberculosis, I may say that these activities are going forward in a very satisfactory manner, and as I intend to speak again later on in the session I shall leave my remarks on these matters for that time. However, there is one thing I would like to mention in connection with the dairying industry and that is in reference to the celebrated Holstein cow, Canary Korndyke Alcartra, owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. You will be pleased to know that this cow has "hung up" another record over a four lactation period. No cow of her age has produced as much milk and butter fat as has Canary Korndyke for this period of time. You might also be interested to know this, that Canary recently gave birth to a son and heir and that both mother and offspring are doing very well.

Reference was made in the newspapers to the record of accomplishments of exhibitors from the Province of Saskatchewan at the exhibitions held last November at Toronto and Chicago, and I want to express my own personal appreciation of them and in particular of the feat of Mr. J. Lorimer of Conquest in capturing the Watson Shield for the Champion Canadian-bred Clydesdale horse of any age raised in the Dominion of Canada. I might inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that exhibitors from this Province captured more prizes than in any other year that we have exhibited at these particular fairs.

I now come to the subject of unemployment and possibly I should link it up with the problem of immigration, because the one is so closely related to the other. The honourable member for Rosthern, (*Dr. Uhrich*) the other day would like to have left the impression with the House that this Government, by refusing admission to several thousand destitute immigrants from Russia, was establishing a policy of restriction of production on the farms and restriction of trade in the cities — in fact that we were giving the people of Saskatchewan a rather dirty deal. Now the honourable gentleman must have known that the Government had invited representatives of these people to come to Regina and discuss the situation with them, and that the Government had asked these representatives if there were any organizations at all that had any money which they could put up as a guarantee that these people would not become a charge on the province. The Government also suggested that the people themselves should be informed of this, but the answer we got was to the effect that there was not one dollar in the treasury of any organization that could be used for the assistance of these proposed immigrants. We asked them if it would be possible for the relatives of these people to take them in for say a period of at least one year so that they would not become a charge on the province, and we were informed at that time that there were none. The Government then notified these gentlemen right there and then that owing to economic conditions throughout the province we could not consider the proposition.

Dr. Uhrich: Were those Lutherans and Mennonite people, both?

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Both, how do you mean?

Dr. Uhrich: I mean were those people who wanted admission Lutherans and Mennonites?

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Well at that particular time I do not think that phase of the question was discussed. The main idea was to get the matter settled and we informed them that we had no particular objection to all of them coming in if they would guarantee that they would be looked after, after they had reached our shores. We have

always contended from the outset that immigration has been a provincial matter and, though administered by a federal department, that when it taxes the pockets of the people of this province, then it certainly becomes a provincial matter. Who pays for the "bread line" and who pays for the extra cost of work in the winter time. It most certainly is the tax-payers of the province. So we feel and have always felt that it was a provincial matter, but I do not think that the late Government ever made one single protest to the Government at Ottawa in connection with its immigration policy or the result of such policy.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I correct the honourable gentleman? We have heard the statement made so often that the former provincial Administration had taken no interest that I would like to say this: If any Minister of the Government will go down to the Bureau of Railways, Labour and Industries they will find that, back as early as 1922, when I first came into the Government, the Dominion Government was then consulting with us and got the opinions of the Provincial Government on this very matter.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: As to individuals?

Mr. Gardiner: No, as to whole groups of people.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: Well, we had no information or notification of that.

Mr. Horner: Not the numbers!

Hon. Mr. Buckle: However, since the new Co-operative Government has come into existence we find that we are actually being consulted on this matter and surely this is only just and right.

The honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) also waxed quite jovial the other evening, and we always welcome that spirit of joviality because in the past it was more the exception than the rule. He described my humble self as a St. John the Baptist going on ahead to prepare the way. I am proud to have St. John used against me as a measuring stick and I feel also that my pride is strengthened in that my head was not delivered on a charger to Salome, in the personnel of the Liberal "machine," on June 6th last. The honourable gentleman also referred to me as another Daniel come to judgment. Once again I must say that the judgment delivered on this particular Daniel by the electors on June 6th last was quite satisfactory. Something was also said about a certain trip made to Toronto. I may say I went to the city of Toronto to represent the Province at the Royal Fair and had a wonderful time. I also attended the Victory banquet of the Ontario Provincial Conservative Party, at which I spoke, and I do not think that anybody on this side of the House could take exception to what I said, and I am not greatly concerned with the opinions of honourable gentlemen opposite, if they want to bring that question forward. However, as there have been different versions of different statements credited to me I will tell the House exactly what I did say. What I said was this: That when the next Federal election was held, seven members from the Province of Saskatchewan would be returned in opposition to Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie King and that that was a conservative estimate. Later on in the evening when another speaker at the same banquet had occasion to get up and say a few words he referred to me as making the statement that seven Conservatives would be returned from Saskatchewan, thereby making the same mistake as some honourable gentlemen opposite did, he was promptly corrected; and if honourable gentlemen opposite want any verification I can give them the name of a very good supporter of their own residing in Regina who attended the banquet with me and who, according to his own words, had a thoroughly enjoyable time.

The honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) has accused this Government of pursuing a policy of restriction of production. He did not inform us, however, of the visits of the former Premier of this Province and Members of the former Government to Toronto and Ottawa, where they attended banquets and delivered speeches and on one particular occasion at least, the former Premier — and I do not know whether there were any assertions whether he could measure up to St. John or not — is credited with making the remarkable statement of advising the mothers of Toronto, speaking on the subject of immigration, to send their sons, not to Saskatchewan, but to the Peace River country. Now as everybody knows, Peace River is in Alberta, and it seems to me a remarkable statement for the Premier of a Province to make, who should be interested in getting those good Canadian people in the east who are thinking of setting their sons and daughters on the high road to fortune, to have those boys and girls come to this province of which he was the Premier, and not to have them sent clean through

the Province of Saskatchewan into the Province of Alberta. How about that for a policy of restriction of production in this province? It is rather strange. Only when we remember that the city of Toronto is possibly about 90 per cent. anti-Liberal do we have the probable reason.

Concerning the honourable member for Rosthern, the saddest thing about the whole situation is that he has not absorbed a little more of the charity and of the love and of the sweetness that is breathed from every leaf of that great Book which he must have studied somewhat thoroughly when he can quote it so glibly. It is not my intention nor is it necessary for me to quote it.

The honourable member for Rosthern also expressed some concern that the matters that came up during the recent campaign were not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. In the Tisdale constituency we had a perfectly wonderful time. My opponent and I were perfectly good friends when we started and as far as I know perfectly good friends when we finished. There were some wild statements made by some of the irreconcilables on both sides, but we ignored them and simply went on our own sweet way. In any event, if any particular member feels that he has received unfair treatment in any particular election, we shall most certainly hear about it on the floor of the House and consequently there is no need, in my estimation, to mention it in the Speech from the Throne.

As to the state of affairs in my own constituency I am happy to say that we were blessed with another good crop. We are not long on cities in the Carrot River Valley district and in fact I believe the town of Tisdale is the largest urban centre in my riding. We have not yet reached the high point of perfection that the honourable member for Lumsden (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) would like you to believe his constituency has reached, but we can march along quite comfortably with the constituency of my honourable friend from Swift Current (*Hon. W. W. Smith*). We have a wonderful country and we thoroughly believe in it.

Since the election there have been a lot of "barnstorming" tours conducted by members of the Opposition, particularly the member for Maple Creek and the Leader of the Opposition. They have apparently been holding postmortems or revival meetings to try and buck up the Liberal party, as it were. However, the state of health of the patient was not sufficiently convalescent to carry on, so the pulmotor was put away for the time being. They made some rather peculiar statements, however, during those tours. Honourable gentlemen waxed quite enthusiastic in some spots and quite indignant in others, especially in reference to the personnel of the Cabinet. However, I do not think that the people of this province are worrying as to this detail as much as the members of the Opposition seem to think they are, at least they are not up north. Some honourable gentlemen have been saying rather unkind words about myself. They would say nasty things to the effect that I was not an agriculturist. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is rather strange because if we take their own "Liberal handbook" published in 1929 and digest what they have to say on page 79, you will find that the statement there does not reconcile at all with their statements made on the platform now. This is what the dime novel of Liberalism has to say about my humble self: "Mr. W. C. Buckle, Conservative member for Tisdale and the only uncamouflaged Tory farmer in the Legislature." And right here and now, Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to say that there is a greater element of truth in that statement than in any other statement made in this particular pamphlet. Apparently honourable gentlemen opposite have actually arrived at the stage where they cannot believe themselves. I think they must have come pretty well to the end of their tether when they try to raise the argument that the farmers of this province will not get a square deal from anybody but themselves. I am quite positive that the Tisdale constituency is just about as rural as any other in the province, and I know that they are not worrying about what the members of the Opposition are saying about my qualifications as a farmer. In fact I noticed that at a meeting held very recently in the town of Tisdale by the "barnstormers" that they were rather careful not to mention that particular argument because it would not have gone down with an audience in that town at any rate. I have lived since 1911 with these people and I think they are quite satisfied as to the agricultural experience of their representative. None of us are perfect by any manner of means, and there are many things that I can learn about agriculture, but I can tell honourable gentlemen this, that if anybody should walk up and ask me where mineral wool was obtained I would not inform them that it was got from the "Hydraulic ram." If the farmers of this province are concerned as to the qualifications of their Minister of Agriculture to administer to their needs what must the people of Alberta feel about their Minister of Health. I doubt if the Honourable Mr. Hoadley, who holds the portfolio of Public Health as well as that of Agriculture, has ever examined a patient or written a prescription in his life.

Another matter that seems to greatly agitate the minds of honourable gentlemen opposite is that of dismissals in the Civil Service, and here we are placed in a rather peculiar position. First we are condemned for doing it and then we are everlastingly condemned for not doing it. If there is one thing that this Co-operative Government was placed in office for it was to get rid of the "machine" and that is what we are honestly trying to do. We would be breaking faith with the people of Saskatchewan if we did not do that. There are one or two features about these dismissals: In the first place there is the matter of efficiency and of active political partizanship. These questions enter into the matter of dismissals a great deal, and there are one or two others also that make our actions in this regard perfectly legitimate. As far as my own Department is concerned it is not exactly as bad as honourable gentlemen opposite would tell us, with "heads rolling promiscuously all over the place." In fact it has been grossly exaggerated, and I do not think that any other Department has witnessed this gruesome spectacle either, but I am afraid if the Opposition crowd us much further with the argument that we have not found enough partizans there will have to be a few more heads "lopped off."

(Interruptions by members of the Opposition.)

and there will be nobody to blame but themselves for it. In spite of reports to the contrary there have not been wholesale dismissals in the Department of Agriculture. In the case of one of those dismissals my Deputy Minister informs me that his was a straight political appointment by the old Government. He was of no earthly use to the department and those responsible for the work being carried on in the department were not sorry when he disappeared from the picture.

Coming to the matter of Highways, our genial Minister administering that Department will deal with them in detail later. One thing we can be certain of and that is that we will not be cursed with misleading road maps. There was one instance in my own constituency where a road was marked "Highway No. 35" on the map, covering a distance of forty miles, and there was no highway there at all. Even members of the Opposition would surely condemn those responsible for a situation like that if they were induced to travel over a road charted as a highway whereas in reality no highway existed at all, and any other organization would be condemned also if they practised deception such as this; and that is why we have condemned them.

The Leader of the Opposition when discussing the general highway situation the other day made some mention of the former road inspectors' expenses and one thing he stated was that they had used up some of their time and some of the people's money locating gravel pits. I cannot understand that, because after reading the Farm Loan Board report we learned of one instance at any rate where all they had to do was to call at the Farm Loan Board office and get the location of a first class gravel pit, and no doubt others were in existence at the same source.

The Leader of the Opposition also referred to meeting a Mr. Williams on the street — Williams I think the name was — and Mr. Williams informed him that he had been fired.

Mr. Gardiner: I want to correct the honourable gentleman it was not Mr. Williams.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: This gentleman was quite wrathful because he had been dismissed two weeks before the snow came, and that brings to mind the question that was asked the late Government by a member of the then Opposition as to where the road inspectors went and what they did in the winter time. This question so embarrassed the then Government that the only answer they could give was to ask another question, and we had the spectacle of a Minister in that Government actually replying to that question, by asking the questioner to tell him "where the flies go in the winter time." I imagine that it was possibly to avoid that sort of embarrassment for the present Government that these men were dismissed at the time of the year they were by the present Minister of Highways.

The member for Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*) expressed himself as being antagonistic to the idea of the Government assisting, by way of useful information, those settlers who come from other lands into this country to farm. I might tell him that this has been going on for some considerable time, and I have here a letter which I received just a few days ago from Mr. F. B. Kirkwood of the Department of Colonization of the Canadian National Railways, and it has reference to a meeting at St. Walburg that was held in the interests of the people of that locality by way of increasing their knowledge of agriculture and how to meet some of its problems. Mr. Kirkwood writes in part:

"There was a very large attendance and I believe the meeting was well worth while. We placed the attendance at 162, and with the exception of two Germans and two British in the audience, they were all Ukrainians. The demonstrations were eagerly observed and the lectures given were very well received."

And he says further:

"These people are lacking in organization and also lack the necessary knowledge of what our various agricultural branches are prepared to give them in the way of advice and help. I believe that in the initial years of a settler's establishment there are more problems and difficulties to be faced than there are in later years, and good advice at this juncture would be invaluable to him."

And further on he says:

"I believe I am safe in saying that it (that is, some measure of supervision and assistance) would be eagerly welcomed."

So I think that the objection and criticism made by the member for Vonda was not in accordance with facts.

I would now like to deal for a few moments with the Farm Loan Board report. I was rather struck by the remark passed by the honourable member for Pipestone (*Mr. Patterson*) that one of the first acts of this Government was to appoint a commission to look into the mental condition of the people, and he suggested it should have been to look into the mentality of the people who had supported the Co-operative Government. Well, I do not think that his idea of the duties of this Commission are very much clearer than his idea of the duties and objects of the Farm Loan Board, because, as I take it, the duties of that Commission consisted chiefly of examining the mentality of the people who had been put into the Government mental institutions under a Liberal regime. That was their duty, and I may say also that these institutions were under the administration of the late Government on June 6th last and any of the inmates that voted would be told who they would be expected to vote for. Then he made an effort to establish the fact that there was a feeling of distrust among the rural population against the present Government. He said, in effect, that, in future, the towns and cities would come into their own now that the Co-operative Government was in power. This the honourable gentleman knows to be incorrect and I also feel that if there was a Liberal member in the city of Regina that he would be supporting the Opposition and not the Government. In respect to the honourable member's criticism of the Farm Loan Board report, I cannot help but feel that he adopted the attitude of anyone who has a weak defence, so he adopted the attitude of abusing his opponent. First of all he gave the Provincial Treasurer a severe castigation for bringing the report into the House at all, then he turned his pea-shooter on the man who made the audit and accused him of political deception. Well, political deception is a thing that can be very well discussed when the matter is brought before the Committee, so it will not be necessary for me to talk about that. Some other honourable gentlemen have repeatedly made the statement that the members of this Government had charged dishonesty in connection with the handling of the Farm Loan Board, and that that charge had not been supported by the auditor's findings. This Government has never accused anyone of dishonesty in connection with the administration. All the criticism we ever made was that the Board had been badly administered. Then the honourable member went on to speak about fire insurance policies. He stated that line loan companies were in the same shape as the Farm Loan Board in this respect, but I think the honourable member for Pipestone would have some difficulty in finding a line company whose affairs, in this particular direction, were in the same condition as the Farm Loan Board. The honourable member went on to say also that the Provincial Treasurer did not have enough sympathy in his "make-up." I do not think that there should be any sympathy for anyone who is drawing a good salary to administer millions of dollars and making a particularly poor job of it. He then proceeded to argue that there was no proof that there would be heavy losses in connection with the Farm Loan Board. As a matter of fact some seven hundred loans were examined and from that seven hundred there are several score of examples taken, and it might reasonably be considered that a cross-section composed of these seven hundred out of 5,000 loans would be a fair indication of the operation of the Board. The honourable gentleman then said that the Farm Loan Board was not intended to be a collection agency. I feel if a collection agency would be of any use, and it most assuredly would be, then it should be put there. The honourable member also went on record as saying that he was satisfied with the showing made by the Board. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that has been the whole trouble with the Farm Loan Board, too much satisfaction and not enough inspection. He then referred to the fact, and this, of course, was for political effect, that the Government

was insulting the farmers of the province, who are the Board's borrowers. The Government has done nothing of the sort, but we are discussing some seven hundred borrowers of the Farm Loan Board and some of these seven hundred would come in the scope of that discussion, but as far as the balance of the borrowers are concerned, we have nothing to say in connection with them at all. We do feel, however, that we are justified in criticising the management of the Board when we find that there are defaulters to the number of several hundred, especially when we realize that it is the taxpayer of the province that has to eventually foot the bill. The honourable gentleman then went on to say that the Co-operative Government has sold out to the line companies. He knows better than that. He also stated that we are going to foreclose the loans and find a supporter of the Co-operative Government and sell to him. All I can say to this ridiculous statement is that there will not be any more farm loans foreclosed then there should have been under the Liberal Government's term of administration, and that friends of the late Liberal Government will have every opportunity granted to them to bid in open competition for these parcels of land if and when they are sold. The honourable gentleman also stated that all the interest payments owing to the Treasury from the Farm Loan Board had been paid. I was wondering if he meant that sufficient interest had been received from the borrowers to pay to the Treasury the interest due to it by the Farm Loan Board or whether the Board had taken repayments of principal from the borrowers and repaid it to the Treasury as interest.

In bringing my remarks to a close I wish to say I am bound to come to this conclusion: I have read the report, I have listened to the honourable member's speech very carefully and I have had to come to the conclusion that — I can repeat now what I have said before — the tax payers of this province are going to lose a considerable sum of money from the past operations of the Farm Loan Board.

There is one request I wish to make in connection with the World's Grain Exhibition and Conference to be held in Regina in 1932. We have now brought all the threads of this project together into one connected organization. We now have permanent officials and we also have permanent offices and I would ask the co-operation of every member in this House to get behind this Fair and make it a great success, because it means so much to the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, there seems to be a great deal of anxiety as to the co-operative nature of this Government. We are not particularly concerned with the opinions of honourable gentlemen to your left, but we do know on this side that we are a very happy group indeed, and we are marching forward to greater triumphs, and to paraphrase that grand old hymn:

"We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in point of purpose,
Acting co-operatively."

I intend to support the motion.

MR. J. BENSON, M.L.A.

(*Last Mountain*)

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1930.

Mr. Speaker: As I have already congratulated you privately I do not think it is necessary for me to go over the formality of congratulation that has been the custom in the House. I was sorry to see you leaving our little group in order to take so honourable a position because we have very few members in the House and your going took just twenty per cent. off our strength. But I desire today that I wish you great success in the position you hold, and I hope that you, when your tenure of office is at an end, will be able to look back upon your present term with pleasure and satisfaction.

Now, I do not intend to keep you very long. The honourable member who has just spoken (*Mr. McGregor*) stated he was going to be very brief, and I would like to ask him, what is a long address if that was a brief one? In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to state that some time during this present session I am going to move a resolution in this House to limit the length of speeches. It has been done in the House of Commons at Ottawa and I believe it is a great time-saver. We have now spent two weeks talking on this debate and I would think before the honourable member, who has just spoken, criticised anyone and urged anyone else to practise economy he should have thought of that before he started to speak. I think that he took a very unfair advantage of me as I was told that the honourable member would speak for fifteen minutes only and I had taken no lunch and refrained from leaving the chamber to get any because I thought he would stop at any time.

The honourable member referred to the fact that, when the member from Lumsden (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) was speaking the other day, half the ladies in the galleries arose and left the chamber. Now, I did not see any ladies leave the chamber from that side of the galleries, and I further believe, Mr. Speaker, that they did not understand the language which was read. If there were any who left from this gallery presumably it was because they were tired of looking at the Liberal members.

Mr. Speaker, it was hard for me to understand the criticism that the honourable members opposite have passed upon the new Government with respect to the dismissal of certain members of the Civil Service. I live in the constituency of Last Mountain and I may tell you that the civil servants working in there for election purposes were so thick at the last election that I could not count them. That is true, too, not only for the provincial campaign, but during the last two Federal campaigns as well. I cannot see why the late Provincial Government should have taken any side in the Federal elections in Last Mountain in the way it did. It seemed to me that at that time it was out to wipe the Progressives off the map. We had nearly every member of the old Cabinet who sits in this House in there in 1925 and 1926 fighting a lone farmer and, Mr. Speaker, you know the result. The honourable member who has just sat down says, that in his constituency, they were appointing all Tories to the Civil Service. I want to point out that, if they have any criticisms to offer with regard to Last Mountain, it must be of the Progressives, because there are no Tories there and there are few Liberals left.

The honourable member from Wynyard claims to be my representative in this House and that is so because I live just within the border of the Wynyard constituency, and I am proud to have him here and I should be proud to have him sit beside me that I might see that he represents me in a proper manner.

I have no affidavits but I have one short newspaper item and some other items to read but they are along a little different line to what has been referred to and I hope they will have some effect in turning the thoughts of honourable members to things which are vitally needed in the province at this time.

Practically every member who has spoken has stated he has the best constituency in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I believe probably some of the constituencies in the province are more wealthy than the one I represent, but we have a community which I claim to be second to none, in at least one respect, and that is in the advanced ideas of the people therein. We have in Last Mountain people who are foremost in the province in agricultural and social reforms. We have in that district, or constituency, the first Tuberculosis Free Area in the province and we have the first Pure Bred Sire Area that was formed in the Dominion of Canada, and the first Women's Progressive Association that was formed in Canada. Then in the matter of education, when the Premier of Saskatchewan establishes his first unit for educational purposes it is going to be in Last Mountain Constituency. I will do all I can to help that along.

We have been told by some members that the late Liberal Government, judged by the legislation it passed, was a good Government. Mr. Speaker, I have no fault to find with the legislation that was passed but I have a great deal of fault to find with the administration of that legislation by the last Government. Probably it would be well for me to tell you some of the reasons why I voted against the late Administration. I am going to tell you this, that had it only taken my vote to turn the late Government out of office, that Government would have had to go out. I had lost all confidence in the Liberal Administration and for at least this one reason,—the way in which road grants were handled in the province. In some cases grants were handled in the proper manner when they were put directly into the hands of the municipality. In some others they were not. They were given through road foremen, and the money was not handled by the municipality at all but was handled directly from the Treasury. Some of this money was not spent on main market roads. Some of the grants that were made in my constituency were made through individuals. The money did not go through the hands of the council. In one case the money granted to one municipality was handled by an individual who also handled grant money for the municipality. When I started out in the campaign I went to that district to see some of our supporters in the Federal field. The first man I called on at south of Quinton told me he was sorry he could not work for us, as they had had quite a bit of money there, and he would have to work for the Liberal Government.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, might I interrupt the honourable member. We have had similar statements to that made when we were sitting on the Government side of the House, and I would like to ask the honourable gentleman if he is intending to state that money was paid to individuals over the Province of Saskatchewan and that they took that money instead of doing road work for it, is that what he is intending to say?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, what I stated was, that these men were appointed as road foremen, they acted as road foremen and sent in their time sheets. They were in an organised territory, and when I went to the rural municipality to check this stuff up I found that the inspector of the district had gone to the council and asked them if they would not accept \$300 of the grant, the idea being to cover up the manner in which the grants had been handled in that locality. The council told him it would not accept that money because it had had nothing to say with regard to where it had been spent.

Mr. Gardiner: Let us get this clear. The honourable gentleman says that contracts were made with the municipality for \$300, and that contracts were also made with foremen to spend money on highways, and I would understand this from his remarks that, after these contracts were let either to the foreman or the municipality, pay sheets were made out as a result of the work which had been done?

Mr. Benson: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition knows quite well what was done.

(Opposition interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Order! You must control your discussion.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I asked the honourable gentleman—

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is entirely out of order. The speaker has the floor.

Mr. Gardiner: I am perfectly in order, and if he wishes to answer me, well, what I am going to ask him is this—

Mr. Speaker: Order! *Bourinot*, at page 353, reads:

"A member will, at times, allow such interruptions through a sense of courtesy to another, but it is entirely at the option of the member in possession of the floor to give way or not to an immediate explanation."

Mr. Gardiner: I am going to ask him a question!

Premier Anderson: "Entirely at the option of the member," and he may refuse to answer.

Mr. Gardiner: He may refuse to answer, but I am in order in asking it. I want to ask the honourable gentleman if it is not true that, when these pay sheets are made out, the cheques for the work done go directly to the individual who did the work and not to the foreman and not to the municipality? Either that, or the cheques are made out to the person who did the work?

Mr. Benson: I understand that this is the procedure. But this is not the point I was discussing. The point I was discussing was that this money, which should have gone directly through the hands of the officials, was spent through political "heelers" and, in an indirect way, went into the hands of political "heelers" in the district.

Mr. Spence: In how many cases?

Mr. Benson: I have not the figures.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will give him the figures tonight.

(Opposition interruptions)

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I fear I am not going to get done in my fifteen or twenty minutes if I am going to be interrupted.

Another reason why I had lost confidence in the late Administration was because of the general handling of the Highways Department. An inspector was in charge of the work in the Last Mountain area, who is well known to me. He posed at one time as a good Progressive, and I want to say here that, whenever we had a Progressive meeting, we almost always found him in the neighbourhood of the meeting. Since the election I understand he went to the present Minister of Highways, at Yorkton, to see whether he might retain his position; and he came and saw me at my home in order to see whether I would support his application to retain his position or some position in the Highways Department. He admitted quite freely to me he had been doing political work. These are the things that caused me to lose confidence in the Liberal Administration.

Then, in regard to the Farm Loan Board, the statements of the auditor, which we have had, we must accept because, if we cannot accept the statements of the auditors of the province, whose statements are we going to accept? There is another item in connection with this. Members of the opposition have said that the Farm Loan Board was not interested in politics. I want to tell you that political "heelers" during the last campaign were peddling farm loan application forms from the Farm Loan Board, and I have in my possession an application which I received from one of these gentlemen, and I have witnesses to prove that I got it from him. Old Age Pensions were handled in the same way.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is the lack of law enforcement. Some of the other members of the House will well remember the late Attorney General getting up on the floor of the House and stating that he would not prosecute a certain individual. I am glad to say that this individual is now in the hands of the courts.

There is another reason why I had lost confidence in the previous administration and that is the way in which the schools of this province were being handled. During the last campaign the Honourable Mr. Latta at his nominating convention, at which I was present, stated that there was not one single complaint in the Province of Saskatchewan and he was subsequently challenged during the campaign by trustees, who went forward and told the people the facts in regard to the school question at Quinton. I believe that, just as soon as the public school is run on a proper basis, our people are going to come back into the one school.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why I had lost confidence and that is the lack of an immigration policy. We were told that we had nothing to do with

immigration in this province. I would like to hear from the honourable gentlemen opposite who has got anything to do with it, if the people of Saskatchewan have not?

Then there is another reason, the lack of a tariff policy. Do not think I am a supporter of high tariff. Mr. Speaker, I am going to draw your attention to what happened in the House of Commons in the session of 1928. Canada had given a preferential tariff to British goods coming into this country having in their content 25 per cent. British labour and material. During the session of 1928 the House of Commons, of the Liberal Government in the House of Commons, decided that that preference would be decreased by requiring the content to be 50 per cent. British labour and material to enjoy the preferential tariff. This had the effect of practically shutting out woollen and cotton goods from Great Britain. What I want to complain of is that when on the 1st of February, last year, that tariff went into force, there was not one word of protest from the late Government, and we farmers were struggling for a market for our wheat. I will have something further to say about this when the time comes.

I am opposed to the party system of government. I am opposed for these reasons,—because it is out of date; it is far too costly; it would get into a similar rut to that which the previous administration got into up to the 1st of September last; justice is not properly dealt out; it uses its energy for party gains; it is subservient to the federal party—and that is proved by the fact that the late Prime Minister did not act when he should have resigned. He had to get his advice from Ottawa.

There is one other great reason, which is the root of all evils in the party system and that is the source of campaign funds and now I will give you a few illustrations to show you where the campaign funds of the political parties come from. First, I am going to read you an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Woodsworth in the House of Commons on May 21, 1929. He says:

“With regard to Gooderham and Worts: It was disclosed by an examination of the books of the company that large unvouchered payments were made

This, Mr. Speaker, was the evidence collected by the Customs Enquiry Committee which investigated the customs charges made by the Honourable H. H. Stevens in 1927,—

“that large unvouchered payments were made, which were charged as part of the cost of operation, under various headings which did not show the real nature of the expenditures. Most of these payments were deducted from the profits before arriving at the amount upon which income tax was payable by the company to the Government. The evidence disclosed that these payments were principally for political and propaganda purposes. In so far as contributed for federal political purposes, they were illegal and contrary to the provisions of section 10, chapter 46 of the Dominion Elections Act.”

And to come down a little bit further, this is a report with regard to Wiser's Distillery Company reported in the Toronto Telegram, Mr. Woodsworth read:

“James G. Lawrence, secretary-treasurer of the Consolidated Distillers, admitted that the sum of \$380,608.59 was paid to both political parties between July, 1923, and the end of 1926.”

That is one source of campaign funds and we have many more illustrations and much more evidence along that line. Now, I am going to quote here from the Honourable R. B. Bennett, on May 14, 1914:

“I appeal to every man in this and say that if he will take the time to read the history of the operations of Mackenzie and Mann till now he will find nothing but a long trail of parliamentary corruption, of lobbying, of degradation of parliamentary institutions, of the lowering of the morale of public life, and the degrading of the standards by which public life should be truly measured. Both sides of the House have been to blame. Look to the statute books for the aid that has been given to this company. Just a few days before a general election one party proposes and the other acquiesces. They are bound to ask a few questions in order that the contributions to the party funds may be large enough’.

Mr. Gardiner: Read us something on Drewry's.

Mr. Benson: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other source of campaign funds and if you will look up Hansard of 1928 you will find that Mr. Bourassa had charged that Sir Wilfrid Laurier sold senate seats to the highest bidder. Now, so long as campaign funds are derived in that way, there will be party government and while there is party

government campaign funds will be derived in that way. I want to point out also that, if political funds are necessary, how to get them, and I would suggest a plan similar to that used in Last Mountain. We have a political organization of the people in the constituency and those people of the constituency contribute every cent that is spent; and, Mr. Speaker, the people of Last Mountain contributed every cent of my election expenses. I did not pay one cent.

Mr. Davis: Lucky man!

Mr. Benson: I am not under the control of the distiller or of those men who look for a quick return for the money invested in campaign funds.

Mr. Gardiner: The people in my constituency do a lot of that.

Mr. Benson: I am glad to hear it. I cannot see how you are a party man.

Now, for a few minutes I wish to deal with the reasons I believe that party government has been a failure — and I say that it is a failure — because of the condition of the Civil Service, the condition of the Farm Loan Board, the Co-operative Creameries and the Weyburn Mental Hospital, the conditions we will hear about in the Telephones Department and the enforcement of law in the Province of Saskatchewan. And further, party system of government has been of no benefit to the primary producer of the Dominion, as proven by the present economic conditions of the agriculturist.

Now, here are extracts from a few speeches. First of all I wish to read from the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, ex-Prime Minister, in the Federal House in 1910, when he said:

“Party government as we know can be the highest conception of public duty, but partyism as we know it, is nothing more or less than a mere scramble for office. I would therefore suggest that important questions be submitted to a committee, so that parliament may be able to consider the subject intelligently, away from the narrow atmosphere of partyism.”

And from Professor Ira McKay of McGill University, speaking in Winnipeg in 1927:

“I could accomplish more in the governing of the country, with twelve scientists, willing to co-operate, than can be accomplished by three hundred members of parliament competing for office under the iniquitous party system.”

I will give you one from David Lloyd George:

“Unless representative government is to be entirely discredited a new system must be adopted. At present the president of the Bank of England wields a power which makes kings and premiers mere pygmies. He works with the hidden hand of Wall Street, whose secret diplomacy in Europe and elsewhere makes an open mockery of the nations’ representatives. Up to the present the owners of the vested interests have been so powerful in both the old parties that those clearing the road have failed to cut through the toughest and sturdiest obstacles.”

One from Ramsay MacDonald:

“The two-party system is the medium through which the capitalists have kept the people divided, while they exploited them. The war for whatever purpose it may have been fought, has left mankind at the mercy of the financial machine. They alone hold the power of making direct action effective. A meeting of half a dozen men can thwart any parliamentary majority. Our economic life depends more and more on the goodwill and self-interest of a group who can hold an executive meeting on the back seat of a Rolls-Royce motor car. As a result of this domination by the financial machine, governments in the great countries of the world, are helpless to aid the great mass of people to a proper standard of living and existence.”

And Woodrow Wilson, a late President of the United States:

“A comparatively small number of men control the water powers, railroads, banks, prices and the larger credits of the country. There is hardly a part of the U.S.A., where men are not aware that secret private interests have been running the government. It is now a government by, for and of, big business with its completely subservient employees in the White House. Yes, an invisible government has erected itself above the forms of democracy.”

And there is also one other statement I want to refer to. I forgot to bring my own notes of these things along but it was a statement made by Sir John A. Macdonald:

"Send me men to support me when I am wrong for I have the whole House to support me when I am right."

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you and this House I have been called a Grit and called a Tory, with the usual descriptive adjectives that are applied, and I declare that I am neither a Grit or a Tory and have no intention of ever becoming either. The Liberals despise the Conservative-Progressives, the Tories despise the Liberal-Progressives, and I despise them both.

We heard of the dual-purpose cow the other day. Well, I am not a dual-purpose politician. I have never been Liberal or Conservative and, as long as there is anything else to vote for, I do not intend to vote for either. I was elected by my constituency not to play party politics. I was sent here to help to do the business of the province in a business-like way. You can call the Government what you like; call it Tory or Independent, or whatever you like, it does not make a particle of difference to me. I am here to support legislation that is good and to oppose legislation that is bad, and that only. I am going to do my best to consider every question before the House according to its merits and there is no consideration other than the interests of the people of Saskatchewan to sway me. Further, Mr. Speaker, I am the only member sitting on the Government side of the House who did not enter into the arrangement to entrust the leadership of the Government to Dr. Anderson. I did not endorse the leadership of Premier Anderson, but I have nothing against him. I am willing to support his Government so long as it administers the affairs of this province in a business-like way, and in the interests of all the people of the province. That is the only reason I will support it.

We have heard, up to this time, a lot of criticism against the present Government. Let me read a letter I received the other day from Semans. It is from the secretary of the local Lodge of the United Farmers and reads as follows:

"The following is a copy of resolution passed by the Lodge on Saturday last:

"That we commend the action of Premier Anderson in passing an Order-in-Council to safeguard the Wheat Pool if necessary."

"I am enclosing this to you only for the sake of letting you know how we are expressing our appreciation of the Premier and his Government. As you know, we have sent resolutions that were in no sense commendable to the Government, so I think it is only right that we should show our appreciation of what is really done for our benefit. Indirectly, it is a benefit to the province as a whole, and that is the kind of legislation any Government should pass.

"Have we at last found a Government of the people, for the people? Let's hope so."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe in co-operation, and I shall never be satisfied until I see in this province a Government 100 per cent. Co-operative; and I shall not be satisfied until I see a Dominion Government the full 100 per cent. Co-operative. This legislature is nothing more than a glorified rural or city council and should be run along the same lines as rural or city councils. In every line of business we advance in accordance with the times. Why not, then, in the matter of the Provincial Legislature?

When the Legislature opened the other day with all its ceremony, I saw great colour, great pomp and show, and when I came in here I thought I must be dreaming. Later I noticed that Oliver Cromwell was not present, that I was not dreaming at all, and I suddenly realised that it was 1930. Yet here we were using the very methods of Cromwell's time! So I say, Mr. Speaker, why use methods so out-of-date and inefficient? The biggest business concern in this country could have conducted its annual business in the time we have spent in this pointless debate, and I am participating in it not for the sake of speaking, but to set forth my views and to tell where and for what I stand.

I am anxious to see a Government in this province made up after this manner: Each member to come here as an absolute independent, independent of each other but representing the constituency from which he comes. The first duty of such a Legislature after its election would be to meet in this Chamber and elect a leader. That is, the Premier would be elected by the whole representation of the province. Then would follow the election of the executive or Government to carry on the business of the province and this, too, would be elected by all the elected members.

So long as there are groups elected to this House as at present, then I say the Premier should be elected by all the groups and all groups should be represented in the Government in their proper proportion. Under such conditions, the Government today would consist of three Conservatives, three Liberals, one Independent and one Progressive. — A gentleman says here, two Independents, but their numbers would not warrant that. The Ministers from each of these groups would be chosen from and by the groups themselves. I have a great deal of criticism to make of the way cabinets are chosen at the present time, because the people who elect the members do not have a say as to who goes into the cabinet. There is too much outside influence exercised at the present time. If under the conditions I have outlined, there were any groups that would not co-operate, those who would co-operate should do so and leave the others to come in as soon as they had seen their mistake.

Saskatchewan as I see it is a corporation in which the electors are the shareholders, the members of the Legislature are the representatives and the Government the Board of Directors, and I say it should conduct the business of the province in the manner the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Wheat Pool, conducts its affairs. In connection with the Wheat Pool, there are elected each year 160 delegates without a cent of campaign funds being required; and you cannot tell me that campaign funds are necessary for the election of members to this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to some other matters, very briefly. First of all, I would deal with the matter of highways. The Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) has stated that any system of road work that shall be carried on must necessarily be "a patch-work" system. I am opposed to any "patch-work" system in the future; we have seen far too much of that in the past. To illustrate, let me tell you a little story. It is about a road in my constituency (I think the Honourable Premier knows the road to which I refer). It is a good road, in parts; but at one point on it some practical joker had stuck up a sign: "Choose your rut here; you cannot change for eight miles."

I suggest that our road programme should follow the same lines as in the rural municipalities. They start with market roads leading from the town in all directions and they keep on with the road until they get it finished. There is no "patch-work" in the municipalities and there should be none in the provincial system. We should build our roads starting somewhere and keep on until they get somewhere. I would like to know when I start out for a place that I am going to get there, but at the present time, coming into Regina from my district you get along all right until you are within eight miles of the city and then the condition is almost impassable; and that condition has existed for some years.

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

Resuming at 8.50 o'clock p.m., Mr. Benson said:

Mr. Speaker,—When the House rose at 6 o'clock I had just about concluded my remarks on the highway. Before going on, however, I would like to tell our friends the Cabinet Ministers that, if they worked for us on the farm and came in 20 minutes late, they would be fired; and I want to tell them there are enough farmers here to see that, if they want to keep their jobs, they must come in on time.

Just to get you in good humor, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you a story. When I have an opportunity of speaking to any audience, it reminds me of the young lad with the pup he was training to be a good watch-dog. The lad tied the pup out on the verandah and along came his father and the pup growled, refusing to let him pass. The father called to the boy to call off his dog, but the lad asked: "Father, cannot you stand it a little longer, it is excellent training for the pup."

There is another story, and it explains to us why people are Conservatives and Liberals. I may say it is not my story, I have heard it given by speakers speaking against party politics. —

Jim and his friend were in conversation one day, and his friend said: "Jim, to what religious denomination do you belong?" "I am a Presbyterian," he answered. "And what is a Presbyterian?" Jim was asked. "Well, a Presbyterian is opposite to a Methodist," said Jim. "And why are you of that particular leaning, Jim?" "Well, it is like this, you see," said Jim, "Grandfather was a Presbyterian, father was a Presbyterian, and so am I." "What politics are you, Jim?" asked his friend. "Oh, I am a Liberal," complacently replied Jim. "A Liberal, what is that?" said his friend. "Well, where have you lived all this time that you need to ask that question?" laughed Jim,

"You see, there are Liberals and Conservatives and one is opposite to the other." "Oh," said the friend, not feeling overly enlightened, "and why are you a Liberal?" "Well, you see," said Jim, "all our family has been Liberal for years, so, so am I."

That story has as much argument as to why men are Liberals or Conservatives as any argument I have yet heard.

Since my election to this House, Mr. Speaker, I have been introduced invariably as "the guy who put the skids under Sam Latta." I want to tell you that I do not claim that honour. Mr. Latta put the skids under himself when he decided to serve the interests of the Liberal party instead of the people of this province.

Just before closing my remarks on highways, I have a clipping here I would like to read. I want to say that I read the *Regina Star*, the *Saskatoon Star* and the *Regina Leader* and I do not believe all I read in any of them. But the following from the *Regina Post* of November 29, 1929, will close my remarks on highways:

"It is generally realised that it is no simple task to provide Saskatchewan with all-weather roads and it will be noted that the present Government of the Province is proceeding cautiously in the matter. It is proposed to concentrate on six trunk highways, three running east and west and three north and south. For this purpose five million dollars a year will be spent from the public funds but not until the end of next season will it be possible to say definitely how many miles of gravelled highway can be built for that sum. It may be taken for granted that the people want permanent roads with the least possible delay and no doubt are prepared to pay for them on a reasonable basis. Mr. Stewart, Minister of Highways, is new to the job but has indicated quite clearly that he is going to make a much better Minister of Highways than those who preceded him in the office. He is entitled to a fair chance to show what he can do and will be judged by results."

As I understand it, Hon. Mr. Stewart's predecessors as Ministers of Highways were Mr. Latta, Mr. Spence and Mr. Gardiner; but I want to warn the *Regina Post* against handing out too many compliments to the present Minister of Highways or he will have to buy a new hat.

With regard to power, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am going to support the power policy as stated by the Government because I believe in public ownership of power. There is a great problem on power confronting the province today, and it is due to the failure of the late Government to meet the situation when the problem first arose a few years ago. They waited until private interests were established in the province before they took a definite stand and that is why a serious situation along those lines confronts this province today. The other day the Liberal members were criticising the attitude of the Government in regard to the sale of the Moose Jaw plant; but I say, had the late Government come out definitely for public ownership of power before those companies came here, the situation would have been easy to handle.

I want to say a few words on Immigration. I am opposed to any immigration to Saskatchewan at the present time and until such time as all the people in the province are kept occupied. I believe provincial control must be recognised and exercised and that the Railway Agreement in respect to Immigration should be cancelled and never renewed. Further immigration at the present time would mean more unemployment and distress; it would lead to more production of wheat and a greater world surplus; and increased production with restricted markets to a lower price and that would be but another step to peasantry in this province.

The tariff measure passed in 1928 and which became effective on February 1, 1929, was a direct slap at Britain and our wheat market. The Co-operative Conference held in Regina in 1928 at which were represented the great co-operative and consumers' organisations of Great Britain and the Wheat Pools of this country saw a good understanding reached between the consumers and the producers. Out of that conference should have come a market in Britain to sell our wheat at a price over cost of production. But this regulation which increased the duties on British cotton, woollen and copper goods, came along. There was not a word of protest from this Provincial House which was then sitting. What was the effect of that regulation? Immediately, a British delegation went to Russia to see if the wheat industry in Russia could not be re-established and to find there a market for British goods, and if there was a market in Russia for manufactured goods from Britain, then Britain would offer a market to Russia for wheat. There should never have been any question about Canada, or Western Canada in particular, retaining the British market for its wheat. Russia will come back, then I ask, where will Canada's greatest industry be when Russia does come

back? Where will Saskatchewan wheat growers be and where will Saskatchewan be without its market? Saskatchewan grows the best wheat in the world. Canada is the greatest exporter of wheat in the world, but what is the good of all this without a market? The farmers are faced with a serious problem. Unless this problem is solved, there are only two courses for the farmers: lower standard of living and another step to peasantry, or leave the farm. I am not a pessimist, Mr. Speaker, but because I realise the conditions I say this: We have got to solve the problem or the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to become peasants; we are moving at an alarming rate to the state of peasantry in our rural areas.

I have a few quotations to give along those lines. I know you realise the situation and I want to show what other men think about this thing. First I am going to read from "Mankind at the Crossroads" by Edward M. East:

"Perhaps the most helpful means available today for aiding agriculture is an indirect one—a severe permanent restriction on immigration. Any present cry for immigration can only be made by the fool, the hypocrite, or the ignorant. First there is the individual who wishes to exploit alien labour at low wages, failing to realise that this policy is no more defensible as business than it is as ethics. There are plenty of people whose productive ability is but slightly over the starvation level. They are not assets to the country, and they are liabilities on the floor of a factory. Let us not import them; we will raise a large enough crop of the native article. On the other hand, if this type of business man succeeds in getting worthy and competent employees at starvation wages, his success is equivocal at best. He drives away ambition and reduces output always, and too often forces the development of that pathological ego which magnifies both its own ability and the hardships it has to face.

"In the same category belong the transportation companies that have ever been ready and willing to betray the country into accepting undesirables for the thirty pieces of silver involved in a steerage passage."

And, Mr. Speaker, we know that is true in this country at the present time:

"Then there are those whose sympathies are developed more highly than their brains. They wish to transport their kindred of the fourth degree, root and branch, to this more fertile garden-spot without realising the chance they take of making the garden spot something of a wilderness for kindred of the first degree, their children.

"Of somewhat the same stripe are the numerous dabblers in sociology who honestly believe immigration should be encouraged for the twofold good of the immigrant and the country. To such as these one may say: 'Do you realise that the immigrant nearly always comes with a lower standard of living and tends to reduce the one he meets by his competition? Do you realise that the unrestrained fertility of the new arrivals depresses the fecundity of the native sons and daughters who know that the time of diminishing returns has come? Do you realise that the smaller the quantity of this artificial increase of population, the greater will be the length of time available to meet the economic re-adjustment required by diminishing returns?'

"Next, the farmer's financial way should be made as easy as possible. Farming of the right sort should be made attractive. Something is now being done in the way of extending credit. This will help matters, if properly handled. But the type of operation carried out by the Farm Loan Banks does not really get to the bottom of things. The true financial worry of the farmer comes from having to plant his maximum acreage from six months to a year before he receives his returns, without having any idea of the price he is to receive for his labour. He not only has to plant, but he has to plant pretty much the same crops as he planted the previous year, for proper farming means specialisation. He is therefore between the upper and the nether millstones.

"Now I am sure I can give no concrete remedy for this problem. It is too big and involved for offhand solution. Yet it must have a solution, even though it be somewhat imperfect, if the nation is going to make the most of its resources. Solutions should be worked out by experts, and Congress forced into line to try them out. Something can certainly be done to give the farmer a return for his products that is based on the cost of production, as in any other business; and that is all he asks."

That was written by Professor East, of Harvard University. I am next going to quote from "Rural Life at the Crossroads," by Professor Campbell, head of the Department of Rural Education at Iowa State Teachers' College:

"Farm Tenantry. The United States census records (of 1920) show that tenantry is constantly increasing among American farmers. In our early history fertile virgin farm lands were so plentiful that nearly every family which tilled the soil could secure a farm of its own by settling upon it or by purchasing it for a few dollars per acre. With the exhaustion of public lands suitable for farming, tenantry began to increase. By 1880, the number of farmers who did not own the land they tilled had risen to 26 per cent. of the total number; by 1900 to 35 per cent.; by 1920, to 38 per cent. In nine leading agricultural states the number of landless farmers has increased to between 40 and 50 per cent. of the total number of farmers in the state. In two agricultural states more than half the farmers are now landless. The increasing loss of the land by those who till it is one of the signs of decay in American rural life today."

I quote from these books, Mr. Speaker, because I cannot find anything along those lines by Canadian authors. However, we all know conditions in Canada are much the same as they are in the United States.

"Farm Mortgages. A second sign of decay in American rural life is found in the constantly increasing mortgaged indebtedness against the farm lands. The census records show that by 1890 approximately 28 per cent. of the owner-operated farms in the United States were encumbered by mortgages. By 1920 the number so burdened had risen to approximately 40 per cent. of the owner-operated farms.

"After a farmer mortgages his farm he no longer owns the farm; he owns only a part interest, or equity, in it. The holder of the mortgage owns the other part interest, or equity, in the farm. The holders of the mortgages against American farms now live largely in the cities. The people of the towns and cities are acquiring a constantly increasing equity in these mortgaged farms. The equity owned by the farmers who till the mortgaged farms is constantly decreasing. In 1910 farmer operators owned 72.7 per cent. of the total value of the mortgaged farms, in 1920 they owned 70.9 per cent., and in 1925 it was estimated that their equity had shrunk to approximately 60 per cent. The rapid decrease in the farmers' equity, as estimated in 1925, is the result of two causes: when the value of farms increased rapidly (1910 to 1920) the indebtedness against them increased rapidly; later, when the value of the farms shrank rapidly (1920 to 1925), the indebtedness against them did not shrink to the same degree. Hence the farmers lost.

"From the angle of the practical problem which farmers face in paying the interest on the mortgages each year, we find that in the ten-year period from 1910 to 1920, the load of annual interest on farm mortgages approximately doubled. To make the situation worse, the net earning power of the farm has decreased during the very period when the interest to be paid on the farm mortgages has doubled.

"From the angle of actual loss on the investment we find that the average rate of interest paid on farm mortgages is 6.1 per cent. (1920) whereas the earnings to the farmer on his investments in land are about 3 per cent. The result at present is a dead loss of staggering proportions to farm communities, which now carry a mortgage load of nearly eight billions of dollars.

"The increasing extent to which those who till the land are losing their ownership in it through the increasing burden of mortgage indebtedness is another sign of the decay of rural life in America."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you a few figures on the cost of production in Saskatchewan. The figures I am going to quote were prepared by Prof. Allen of the Department of Farm Management at the University of Saskatchewan. Some of you may know that he conducted a survey of different districts in Saskatchewan on the farm business. Unfortunately, I have only the figures from two of the best districts in Saskatchewan and none from any of the poorer districts. This is a summary of the indebtedness of Belbeck Farm Owners in 1926:

| | Average Capital farms reporting debt | Average farm debt |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Size of farms: | | |
| Under 100 acres wheat..... | \$15,571 | \$ 3,200 |
| 101 to 149 acres wheat..... | 23,395 | 4,917 |
| 150 to 199 acres wheat..... | 25,030 | 10,218 |
| 200 to 249 acres wheat..... | 34,039 | 8,227 |
| 250 to 299 acres wheat..... | 42,351 | 11,200 |
| 300 to 349 acres wheat..... | 46,804 | 20,000 |
| 350 acres wheat and over..... | 76,853 | 19,325 |

I want to show you the cost of production on these farms in this same district of Belbeck:

| | |
|--|---------|
| Cost of producing 5,361 bushels of wheat | \$5,372 |
| Cost of producing wheat per bushel | 1.002 |
| Received for 5,361 bushels of wheat | 6,805 |
| Selling price per bushel of wheat | 1.269 |
| Profit per bushel of wheat | 0.267 |
| Average bushels of wheat sold per acre | 25.9 |
| Cost of production per acre | 25.95 |
| Profit per acre | 6.92 |

I have to read you a little passage from the report to follow up these figures:

"The average cost of wheat production was considerably lower at Belbeck than for most parts of Saskatchewan. This low cost resulted from the extremely favourable conditions experienced there during 1925, and also from the permanent natural advantages associated with its soil. With the high price prevailing a very generous profit was made by the grower.

"Details of the cost of production per acre are probably of greater service to the farmer than details of the cost of production per bushel. Working costs per acre are comparatively stable, whereas the cost of raising the bushel of grain fluctuates with the yield per acre.

"The average yield of wheat for Saskatchewan in 1925 was 18.5 bushels per acre. Had the provincial average yield been obtained on these farms, with the selling price of the grain and the cost of production per acre unchanged, the costs would then have exceeded receipts by \$0.13 per bushel, or by \$2.47 per acre, and the total wheat raised per farm would have sold for \$511.29 below its cost of production.

"The difference in yield per acre between the Belbeck farms and the average for the province is 8.9 bushels. The costs per acre do not vary materially with yield except for harvesting and threshing. The average price paid for threshing was 12 cents per bushel, with an extra two cents when a cook car was provided. The cost is generally materially lower where farmers thresh their own grain. The deduction of 12 cents per bushel for 8.9 bushels per acre reduces the cost per acre \$1.07, from \$25.95 to \$24.88. With this cost per acre the cost of production per bushel would be \$1.345. On this basis the average price per bushel of \$1.269 would be \$0.076 less than the cost of production."

I have some figures from the Melfort district, but I will not trouble you with those at the present time. I have also the survey made by a private person, as well as the survey by Dr. Allen showing a comparison between the cost price and the average selling price of all Pool wheat for the different years from 1924. I might say that the figures I have here are compiled from nine outside surveys of over 400 units:

| | Average yield | Cost Price Basis Ft. William | Selling Price Basis Ft. William |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1924 crop | 11.90 | 1.94 | 1.52 5/8 |
| 1925 crop | 18.70 | 1.36 | 1.39 1/4 |
| 1926 crop | 17.80 | 1.40 1/4 | 1.30 7/8 |
| 1927 crop | 20.40 | 1.27 | 1.20 1/4 |
| 1928 crop | 21.80 | 1.22 | .98 5/8 (now final) |

The 1928 figures are not yet available.

I read those figures just to indicate where we are going in the wheat industry in Saskatchewan. I want to read the conclusion of an article in "The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science." I would just like to read what is on the cover of this volume. Under the heading "Farm Relief," it says:

"The Nation is committed to Farm Relief Legislation at this session of Congress. Such legislation to be of lasting value must lead to and be part of a permanent national agricultural policy."

I think the same situation exists here. What I am going to read now is from an article on "The Farm Income Problem," by Professor R. J. McFall, formerly of Massachusetts Agricultural College. He says:

"Why, though, since other industries have also increased their efficiency in late years, is it that farm prices are low in comparison with the prices of other

products and the farm income is not increasing as rapidly as the national farm income? This seems unfair to the farmers. The reason lies in two factors. One is that the costs of distribution, which enter so largely into the prices of things farmers (and others) buy, have not declined as have the costs of agriculture and manufacturing. Another factor is still more far-reaching and less readily accepted as yet. It is that the demand for farm products is not increasing as rapidly as the demand for other products, nor even as rapidly as the farm production.

"The problem of reducing the costs of distribution is now being attacked vigorously by the Government and other agencies. Good results are appearing."

This, of course, refers to the United States.

"The problem of a greater expansion of farm output than the demand for its products is potentially serious. The writer has for years protested against the impending-starvation theory. The real facts are now becoming so apparent that they are more generally faced. The history of modern civilisation shows that among western peoples a smaller and smaller proportion of the people is required in agriculture in order to feed the total population ever more generously. Increased efficiency in all branches of economic life brings more production per person in the total population. But in what lines can we increase our consumption? Our intake of food cannot be increased appreciably in quantity. Its quality and cost in terms of human effort are being increased somewhat through the use of a greater proportion of animal products and through the use of less seasonable fruits and vegetables. Such increased demands upon the farms per unit of total population are limited, however, and the fact has been with us for a century that our food production employs a decreasing proportion of our population on the farm. This is a world-wide phenomenon where western civilisation rules. The increasing human demands must be diverted to what would have been luxuries to our ancestors. The maintenance of life consumes a decreasing share of our total energies, and farm production is largely engaged in supplying the means for the mere maintenance of life. The natural sequel is that farm prices and farm incomes are sufficiently low to divert a steady stream of people from farming to other occupations.

"We realise, today, as we did not a decade ago, that this is true of farming and of other basic industries as well. Men must be diverted to other activities catering to what would once have been classed as luxury demands. The result is a keener struggle for existence in farming and these other industries whose products are not subject to an increasing per capita demand.

"When confronted, as we are, with facts showing a tendency toward a decline in the growth of population in this country and in our chief foreign food markets, we see the seriousness of the situation. Dr. Baker points out that our national agricultural production increased 13.5 per cent., while our population increased only about 8 per cent. Dr. Kuczynski shows that even in England, the world's chief food importer, the present birth rate is not great enough to maintain the population of that country. No wonder that our farmers are receiving a diminished share of our national income!

"In view of the fact that the demands upon our farms are not likely to grow more rapidly than our total population, and that increased per capita expenditures will be largely for non-farm products, we can hardly hope to see the farm income rise as rapidly as the total national income. Those who claim that the farms should by rights receive a full share of the national income look on the matter superficially if they claim this for the total farming population. However, the claim may, with reason, be made for the farmers as individuals. If our economic life were thoroughly balanced at all times, the numbers employed in agriculture might be kept so reduced that the average farm income would keep pace with the average national income.

"This latter situation is an end highly to be desired. It is but justice that the prosperity of our farmers should equal the prosperity of their city cousins. Such an end can hardly be secured by simple means, however. It cannot be expected to be attained if obstacles such as 'keep the boy on the farm' propaganda, are placed in the way of occupational migration to other livelihoods. Neither can it be expected from measures which will artificially maintain prices while allowing farm production to go on increasing faster than its market.

"Real solution of the farm income problem demands radical and far-reaching measures for its solution. A board engaged in its study might well inquire as to whether or not our farm traditions tend toward keeping too large a share of our population on our farms; whether or not our agricultural educational policies tend

toward an increase in production not based upon market demands, as expressed in price; whether or not national policies which help individual farmers so encourage increased production as to prove a detriment to the whole body of farmers."

I shall just read the last paragraph in this, Mr. Speaker, so as not to keep you too long:

"The dairy farmers of the Philadelphia area, under wise economic leadership, have shown that the serious problems of seasonal surplus can be controlled to the advantage of both producer and consumer. This has been done by going to the root of the problem and controlling the cause. At the same time those dairymen who have attempted to control price, while neglecting its cause, have not met with such success. If the dairy farmers can find a solution for their chief troubles, a solution is not impossible for the larger problems of the farm income. It will be necessary, however, to go deeper than the superficial symptoms and to attack the underlying causes of the situation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only way I see to solve this problem is by education. It is an educational problem. The farmers and their children must be educated along lines that will teach them how to solve their own problems. They must be educated so that the agriculturists of this country shall be on a par with the industrialists in the city, because, if they are not educated along these lines and not able to meet the competition of the industrialists of the cities, we will never have the progress of the one on a proportional basis to the other.

The only figures I have heard on the Saskatchewan condition with regard to farm mortgages are those which the honourable member for Kindersley (*Mr. Whatley*) mentioned in his speech in this debate the other day. He said the total of farm mortgages was \$200,000,00 and I want to say, in addition to that, that I am given to understand that farm mortgages in one district cover 95 per cent. of the farms, and, in the light of these figures, I would like you to consider where we are going as an agricultural province.

I want to say in conclusion that I believe Premier Anderson and his Government are sincere and are trying to do the best they can, and I will do the best I can to assist them. I want to tell them that, if this Government develops into a real Co-operative Government, it will live long; but if, like my friend's dairy cow, it reverts back to the type of the major political party from which it sprung, it will be dead and buried within eight years.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

THE HONOURABLE A. C. STEWART, LL.B., K.C.

(*Minister of Highways*)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In accordance with time-honoured custom and following the precedent set by other speakers who have already spoken in this debate, I wish to extend my hearty congratulations on your appointment as Speaker of this House. We know and appreciate that you will deal fairly with both sides and that you will decide such questions as may arise in the House in accordance with the best practices set and followed by a long line of Speakers in the British House of Parliament and in the Houses of the Dominion of Canada. There is one thing I would like to say in the opening words of my address, and in saying this I believe I speak for all members on this side of the House, that we of the British nations pride ourselves on the fact that we are just. We also pride ourselves on our great institutions, we pride ourselves on our jury system, and I shall just say this. That when a man comes before a jury for trial, the judge instructs the jury that they must give to that man the benefit of all reasonable doubt: And I would ask you if and when you have any doubt that you will give to the members over on that side of the House the benefit of the doubt as they may need that benefit.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply and to add to the commendations that have already been forthcoming in this House to them for the ability with which they presented their "maiden" speeches. I also wish to congratulate the "maiden" speakers on each side. You would think they were old campaigners and they certainly did not give me the impression of being blushing brides either.

As other speakers have done, I regret the length of time which has been taken up in this debate, but there was possibly a lot of "atmosphere" to clear away before we could get down to business. I may prolong the debate myself somewhat this evening.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my remarks will not apply to the younger members over there, for I appreciate they were possibly trained in the wrong school and that there is still hope for some of what we believe to be the young element. But as for the "hard-boiled" fellows over there, they can take them at their full face value. It is, Mr. Speaker, common knowledge that throughout the last campaign the electors were told freely by members on that side of the House and by speakers supporting them throughout the province that, in the event of this great Liberal Government being superseded, there was not enough ability in the Opposition wherewith to fill their places in the Cabinet. It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, with great awe, reverence and humility that I have the effrontery to speak in the presence of such intelligensia as remain of the former Cabinet of the Provincial Government. And should I be somewhat diffident in my remarks and perhaps not as careful as I should be, I suggest you would be not too lenient but extend the membership of that group which contains those members who, by their experience, should not expect as much leniency as some of the newer members, to include myself.

The honourable member from Pipestone (*Mr. W. J. Patterson*) was rather amusing. He said that the members on this side of the House at every opportunity boasted of their triumph and gloated over their victory and he said, on the other hand, that they themselves were models of good sportsmanship, or words to that effect. Now, I do not know what good sportsmanship is if they are models of good sportsmanship. I have engaged in a number of sports, and I had always thought a good sportsman when losing was the first to admit the other fellows were the victors. It took my honourable friends in the Opposition several months, Mr. Speaker, to admit they had been beaten and, frankly, those on this side do not think they really realise they have been beaten yet! One of the members of the previous Cabinet I have not even met. Though other members of the late Liberal Government have offered their congratula-

tions to us, he has not. That is the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*). And I have been longing to meet him for some time in order that we might together discuss a few things which I think are in interests of the people of Saskatchewan, things which we should discuss possibly as well for my benefit as for his, and I intend to discuss some of those things this evening.

Now, I would just say further, in connection with their example of sportsmanship, not only did they hold to office three months after the Saskatchewan electorate had condemned them but during that term of office they spent the people's money freely and, as we might say, like drunken sailors. They spent money in every department and I intend to go into their spendings in the Highways Department at some length. Since the campaign and since their ejection from office, the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) has been touring the province of Saskatchewan trying to resuscitate the remains of the so-called Liberal party. I have here an item which appeared in the Moose Jaw Times-Herald. It is the report of a speech by the Leader of the Opposition. He says:

"The only co-operative element in the Cabinet was the Honourable A. C. Stewart, Minister of Highways, all the other members of the Cabinet being Conservatives. The only co-operative representative in the Government for 28 Liberals and 11 Independents and Progressives was Mr. Stewart, who claimed to have been a Liberal when young, who ran as a Progressive in 1925 and as an Independent in 1929 and he had surrendered all rights to be called anything but a Conservative."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that speech has been made by divers persons and by members on the other side, following their leader. It is quite true, as the Leader of the Opposition is quoted, that I was a member of the Liberal organisation when young. The rest I think he has got mixed. The fundamental thing is this that, whether as Conservative or Progressive or Independent, I have been consistent and that has been in opposition all the time to the so-called Liberal "machine" in this province. I believe, as the previous speaker has intimated, that policies are more important than parties and the people of this province are more interested in having a business administration in Regina than they are particularly interested in this or that party. That is a fundamental; and if you do not agree with that you cannot give good government. I might point out that the members of the Progressive group on this side and the Independents, too, have been ridiculed in this House by members of the Opposition because they helped to form a Co-operative Government with the Conservatives.

I might point out, too, for the edification of the honourable members opposite, that every one of these Independents and Progressives was elected in direct opposition to Liberal candidates and none other, who were nominated and defeated as straight Liberal candidates supporting the so-called Gardiner Government, and these Independents and Progressives, who were elected, were instructed by their electorate to vote that Government out. The Leader of the Opposition says, "Why, here, you should not have co-operated with the Conservatives!" Well, it was the duty of the Progressives and Independents to say, once they had turned one Government out, "We shall have to put one in." The people of this province did not desire another election and it was the duty of these Independents and Progressives to form a stable Government in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say further that it has been more or less intimated from the Opposition benches that in the event of this Government going back to the electorate for endorsement that the people would not agree to this Co-operative Government. Well, let me tell my honourable friends that they had the opportunity to test that out in the by-elections and they did not do so. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition further, that one of his famous road superintendents, Archie McCallum, and to his knowledge, too, spent considerable time in my seat for the sole purpose of trying to make sure whether they could not beat me in the by-election and at a meeting they had in Melville with the leading members of the Liberal organisation at Yorkton the thought was, "Can we beat him?" Why did they not try it?

The Leader of the Opposition passed up his chance when he did not have those by-elections contested, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot say that the people of the province are not in favour of the Co-operative Government. Well, they have had the chance to test public opinion of this Government in any of those by-elections and they did not take advantage of the opportunity.

We have heard of other forecasts, too, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition during the last campaign talked about the sixty moral victories they were going to

score, the same sort of moral victory, he said, that he chided the Leader of this Government about when he was over there on those benches, as was scored in the famous Arm River by-election. Well, we gained thirty-five moral victories and I feel safe to say that we may come fairly close to sixty moral victories when the next election comes around. So far as the Leader of this Government is concerned, he was very freely chastised as an "old-line" Tory and an autocrat in the last campaign by "the machine." Personally, I, like a lot of electors, figuratively speaking, swallowed a lot of what was said. Since I have been a member of the Government — and may I say I was not picked by the Leader of the Government but by the members of the Independent group as their representative in the Cabinet — since I have been in the Government I have found the Leader of the Government anything but an autocrat and anything but intolerant, regardless of race, religion or anything else. We are satisfied with the Leader of the Government whether the Leader of the Opposition is satisfied or not.

The member for Estevan, of course, contended that really you had to be one or the other, — either a Liberal or a Conservative. I think the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*) has neglected his political education. If he will cast his eyes over to the province to the west, Alberta, and to the province to the east, Manitoba, he will see that they have neither a Liberal nor a Conservative Government but a Farmers' Government. They have governments of the people's choosing. But they say, "You have different groups in your Government, Progressives, Independents and Conservatives, and they are really an unholy mixture!" I would ask them, before they start to attack us, to remember that they are taking a chance. Let them look to the members sitting on their own side of the House first. They have sitting over there the member for Redberry, a former Progressive, and they have sitting there the member for Saskatoon County, a former Progressive.

Mr. Agar: Just as much Progressive as we ever were.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am glad to hear it!

Mr. Agar: You fellows do not understand what a Progressive is anyway!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You will get a chance to speak after a while if you want to. You may not be used to it but you have got to take a few of these things. You have those two members. And I do not blame them altogether. They were elected, of course, in opposition to the previous administration. They were elected in opposition to the so-called "machine" in this province. A few years ago you found the member for Saskatoon County and the member for Redberry talking along the same lines and holding the same principles as held by other Progressive candidates in the province and opposing "the machine." They were elected and found themselves in this House. But being among the minority, they found their road grants were not coming through and they found it all a hopeless case. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did they do? Did they change their minds? They said, "Well, we don't like the rest of you fellows in the Progressive party," and they walked over and enlisted in the so-called Liberal party. The road grants automatically increased, and they got their price. As far as the honourable member for Pelly (*Mr. R. J. M. Parker*) is concerned, he used to be a Conservative and he ran as a Conservative at one time. And they come to this House and say, "Look what you have over there, Conservatives, Progressives and Independents." Let me tell you, you have got everything but Independents over on that side of the House.

Now, I would like to say further that you hear of "Liberalism." I have heard the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) orating on it at different times and I think that he really should have a little education in the true principles of Liberalism. You will find that the Liberal party first came into being in the province of Ontario, and if you will refer to your Liberal Speaker's Handbook, you will find there stated:

"The Liberal party first asserted itself in Upper Canada (now Ontario) in and previous to the rebellion of 1837 by boldly protesting against the tyranny of the group known as the 'Family Compact'."

and that is very interesting when you go back over the history of the Liberal party:

"... and by demand (1) the exclusion from political or partisan office of all appointees of the government. These had to cease to be political workers..."

But how Liberalism has changed under the so-called "machine"!

"These had to cease to be political workers."

But here is the choice bit of the whole thing. The honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Urrich*) cannot talk about Tories because he talks Tory all the time:

"To the Tory, the institution is a machine, its efficient working is everything, and it is the duty of the individual to subordinate himself to that object whether his own interest is served by it or not."

There is the foundation of Liberalism. I will say that the so-called Liberal party's greatest institution in this province was "the machine." They gloried in "the machine." They revelled and roared about the strength of themselves and what they would do with this and that poor candidate. Some of us know! The honourable member for Wadena (*Mr. Taylor*) knows I am right, and other honourable members over there know I am right. And I know you do not like it, but you are going to get some more. They have experiences with "the machine" the same as I had, and the honourable member for Pelly remembers when "the machine," by the use of the conscription cry in the foreign-born districts defeated him in the district he now represents. We know and we went out to smash "the machine" — and in order to smash it we formed one group and co-operated and we intend to try to give good service. But there is one thing in particular that I do not think you have really realised yet. You have not given yourselves a name. You cannot call yourselves the Liberal party. Your own ancestors would rebel and turn in their graves if they thought you represented Liberalism. That is impossible! The good name "Co-operative" has already been chosen by this side. Now, they have a party over in Italy they call the "Fascisti" and I would suggest you adopt the name of "The Saskatchewan Fascists." You would have all the attributes that distinguish your noted precursors in Italy and you have a pocket edition of Mussolini leading you.

Now, there is another thing I would like you to realise, and I do not want the honourable gentlemen to say we are rubbing it in (though we had it rubbed in steadily here for the past four years, or at least those members of the old Opposition did before we were elected) and I would tell them individually to be a sport and take a little of their own medicine. There is one other thing I would say to the Leader of the Opposition and that is that wherever a government has been in power for a great length of time it takes the members of that government a considerable time to realise that they are defeated, that they merited that defeat and that they had to find out that they had made a mistake. Now, is not that the attitude of the Opposition? They had gone back to the people and forced an election with results most disastrous to themselves.(*Interruptions by members of Opposition.*)

I thought I would get you talking soon. You will find that the first one or two years are the worst and that, after that stage is reached, you will realise that you actually have been defeated and you will find the next twenty-two years won't be so bad. And I would say particularly to the younger members — I do not think we can do much with the older — but for the benefit of the younger members, that when you have arrived at the conclusion that this Government is going to give an honest and business-like administration and have taken that short course in co-operative policies, we will invite you over to this side.

Now, there is this to consider, too: That the people of the province in the last general election did turn you out. That is admitted. You were criticised and warned by your Opposition in this House, and I do not blame an Opposition for criticising, where that criticism is going to produce results in better legislation. But a lot of the talk that has taken place in this House will not serve that purpose and I would say in connection with that that you should, in your Opposition, try and be constructive. You will find that the fellows on this side are not so bad, even some of these Tories. You will find a Tory in your own camp. He is not a bad fellow at all. And you found a place for honourable members in your ranks who were Progressives. You will find the same over here, and while I do not agree with the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*), though for the first year the old bitterness of the campaign may be evident here and there, the next 23 or 24 years will be more reasonable and it won't be so bad at all!

I am going to deal for a minute with the matter of the Civil Service. You have been criticising us on that matter very drastically. Your statement at the one time is that, "You are firing these people indiscriminately and appointing others in the Service," and in the next breath you ask, "Why did not you clean the 'machine' out?" There have been many wild statements made from one end of the province to the other by members of the former "machine" and those statements have been re-echoed in the press about the wholesale dismissals which have, or which they allege to have, been

made. The actual Civil Service includes only 1,700, or whatever the exact figure is; and possibly among the dismissals they would include the road inspectors and road supervisors. These supervisors were not in the Civil Service.

Mr. Gardiner: The road inspectors were in the Civil Service. You mentioned it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You will find these outside supervisors were included in those figures, and a number of others in the figures which were not part of the Civil Service. And I would say this in connection with that, these men were all warned that they would be dismissed if found taking part in election work. I would say further in a number of cases, and I can name them, there are men in the Civil Service at the present moment who have admitted taking part. I saw them myself; they drove cars, and manned polls but they said under the system they were told to do it and they gave that as an excuse and they have been kept on the staff. That has happened in a number of cases: The vendor in the Liquor Store at Yorkton, one of the men in the Land Titles at Yorkton, the assistant vendor of the Liquor Store, — they gave the same excuse and that runs through the whole of the governmental departments. There are men in my own department who admitted they were forced to take part. I have one man of foreign-born parentage and he was ordered out by none other than Archie McCallum for the purpose of electioneering in a foreign-born poll. He said that Archie McCallum told him to do it. That is not good government, and fundamentally wrong to order men out to work for election purposes. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, has mentioned that certain men were dismissed in his own constituency. I would say to him that in the North Qu'Appelle constituency there was one superintendent of highways, one special maintenance operator and two, four, six, seven — seven road supervisors and I can tell him further that none of those men are necessary, and that they will not be replaced this year. You just had nine in there. These men were all drawing money from a fund made up of the taxes of the people of this province. They are not necessary and never were necessary in the winter months.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman will permit me to correct a statement.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Are you arising on a point of order?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, I am going to. The supervisors of highways have never been drawing money for the supervising of highways in the winter months, and quite a number of them were off.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In reply to the honourable gentleman I would say they all drew money.

Mr. Gardiner: You said they did in the winter months.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am talking about their salaries before the election and your superintendents and inspectors were employed all the time, winter and summer.

Mr. Gardiner: I presumed you were dealing with them up to the present time. They were always off in the winter time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They were off a great part of the time.

(Interruptions by Opposition members.)

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They went "with the flies" anyway in the winter time. Now, in connection with the statements of the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Ulrich*), I used to hear that the so-called Tory party was good at flag-waving. Some of you Progressives will know how they talk about flag-waving and have been doing it since 1911. Well, I have never listened to the honourable member from Rosthern unless he has been waving the flag. He waves the flag better than any Tory I ever knew. Well, I know all about the campaign that is carried on among the foreign people of this province. They represent 50 per cent. of the vote in my seat, and they also represent 50 per cent. of the vote in the seat of the member for Wadena. That is quite true of twelve other seats in this province and every one of those seats supported the previous Administration, while in the other seats in the province the verdict was for members who support this Government. Now, why was that? They were brought in here; they were being educated under our laws. You would expect that you would not find them voting one way. But we find that the honourable member for Rosthern made

his political stamping grounds in the foreign-born seats. You find that when he came into a French-Canadian seat he was playing on their sentiments, and when he was talking in any foreign-born seat he was playing on the sentiments of the people there. He is really the most adaptable fellow I ever saw in my life.

Mr. Hogan: He never changed his name.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, perhaps he should have. He will be "Co-operative" after I am through with him. In each one of these seats a steady propaganda has been carried on for years by the Liberal "machine." In each seat, national sentiment is played upon. "Heelers" and others among these people were encouraged in carrying on a vicious campaign against candidates in opposition to "the machine," particularly if he were a Conservative, but always against any candidate that was running. They were told in the last campaign throughout the province, that if these terrible Tories ever got in, their churches would be burned and they would lose their homesteads. That propaganda was spread clean through my seat. That propaganda, I will tell the honourable gentleman, went clean through my seat, and he spoke there. I will tell the honourable gentleman further, that after the election and after the new Government was born, tales of that sort were being spread, and you are going to have an amusing time later on when you go back to those people explaining why all these terrible threats have not been fulfilled.

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would draw the honourable member's attention to Rule 21 of the Standing Orders.

(Government members): Read it!

Mr. Patterson: Every member as he arises should address himself to the Speaker!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is all right. Mr. Speaker, I would say this further with regard to the honourable member for Rosthern, that we can always, if we have two months' time for preparation, prepare a wonderful speech along the lines of national sentiment and anyone can go out among the foreign-born people and, by taking advantage of the sentiments and superstitions that were ingrained in them in the countries from which they came, win their sympathy and support for almost anything you want. But that is not building up a Canadian nationality in this country! I will tell the honourable member for Rosthern that if he wants to promote a real Canadian national unity in this country, he has gone the wrong way about it. And if there is any criticism of some of these foreign-born people, that criticism is of the men of English-speaking nationality who have gone out among them at election times and played upon these sentiments. Further, if the honourable member for Rosthern will get a little more co-operation into his system and get a lot of that fine oratory out of it and get down to business with these people and change some of his tactics in this matter and associate and co-operate with us in building up a Canadian nationality, we will welcome his assistance. I can remember very well when, in the Wynyard by-election of some years ago, he stood in a wagon and addressed a crowd on a Sunday morning and talked about the iniquities of The Wartime Election Act. It is a very touching episode and now we find him coming into the House and orating about "standing to"! I do not know where he got that idea, but possibly the honourable member for Pipestone (*Mr. W. J. Patterson*) can tell him something about that, for he sits alongside of him. Standing to! If we have any "standing to," what we want in this House is to say what we mean and before very long the honourable member for Rosthern will find that out, and that he cannot concentrate on these people in the way he has been concentrating. When he waxes so enthusiastic in this House about some of these matters, he is talking for the immediate benefit of himself and some of the members of "the machine" of which he was a part. He will go out and say, "That Co-operative Government is against you fellows coming to Canada at all, and now they are going to put you down and out." That is the line. He even started that in the debate here the other day, when the question of the Mennonites drew his attention. Yet the honourable the Attorney General told the spokesman for these people that it made no difference, and that if there were 7,000 Highlanders asking for admission he would not permit them to come in at this time to this province.

Mr. Gardiner: They do not exist.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is one other amusing episode with regard to the campaign that was carried on by "the machine" in the rural seats of this province. They go around constantly, and what do they talk about there? They say that "the Govern-

ment you have got is going to burden you farmers with taxation." They say further they are not representative of the farming community of the province, and further that this Government has not got the interests of the farmers at heart.

(Interruptions by Opposition members.)

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You get up when I am through. They go further and say there is not a dirt farmer among us. Now, honourable gentlemen know that there are as many dirt farmers over here, by actual count, as there are on their own side of the House. In fact, I am willing to say that I will put up a prize for competition and we will have a little fun out of it.

Here is a report of what the Leader of the Opposition said, which appeared in the Assiniboia Times:

"Mr. Gardiner stated that the Liberal Government had been generally composed of farmers, that the present Government contained four lawyers, six of its members coming from cities, five of them from the three largest cities and that it represented everything but the fundamental industry of the province, namely, agriculture."

Then we have the former Provincial Treasurer — a former banker and real estate agent — while speaking at Melfort, emphasising that the actions of the former Government had been directed in the interests of the farmers and that the highways had been built to give the best service to the farming community — but we have not started to build highways yet, although the honourable gentleman, this former banker and real estate agent, was most strenuous in his assertions that the highway policy of the new Government was designed to suit the cities.

Then we have the member for Redberry (*Mr. Cockburn*) — and it is amusing, too, to note that the honourable member comes from the constituency once represented by the Hon. George Langley, because he copies very closely the Hon. Mr. Langley in his expressions particularly when he uses the term "arm chair farmers" as descriptive of the present Government and then tries to make the House believe it is original. He even goes further than that, and tries to wave his arms in the way George Langley used to do.

Let me tell my honourable friend that my father homesteaded in this province fourteen years before he (*Mr. Cockburn*) saw the province, and I was born in the province. I say to him . . .

Mr. Cockburn: I was on the farm before you were born!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That just goes to show how absurd is the argument that they use. I do not think they are getting anywhere with it. They have in their own ranks such men as the honourable member for Wynyard (*Mr. Paulson*) who is described in the Parliamentary Guide as a "hardware merchant," and I am of opinion that he is as capable of representing a farming constituency as anyone over there.

I would tell the honourable gentlemen over there that the majority of the members sitting over on this side were elected by rural votes, in spite of the cry that is raised that they do not represent the farmers. I would tell the honourable gentlemen that there are members of this Government who are farmers in a big way, and there are several who owe their majorities very largely to the rural vote in their constituencies.

Opposition Members: No! No!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Many on this side of the House represent rural seats and must, essentially, have been elected by rural votes. Their line of argument is cheap and petty — and, as I said, cannot get them anywhere. I would tell them, Mr. Speaker, that there are many in the Dominion Parliament who are not dirt farmers and who yet represent rural constituencies very capably; and, when the honourable member for Redberry uses the term "arm chair farmer" let me remind him that Dr. Saunders, one of the greatest benefactors the farming community of Canada has known, was not a farmer. He was a trained chemist and other scientists, too, have shown their understanding of the problems which confront the farmers of this country and have contributed more towards meeting those problems than those who raise the cry that this Government is not composed of farmers. By taking that line of argument, they are reflecting on the people and the farmers who elected the present Co-operative Government — reflecting on their intelligence. I might say there are farmers in my own seat

who are capable of showing just as much intelligence as any in any part of the country. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think those gentlemen on the other side are getting very far with this argument, and I would suggest that, in advancing it, they do not go out singly. I suggest that they form a parade, dressed in overalls, and I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition (who was a school teacher) head the parade with the honourable member for Redberry beating the drum. I suggest that the former Attorney General (who is a lawyer) lead the parade on one flank, and the former Provincial Treasurer (who was a banker) flank it on the other side. Then I suggest that the honourable member for Rosthern (who is a doctor) occupy the pivotal point with the illustrious former engineer, the farmer member for Maple Creek, the teachers and the educationists bringing up the rear. And I think that if, for banners, they shoulder the well-known fork the farmer uses in his barn, their equipment would be complete . . .

Mr. Davis: With you coming up behind with a wheel-barrow for the bull!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Farmers! Why, the only crop some of them ever knew is the crop they are reaping now!

I am now going to deal with the matter of highways, and I may say at the outset that I hesitate to announce any policy, because our friends opposite seem to claim unto themselves practically every policy pronounced so far by any member of the Government. I think all members would be interested to notice in the papers the other day, that Saskatchewan has the best highway system in the world and we have that from no less an authority than the honourable member for Maple Creek, the former Minister of Highways. He said this:

"Mr. Spence, speaking at Unity, November 2, 1929, said that the highway policy of the Liberal Government was the most popular in the world. It was greater than the Co-operative policy as that would only serve four towns on the main highway. He compared the Co-operative Government policy to children. He suggested that it would be impossible to have a comprehensive system of highways on account of the geographic conditions; that the Liberals were proud of their one-half completed policy. He stated it would be the job of the Opposition to see that they followed the hewn line policy of the former Liberal Government."

It will be interesting for people in this province and for many living outside it to really recognise that they have had the best system of highways in the world and the most popular, in Saskatchewan, up to the present time. If they had, I would say that Napoleon crossed the Alps in an open boat. Why, even the Leader of the Opposition cannot deny that he was stuck on No. 1 Highway, going west!

Well, Mr. Speaker, you need not take the word of a member of this Government with regard to our highways; you do not need to take the word of the people of this province, who have bumped over them. You only need to go to Manitoba or Alberta or south of the line, to get the real information as to the real state of Saskatchewan highways. I say this with a great deal of diffidence because I do not want to have the honourable member for Pipestone saying that I am ruining the credit of the province, but you only need to look at the signs which are not inconspicuous but which are promiscuous outside the province warning the people to keep out of Saskatchewan because of the highways. That is all you need do, to get the real criticism of the system.

I would say further, despite the statement of the Leader of the Government (*Mr. Gardiner*) after June 6, last, that he was going to refrain from making further appointments and further expenditures until the special session sat, that he did make such expenditures in the Department of Highways. More than that (and I may say that so far I have been unable to find a precedent in any previous parliament in Canada) there has been an over-expenditure of more than \$2,000,000 which had not been authorised by this Legislature, since June 6. The Government last year was voted a total sum of \$3,800,000 for highway purposes by the Legislature, and they have spent or contracted to spend over \$6,000,000 for highway work. I would say further, that it was necessary for the present Government, after it took office, to raise by special warrant, to cover commitments of the previous Government including the special warrants they themselves obtained, a sum of \$2,430,000. I would say, in addition to that, that contracts to the extent of \$300,000 were cancelled after the present Government took office and the money used in the dried-out areas in relief.

It is also remarkable, Mr. Speaker, to compare the statement of the Leader of the Opposition when he seeks to inform the people through the press that these

expenditures were all right and that the revenues of the province were sufficiently buoyant to meet them, with the actual condition of affairs. But I do not think it is a matter of right at all to spend money which has not been voted for the purpose by the Legislature and, as I say, I have found no precedent for such action in any previous parliament of Canada. As a matter of fact, the \$6,000,000 I mentioned, was far in excess of their estimates for the work and far over the amount the Legislature expected, or authorised, them to make. The former Government spent away over their heads in Liberal seats prior to June 6, last, in an effort to feather some of their nests — like wild ducks hatching out eggs, but the eggs hatched out too soon! Further, the statement that the revenues of the province were sufficiently buoyant to meet this expenditure, is, as I have stated, Mr. Speaker, far wide of the mark and the Provincial Treasurer will deal with that in his Budget.

Now, in dealing with where these expenditures were chiefly made, I would like the former Minister of Highways to explain the reason why it was done in this way:

It is interesting to notice how provincial monies (and by that I mean road monies) were spent in Government seats and remarkable to note at the same time, how others were deprived of their fair share of these monies. But, prior to June 6, 1929, nine seats, now occupied by Government members, received \$100,000 each in highway expenditures — that was, as I stated, mostly before June 6 and before they ceased to be Liberal seats; whereas, after the election, 22 Liberal seats received expenditures of over \$100,000 each. Only six of the 28 seats represented on the other side of the House missed fire and two of these, Ile à la Crosse and Cumberland, did not expect to get any highways.

In main market road grants, Shellbrook constituency led the parade closely followed by Ile à la Crosse where there was an expensive deferred election. Then in new earth construction during 1929, Maple Creek and the former Minister of Highways led the parade, receiving considerably more than any other member of the Government or this side, in the matter of calls upon the people's taxes, to pave the way for an easy election.

Mr. Spence: Will the honourable gentleman inform me, Mr. Speaker, if it is revenue money he is speaking of in connection with Maple Creek?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They got both their revenue and capital expenditures so mixed up that they are indistinguishable, and the honourable member received more than any one else to pave the way for his election.

Mr. Spence: It was in line with the honourable gentleman's own policy to complete No. 1 Highway. There were three gaps in No. 1, in my constituency to be completed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And you got a considerable amount for main market roads. In that respect also he has done more for his own seat than for any other; and also in the seat of Notukeu when he was there. The only one to fall short of the mark among the Ministers was the honourable member for Pipestone and then the poor individuals who occupied the ten opposition benches at the time followed in order; but it is interesting to note that the member for Pipestone jumped up considerably in the last two years. Then the member for Saskatoon County (*Mr. Agar*), while in the Opposition, suffered tremendously in the way of grants as did other members of that Opposition, but, when he joined the "Fascist" Government, he jumped up, too. He got, in main market road grants, approximately four times as much, as did the majority of the members on that side of the House, particularly in election years. Election years usually exceeded all other years by \$2,000,000 or more. Apparently, the one year when roads were most needed in this province was election year — and it was marvelous how they managed to spread the money around in election years!

I would also like to point out to the honourable member for Maple Creek that road grants were paid to men not on the rural councils. Four hundred and eighteen grants were paid in municipalities to men who were not councillors of municipalities and I claim they were paid to "heelers" who were otherwise known as road foremen. They were paid, not by the Minister (he knew nothing about them, I am prepared to admit). They were made payable to the road foremen . . .

Mr. Gardiner: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Is he trying to lead the House to believe that these men authorised the grants (*reads names of road inspectors*)?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Gardiner: I think if the honourable gentleman will question his Deputy Minister he will find that statement is not correct.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have consulted my deputy, and I am of the considered opinion that the Minister did not know anything about it. The grants were paid to these men:

District Superintendents: Gibson, McCallum, Tweeddale, McDougall; Inspectors, Doutre, Kissack, W. Loch, E. F. Hunter, W. J. Reid, R. J. Fyfe, W. McIntyre, J. D. Munro, G. A. Stephens, O. L. Carlsen, and J. R. McLeod.

I say they paid grants to the numbers of 418 to individuals, last year—election year, who were not on the councils of municipalities, and in practically all these cases the grants were made for road construction in Liberal seats. I believe it to be true that in the majority of those cases the municipal councils were never consulted, and there is nothing on the records of the Department of Highways to show that those grants were authorised by the Minister. There is only one conclusion I can come to and it is that the money was used by the road inspectors as vote-catchers, and this is how they purchased votes. We could play the same game very easily, if we so desired, Mr. Speaker. But I wish to assure you, and through you the members of this Legislature, that this system was thoroughly scrapped the minute the Co-operative Government took office, and will not be continued under my administration.

The constituency of Yorkton was very

Mr. Gardiner: Am I not correct in this, that the Minister signed an authorisation for \$3,000 just before the by-election was due, for work south of Yorkton?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That money was not paid by this Administration but by the municipalities of Cana and Orkney and it had nothing whatever to do with the by-election in the seat because there was no by-election and any need of there being one had been removed.

I would tell the honourable gentleman something of the system that was followed under his administration. I would mention the cases of McKay and Foulkes. These two men were mixed up in the Leader football scandal and were taken into the Gardiner "machine" in spite of the information given by Mr. George Bell.

Mr. Gardiner: Since the honourable gentleman appears to be dealing with me personally, I would inform him that these men were in the department before I became Minister. These men were in the department when I went into it in 1922, and McKay left the employ of the Government in December, 1928. But it never was shown, at any time, except in election propaganda, to me or anyone else, that McKay was actually guilty.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will withdraw my remark, if he denies the statement of Mr. George Bell that appeared in the paper.

Mr. Gardiner: What statement?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That appeared in *The Regina Daily Star*.

Mr. Gardiner: I would deny anything that appeared in *The Star*, I think.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we'll leave it at that. In this last election year, some \$164,058.06 was expended without authorisation, in rural municipal road grants and I have here a list of the constituencies in which the money was expended. It is most noticeable that these grants were made in Opposition seats — Canora and Pelly — where these road foremen had been appointed and where they were at their game.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the general policy of the present Government is to recognise the councils of the municipalities as the elected representatives of the people, and we are not following the policy of the previous administration as to whom the grants should go and as to where they should be spent. None of these grants went into the hands of the rural municipal councils at all. They were sent to the men on the job or supposed to be on the job — the "heelers" — and they relied on the foreman's report as to where they should be spent.

I would also say this, that candidates representing the now Opposition did, during the election campaign, go from meeting to meeting and at those meetings promise road grants without the authorisation of the former Minister of Highways. I do not blame him for all the political activities within the department under the previous administration. I believe that a great deal of it was done over his head and that it had been taken out of his hands and I think the man in the department before him took it over. I think the present Leader of the Opposition, when he was out in his constituency, did promise them roads . . .

Mr. Gardiner: I absolutely deny the statement, and would ask the honourable minister to accept my denial.

Mr. Dunn: I would object, too, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I accept the denial and will read a letter which I have here. Now, the present Leader of the Opposition, in the the course of the campaign, spoke at Dubuc. I have here a copy of a letter he wrote to Mr. A. E. Sahlmark:

"In reply to your letter of August 3rd, I may state that I do not remember the exact conversation which took place between you and myself at the Dubuc meeting, but you must have misunderstood my intention when you indicate that I had promised you a grant for all of the councillors in your municipality.

This is a matter which is always dealt with by the member for the constituency and the inspector covering the district. I no doubt agreed to bring your representations before these gentlemen and I am therefore immediately forwarding your letter to Mr. Dunn of Melville in order that he may be in a position to take the matter up with you and make any recommendations he thinks advisable to the Department."

Mr. Gardiner: I would ask the honourable gentleman to read the letter of Mr. Sahlmark, to which that is the reply.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I shall do that. This was on August 3, 1929:

"Dear Mr. Gardiner:

During the evening of your meeting at Dubuc, I spoke to you about municipal grants and you promised me a grant for all the councillors in my municipality.

To date, we have received some grant but only for three divisions though the rest have been recommended by the road inspector.

Kindly look into this and do what you possibly can and let me know by return mail.

Thanking you for the same, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Alex E. Sahlmark, Reeve.

This, I may say, Mr. Speaker, was one of the files that did not move out when the evacuation of the Buildings by our predecessors in office, took place.

Mr. Gardiner: Will the honourable gentleman now read my letter in reply?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I want to be fair. I have no objection at all. But I want to say at this stage that I am very sorry I overlooked the honourable member for Pheasant Hills (*Mr. Dunn*) when he interjected his remark. (*Mr. Gardiner's letter repeated.*)

Now I have another letter here which shows that the idea the public had was that the honourable gentleman himself was really running "the machine." We have here a letter, dated March 30, 1929, that is shortly before the election, written to "Dear Mr. Gardiner" at the instance of the Oblate Fathers at Lebret:

"The Oblate Fathers of Scholasticate at Lebret have approached me seeking to have some little assistance in finishing a road on Lake Side from the College to the bridge at Lebret. There remains but a small distance close to bridge to complete a fairly good road.

I might say that a great number of resident farmers who live west of R. 12 use a hill behind the College as it saves them as much as a two-mile trip to the Fort.

Now, Mr. Gardiner, I can't do anything out of my small municipal apportionment this year as I have a lot to do south of lake. Fr. Boyer thinks you might have it arranged so that, although not a provincial road, you could have a grant of \$200 or \$250 which I am sure would be ample"

Now, this is the very touching part and this is the idea they had, the idea that he was back of everything the "machine" did:

"I might add that there are over 100 good Gardiner votes housed in that building and we want to keep them as such."

I have also another letter from the Deputy Minister to George A. Stephens, district superintendent. Well, I won't worry with that just now. I will leave the rest of it until another occasion.

That is the method of vote-catching that has been the practice in this province. For how long? Do you wonder, you Progressives, you Independents, you Conservatives that it was an up-hill fight in election after election, to hold or win a seat? I will say that it is fundamentally wrong. I will say that no member of this House has the right to infer that he is promising road grants in consideration of so many votes. I say that system is wrong, fundamentally wrong. The road grants should be given at the proper time of the year and, personally, I think in future that you will find the system a fairer system and that members of this House will be treated fairly — even the honourable member for Rosthern. And I am going to say again we intend to see to it that certain seats that have not been fairly treated in the past are going to be brought up into line with the others and then we will all start out even.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my constituency of Yorkton a poll called the Insinger poll. That poll gave a majority of 159 against me in the election. There is only one other poll that went near that. What happened there? The usual municipal grant per municipality in this province has been around \$2,000. But Insinger, which gave a majority of 159 for the candidate of the "machine" in the last election, received over \$9,000 in the municipal grants; so it cost \$60 per vote to the taxpayers of the province generally, to secure a majority of 159 for the Liberal candidate at the Insinger poll! Those grants were made under the previous administration, and the grants there were far and away above other grants in the Yorkton constituency — and most of the other polls showed majorities the other way!

Now, in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time, we have actually, in miles of standard earth grading, a total of 3,051.07 miles, and we also had on September 6, 1929, some 603 miles of gravel. Since the present Government took over, the actual number of miles has risen to 839.5, an increase of 236 miles of gravel. The actual mileage of standard earth grades is 3,288.7. Therefore, the actual total is 4,128.2 miles out of a system of 7,300 miles and that system, or, at least, a lot of that system, as constructed, has to be rebuilt. We find that the number of miles comprised in the main market roads of the province is approximately 25,000, and we have in addition some 3,015 bridges.

Now, the honourable member for North Qu'Appelle when he criticised the matter, or, at least, in discussing the matter of the dismissal of inspectors and superintendents under the new administration, knew — and we know and the members on the opposite side of the House know and the people of the province know — that the main function of these road inspectors and superintendents was politics. The honourable member for North Qu'Appelle, when he spoke the other evening, said that I was taking credit for dismissing men from that staff and said, "Well, I got rid of nearly as many as you did!" In 1922 and 1923 — that is the time I think he took over — or 1921-22 . . .

Mr. Gardiner: You are a year late.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We had then nine district supervisors and seventeen road inspectors — a total of twenty-six. This year, when this Administration took over we had fourteen district superintendents, five road inspectors, or a total saving of seven.

Mr. Gardiner: Take the period when I was Minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: During that period there was a total saving of only ten. You fired ten and I fired nineteen. Here is the touching part, Mr. Speaker: After changing these around the honourable member for North Qu'Appelle, when he was Minister of Highways, appointed a number of what he called "road supervisors," and they jumped

up while he was Minister and when he quit the total was 111 road supervisors, so we have really an increase during his regime as Minister of 107. Some of these men were paid high salaries, and that is where considerable revenue went to under the then Minister of Highways, and these men were not necessary.

Mr. Gardiner: Why did you retain men on the staff?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Some of them were employed temporarily, and we had had no opportunity of overhauling the system. However, they were dismissed and they won't be reappointed for the year 1930 and the saving effected in that way is roughly \$165,000. That covers the district superintendents, inspectors and the supervisors of roads.

Mr. Spence: If I might ask the honourable gentleman a question: First, does he propose giving grants, and if he does how does he propose giving those grants to the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will come to that. Now, the saving is around \$165,000 per year. The Leader of the Opposition says, "Why, you are going to put out, at divisional points, engineers and they will cost you something!" These engineers will be employed by the department here along the same lines as employed by the Department of Highways before, and they will just have to move out to the divisional centres.

Mr. Spence: Will they do the work of those men?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will deal with it when I come to it. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the organisation we propose to build up in this province, will be practically identical with that of the provinces on either side of us and of the states to the south. There is nothing original in the matter. It is a matter of just pure business and following lines which others have found to be practicable. The reason no doubt why it was not followed here was the same reason the Engineering Bill did not pass: a number of these superintendents might have lost a job and that system could not be scrapped and the political "machine" remain intact.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition in speaking at least an hour on Highways, on the point that "future generations will pay for present highway construction," took the position that increase of the public debt casts an immediate interest charge upon the present population and the future population. That statement is incorrect. There will be no increase in the burden of debt and for what money we spend, we will have something to show you for it, and I will deal with that more fully on the Budget debate. I say the people will not feel the effect of the policy at all other than to feel much easier when they ride on the roads. The Leader of the Opposition continues:

"I would like you to go down to that part of the country from which the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) comes, and look into the State of Montana, and you will see there the effects of that policy. If you run up the public debt, as this policy involves, you immediately incur high interest charges imposing a high taxation cost upon the land which drives the people off the land.

If you cross over into the State of Montana and drive along their fine roads to a filling station and say to the people there, "You certainly have got fine highways here," they will tell you that that is all they have left."

It is a dismal tale!

"As you drive along —"

Mr. Spence: It is true, too!

Hon. Mr. Stewart:

"As you drive along, you will see large consolidated schools with their windows boarded up; you will see homesteads deserted and boarded up, the land abandoned."

And this is significant:

"The people have been driven off because of high taxation costs. We are going to watch that the people of this province are not placed in that position where they, too, will be driven off their land."

Wonderful watchdogs of the Treasury! After four months of spending the money of the people! I have been down to Montana. The thing to me looked ridiculous on the face of it, so I wired to the Commissioner of Education in Montana. This is what I wired:

"Opposition Leader here stated in our Legislature your State had closed and boarded up consolidated schools owing to drain on your finances by highway expenditures. Wire me your comment."

This is the Commissioner's reply:

"Montana highway programme in no way interferes with school programme. All schools open."

That is going to be the game, Mr. Speaker. Try to frighten them out of it. That is what the Leader of the Opposition considers to be the duty of an Opposition. If the Opposition think this highway policy is right they should back it in the House and not try to persuade the people that they are going to have a heavy burden of taxation. I also wired to the Commissioner of Highways at Great Falls, and the honourable Leader of the Opposition should listen to this:

"Please wire me collect following information. Capital indebtedness of Montana. Total capital indebtedness of State re roads and highways. Mileage from Canadian border of State or Federal Highway nearest south-western Saskatchewan."

Remember, he saw this from the Spence farm. Here is the Commissioner's reply:

"Re telegram to Warden. Outstanding bonded indebtedness of State of Montana is about \$4,650,000. State has no bonded indebtedness for roads or highways. Federal highway nearest to south-western Saskatchewan is Roosevelt Highway running east and west across northern part of State and at Havre is about thirty miles from Canadian border."

A very small outstanding debt! \$4,650,000 as against over \$68,000,000 in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Gardiner: It has nothing to do with Highways there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I had the honour of driving over one of their highways, thirty miles from the Canadian boundary. Thirty miles, Mr. Speaker! The honourable Leader of the Opposition gazes from the farm of the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) and says he saw all these things which the officials of the State of Montana say never existed. The Leader of the Opposition may be far-seeing in some things, but I would just say that, if he had been as far-seeing in leading the party to which he belongs, he would not be sitting in the Opposition today.

Mr. Gardiner: If the honourable gentleman will now read the statement which I made with reference to the high taxation cost upon the land he will see —

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to re-read it. I read it clearly and distinctly the first time and stressed the point I wished to make.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman will just —

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You are out of order!

Mr. Gardiner: I won't be when I reply.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now, they have stressed, of course, in connection with this policy that there will be a heavy burden of taxation. I would just refer you to the State of North Carolina. In that state they were one of the most conservative in the United States. In 1921 the State of Montana had a state public debt of \$11,200,000. Owing to propaganda by the Good Roads Commission, the State of Montana decided to go ahead with the highway policy. They floated a bond issue of \$50,000,000. I may say with regard to the people of North Carolina, that the people of that state have not suffered in any way from a burden of taxation and they are producing the results in good highways and they figure that the gasoline fees are sufficient to meet the fixed charges and are paying interest on the bonds floated for that purpose. I also notice in the province of Alberta that a group of private people have applied for an Act in the province of Alberta with a petition signed by over 5,000 people to build a paved highway from Calgary to Lethbridge. Now, if private capital is interested in building a road, a paved road, in the province of Alberta and are willing to gamble \$1,000,000

on the construction of a highway, with the collection of a small toll to make money to finance it, surely the people of Saskatchewan can embark on a policy of building all-weather gravel roads across the province — and the toll in that case will not be heavier than the proposed tax from gasoline, where you collect five cents from all cars on the road.

Now the Leader of the Opposition said we would be building more "patch-work" roads than he did. You will find there is not one highway in Saskatchewan completed out of fifty-two. You will find there are scattered spots all over that 7,300 mile system. And, of course, they express the hope that the new Minister of Highways will not scrap the system. Well, the unfortunate fact is that the roads have little pieces of patchwork all the way along them and it is almost impossible to scrap some, or they would be scrapped. There are some curves and indentations which are not logical. The thing is this, that on each one of the highways certain expensive work has been done. He has also made the statement that last year not a dollar of the taxpayers' money was spent that the taxpayer did not receive equivalent value for. I would like to refer him to several cases: This road built for 3.84 miles near Rocanville, four miles. That road runs through a country I know very well and it cost over \$6,000 a mile. I say that that is one example of where the taxpayers did not receive value for their money, and anybody who wants to go and look at the country will realise it if he knows anything about road building.

Our policy is not to build isolated portions of highways. Our policy is to connect isolated ones as quickly as possible, starting where the main traffic is first and not where the political benefit is. Take the city of Regina for instance. You go north on No. 6. The traffic there is the heaviest possibly on any part of No. 6. Well, you find that the part where the heaviest traffic is on No. 6 is the piece which is left to complete last. You go down the Soo Highway and you will find the same thing. Go to the constituency of the honourable member for Redberry and you will find there road No. 14, at a point at which a number of highways converge —

Mr. Cockburn: No. 14 is not in my seat!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I mean, of the honourable member from Saskatoon County (*Mr. Agar*). I get those two gentlemen mixed, they hang together so well, anyway. There is the heavy traffic along that road leading into Saskatoon. The same thing is true there. Highway after highway, the same! Well, there is going to be a change in the previous policy. You cannot do it here and there and all over the place, in spots, but, as the Leader of this Government has said, you have got to give it to all the people. I will tell the honourable, the Leader of the Opposition, that approximately 900 miles was covered in gravelling highways. The people do not notice it nor appreciate it because there are over thirty-six patches of highway gravelled all over the province, running from the south-east to the north-west of North Battleford. Just enough to create an appetite all over the province for a gravelled road! And I say that the policy of the previous Administration was fundamentally wrong on highways. They rode over these roads and many of us know about the roads in the other provinces and in the other states to the south of us. If they had followed the policies followed there, they would have derived revenue from the tourist traffic. But they started here a patch and there a patch, bringing no increase of any revenue, and the history of any country is that the gasoline tax is best used to go on and build other roads. That is fundamental. But they overlooked that fundamental matter in their interest in politics, and no Government can concentrate on one department as a political weapon and get ahead. I think that is what happened in the Highway Department in the province of Saskatchewan.

I will say further that, in view of the population of the province and in view of the number of people to be taxed, it would be unsound in building highways to commence by gravelling each one of the roads in that 7,300 miles until the revenues of the province increase. It would be financially wrong and we cannot carry the burden. Well, the previous Administration sprinkled 900 miles with gravel throughout that 7,300 miles, and some of that was done poorly. On the eastern side of the province, within sixty miles, four roads run parallel, with a little patch of gravel sitting next to the Manitoba boundary. Well, the people down there in travelling out of Manitoba struck our roads and started the talk about Saskatchewan roads. Well, Manitoba had four gravelled roads, so the Highways Department puts four patches of gravel and the Leader of the Opposition says, "Why, when you enter Saskatchewan, you are on a good road." There are four down there within a sixty mile radius.

I might say that various members of the Opposition have been in to see this Government, coming with delegates for roads. The Leader of the Government has

announced he invites delegations from the various parts. I will say the same thing and any member of the Opposition may come along. We will give them a good hearing, probably better than they gave Opposition members before. That holds good for the Leader of the Opposition, too, if he comes. I have a three page letter from him asking for three roads to be built in his constituency. I cannot guarantee the Leader of the Opposition all three roads. Other members have been to see me from the Opposition side. We do not condemn that and say they should not come up but, on the other hand, if they believe it is a highway policy that is not in the interests of the province of Saskatchewan, they should not ask for a grant one day and shout about it the next day. If they want the system they should believe in it, or if they do not and say, "Well, the thing is unclean," they should say, "We will stay away from it."

The honourable member from Pheasant Hills has made some complaint about the highway policy being scrapped. I will tell the honourable member from Pheasant Hills (*Mr. Dunn*) that his constituency was very well treated though he did not get a gravelled road. He received considerably more than his share. The contractor on one road — and that was not a main traffic road — was moved to No. 1, without any increase in cost to the system, and furthermore, that contractor did it for the same price and charged nothing for moving. That accounted for the road being completed between McLean and Wolseley.

I might also say for the information of members that we expect this year, as a result of the advertising, to build the highways cheaper than they were built. I have reason to believe that the tenders will be lower.

The hour is so late that I am not going to talk on the matter of the safety devices.

I would say in addition to the financial errors that the other fundamental error in connection with the highways was the matter of maintenance. There was not enough proper maintenance machinery and as a consequence of that a grade fairly well built was left improperly maintained. It is our intention to purchase proper equipment and see that it is properly used on the roads and I can tell my honourable friends on the other side of the House that, if they report to me any section of road in their seats that is not being properly maintained, after giving us a reasonable chance, the man that does that once too often will be dismissed regardless of whether he is an Independent, Progressive or a Conservative, and regardless of whether the sitting member in that seat recommends he should stay on. We expect these roads to be properly maintained.

No doubt there will be some criticism on the matter of winter maintenance. The road from Moose Jaw to Regina is an experiment in this connection. I will tell you this that Alberta has against our three snow ploughs, twelve; that Manitoba has six and that Minnesota keeps open 7,000 miles of highway; that North Dakota has twelve snow ploughs and that Montana also keeps open considerable mileage. This was an experiment. I do not say that the Government intends to keep open winter roads, but it might surprise you to know this: that on one Sunday, 294 cars passed over No. 1 Highway, and if you figure out the gasoline consumption and that it takes an average of 15 miles per gallon, you will find that the revenue is over \$50 a day and, if you get really down to the matter you will see that winter maintenance will carry itself on its own gasoline tax. If we maintain those roads out there, we will also have to keep the side roads open. That was not done this winter; and I think the honourable gentlemen on the other side will agree it was a tough winter to keep roads open. I would say this, however: The cost of maintaining that road this winter was \$75 a mile less than the cost of maintaining it last summer.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition (I am sorry he has left, but you can tell him about it) mentioned Highway No. 13 and asked why not build No. 13 instead of No. 1, and he told of some short highway across the province. I would tell him that there is no such highway on his system. The mileage of No. 13 is considerably longer than that of No. 1 and No. 1 serves some of the largest centres of population in the province.

I do not intend to speak any further in this connection. The matter of highways is a matter of business and it is upon that basis that the present Government proposes to deal with them. I shall speak further on the subject and later on I will discuss the matter of safety on the highways; and I shall deal with where the roads are to go this year and the matter of the cost allotted in each case, in the Budget debate. If we can agree on the principle in these cases, I think we shall be able to forget for a moment the poor roads in favour of this tremendous system that should be given immediate attention. It is my opinion, that nothing is to be gained by waiting. We

intend to give the province (and I say this to those who spoke of my ability as a Minister of Highways) — we are going to give the province, as far as we possibly can, proper roads. I would say further to the honourable member for Pipestone and the honourable member for Prince Albert, that they are not the only men born in the province of Saskatchewan. The honourable member for Pipestone is not the only man who feels pride in his province — and he certainly could not be proud of its highways or the Government to which he belonged; and if he speaks from his heart, he will admit that. If he has pride in the province of Saskatchewan, he surely will not be satisfied to have this province inferior in the matter of highways, to the provinces on either side of us; and it is the policy of the present Government, that Saskatchewan shall not be inferior to either.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion.

THE HONOURABLE M. A. MACPHERSON, B.A., LL.B., K.C.

(Attorney General)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—Might I, first of all, congratulate you on your appointment to your high office in this Legislature, and might I offer my humble praise for the manner in which you have presided in this chamber during the course of this debate and these first weeks of the session, which in addition to being your first experience of the high position you occupy are also your first in point of experience in the Legislature. Might I also add my praise to that of the members, who have already spoken, to the mover and seconder of the Address in leading off in this debate for the very acceptable way in which they discharged the duties that were assigned to them. As other honourable gentlemen who have been in this House for some time well know, we have listened with a very great amount of satisfaction to the new voices heard from both sides of the house, and as the debate progressed and as new member after new member made his contribution, I say it was with a great deal of satisfaction that we felt that these honourable gentlemen have come actuated by the highest of motives—the service of one's country—and that they will make a very real contribution to the life of this Legislature.

Before proceeding further, Mr. Speaker, I think, because of the position I hold in the Government of this Province, I should refer to the death, during the past week, of a member of the judiciary. The bench and the bar of the Province of Saskatchewan regretted very much to hear that His Honour Judge Gravel of Gravelbourg had died at his home. The late Judge Gravel was recognized as a studious judge, a fair minded judge and his contribution to the reports has been a very great contribution indeed as a District Court Judge. I think at this time I should say that we in the Province of Saskatchewan should feel indeed proud, that we are to be congratulated in that we have men of such high calibre administering the law from the bench in both the higher courts and in the District Courts, and in whom the people of our province can have the fullest confidence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the debate there has appeared to be considerable concern on the part of the honourable gentlemen opposite as to the stability of this Government in the Province of Saskatchewan. Well, as the debate progressed they got their answer. From every quarter on this side, gentlemen to your left had their answer, Sir, and the members on this side of the house are determined—and the people of this province have been so told—to give the Leader of this Government and this Government every opportunity to carry out those promises made by the leader and the members of this Government for which the people voted on the 6th day of June last. If they were under any misapprehension or any misconception as to the attitude of the members on this side of the House toward this Government, then I say that honourable gentlemen have had their answer and now know exactly where the members of this House stand.

We listened with a great deal of attention to the speeches delivered by honourable gentlemen opposite and we noticed there was very little by way of defence of old policies, and speaking now, Mr. Speaker, with reference more particularly to one department of the Government: if there was a defence of the highway policy and administration of the former Government, that defence was utterly destroyed on Friday evening last by the present minister. And it was in passing, strange to note that the former Minister of Highways did not actually attempt to defend the late Government in respect of highways. One of the honourable gentlemen opposite—I think it was the honourable member for Notukeu (*Mr. Grant*)—said something about kittens opening their eyes after nine days. I think what he meant was this, that after nine days of debate he had had his eyes opened to the reality of things as they were presented in and evidenced by this debate. The wonderful part of it is that these gentlemen have had their eyes closed for a considerable period of time. They do not realise what the rest of us realise—that this co-operative effort which has been the subject of attack by honourable gentlemen oppo-

site from the platform and through the press, has been in existence for some years in this province. If there is any real reason why they are over there and why we are here, co-operating in the interests of the people, I can give it to you in the words of the amendment which was brought down just a year ago by the honourable gentleman who now leads the Government. This was the amendment introduced on that occasion by the honourable the Prime Minister of this Province, (*Premier Anderson*) who was then leader of the Conservative Opposition:

"We regret there is no expressed desire or intention to deal with the question of stricter enforcement of the present liquor laws in the Province; to introduce remedial legislation for the purpose of clearing up troublesome and difficult situations in regard to the administration of our public schools; to encourage and foster a definite provincial immigration policy; to encourage the development of a wider provincial and foreign market for our immense lignite coal deposits, giving the assurance of a more extensive use of our own coal in Government institutions; to introduce a measure of Civil Service reform leading to the establishment of a Civil Service Commission, which shall be non-partisan; and to bring into effect reforms with reference to the administration of the office of the Official Guardian with a view to effecting greater economy."

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this amendment being introduced in the House, it was voted down by 47 to 8 and if you look at page 48 of the Journals of last year, you will there find that Conservatives and Progressives stood side by side and co-operated at that time and, if the only Independent member in the House last session had been in the House, his name would have appeared there also with those who supported us. If then, Sir, honourable members want to know just why they are there and why we are here let them remember that amendment; if they talk of this "co-operation" as a new thing, let them remember that amendment, and they will find that this co-operation has been going on in the interests of the Province of Saskatchewan for some time.

My honourable friend from Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) the other night proceeded to complain of the Speech from the Throne. He was the only one of the honourable gentlemen who endeavoured to dissect the programme which is being offered. He went from section to section of the speech and started in with the weather, and, apparently, he found fault with the fact that the Government was not claiming to have any control over the weather. So far as I know the only group having complaint over the control of the weather was the Liberal group, for they could not withstand the snowstorm of ballots on the 6th of June last. He proceeded then to charge the Government with not being willing to assume responsibility in the matter of questions that came before it for decision, and he complained that the Government was referring too many matters to commissions for consideration. Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked myself who was this honourable gentleman who was making charges of this sort and it occurred to me that last session he himself, as a responsible Minister of the Crown, introduced two major pieces of legislation, The Workmen's Compensation Act and the Power Commission legislation, and both these were the result of commissions of the late Government themselves!

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: And I remember the discussion last year over the appointment of the Grain Enquiry Commission, a Commission which has cost this Province over \$117,000. I remember that. Remembering this history of a year ago, and remembering the progress of today, I am moved to quote that old couplet, "The Devil was sick, the Devil a monk would be; when the Devil was well, the devil a monk was he!"

The honourable member referred to the question of Immigration; he suggested that the Government assumed no responsibility in connection with this matter. But there has not been one word of condemnation for the Government's attitude in appointing this Commission unless the honourable gentleman's words can be so considered. He intimates that what was done by this Government with relation to the Mennonites was not a new thing in the history of this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to read to him and to this House just a few of the views given by the press favourable to my honourable friend's party. I will quote from the *Star-Phoenix* of November 21, 1929. This is what they say:

"When Mr. Forke, the minister of immigration, was asked some weeks ago to admit some 5,000 Mennonite settlers to Canada, his first step was to consult western governments. He asked them about letting the refugees in and he has said that his decision will depend to a great degree on their replies.

"This procedure is new and signifies a change in the policy of Canada. Five years ago the Minister of Immigration, if asked to allow the entrance of 5,000

colonists from Europe, would not have troubled to consult the local authorities, or at least not in a formal way.

"Today his approach to the problem is wholly different. Mr. Forke knows that immigration is no longer regarded as necessary and always a blessing."

And again in the same editorial:

"He chooses to consult the local governments because they are in touch with local opinion and conditions. It is a wise policy suited to the real needs and wishes of the country. Mr. Forke ought to make it the rule, and not the exception."

Then I have here, Mr. Speaker, the *Free Press* of November 20th, where they say Canada has set its face in a new direction. In the matter of the Commission, when the Commission was appointed, this is what the *Star-Phoenix* had to say on December 7, 1929. The *Star-Phoenix* goes on:

"This newspaper is happy to note that the Commission now appointed is a Commission of men who have special qualifications to study an economic and social question with a clear eye and an open mind."

And in closing it says this:

"Dr. Anderson has done what he could to secure a thorough inquiry and an intelligent report by appointing a good commission."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude of the press, which ordinarily supports my honourable friends opposite, towards the appointment of this Commission. That is the answer of the press towards the criticism that this Provincial Government was appointing more commissions than ever before.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I point out to the honourable gentleman what I pointed out the other night; that if he will go to the Department of Labour and Industries he will find records of quite a number of occasions on which the Federal Government had consulted the Provincial Government over all the years that I was a minister.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to go down to the department. I can go to the records of the House for 1928. I realise, Mr. Speaker, that you will find individual cases where there has been consultation—

Mr. Gardiner: I would go further than that. We were consulted in the matter of bringing in refugees.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: How many?

Mr. Gardiner: About five or six hundred of them, if I remember right. We were discussing with them in all the schemes with regard to bringing immigrants from the British Isles, boys, domestics, etc.; we were always consulted and always gave our permission. We always took the view it was not our duty to enunciate a policy of immigration.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I realise what my honourable friend says may be true in several respects but never have they, on one occasion, taken the people of this province into their confidence after consulting with them or told them that this was being done.

Mr. Gardiner: If my honourable friend would read the newspapers at that time he would know.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, it is a most unusual thing, in the fall of last year, for the first time apparently, notice came to the public through the press as to the representations being made to the Provincial Government in this regard. There were individual cases before. But let me quote you from the honourable member from Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*), in his speech delivered when he moved the second reading of Bill No. 9, an Act respecting the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries, in the session of 1928. This is what he said:

"With regard to immigration, let me say first and foremost, that I look on this as purely a Dominion matter."

That was his attitude in 1928. And then, in answer to a question from the present Leader of the Government, who was then the Leader of the Conservative opposition, he said this:

"As I was saying: I consider immigration purely a Dominion matter, and not provincial at all."

That was the policy of my honourable friend in 1928. But my honourable friend went further, as he will remember himself, in that same speech in order that the policy of the Government might properly be set forth, and he read into the records the attitude of the Government in regard to the question of immigration. He will remember that, and in that connection he enunciated a scheme of an inter-provincial board, which would be set up in the Province of Saskatchewan along with other provinces of Canada for the purpose of grappling with this problem. That was his solution and the solution of his Government. But he will remember, as I do, that during the last session I asked for a return in this House, a return of all correspondence that had passed between him or his Department and anyone else dealing with this inter-provincial board, and, after some time, the answer or the return came down that there was no correspondence, that not a letter had been written of any kind, not a "t" crossed or an "I" dotted to carry out the supposed policy of the Government in regard to immigration. We were told this, to be fair to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker,—we were told that there had been no correspondence, but there had been some conversations. That was the answer given at that time.

Now I submit this: So far as this question is concerned: It has received a great deal of attention during the past few months. The Government promised a Commission and that Commission is now working in the Province. That is the Commission that my honourable friends cannot criticise. They cannot suggest it is a political commission. This Commission is doing its work in the Province to-day.

My honourable friend from Rosthern, in his speech the other day, referred to the Mennonites—

Dr. Uhrich: Will my honourable friend permit me? Mennonites and Lutherans!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Very well, Mr. Speaker: Mennonites and Lutherans.

Dr. Uhrich: That is better.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I will come to that and deal with that in a minute. Here is the interesting part of it all, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend from Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) damns us for what we do not do (as he says) and my honourable friend from Rosthern damns us because of what we do! The situation was, as it was outlined by the Prime Minister the other day, in regard to the Mennonites. They came to the Government and did make representations and we felt then as we feel still, that it was not in the interests of the country, with conditions as they were, that they should be admitted here. It was after they had come and had been given their answer that we had the request that the Lutherans should come in; they were refused in the same way. The only fair thing to do was to treat these people all in the same way. Lutherans and Mennonites, they were not treated differently. It made no difference because they were Mennonites. English, Irish or Scottish would have received the same treatment—a treatment which the Government decided was the best in the interests of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Dr. Uhrich: Might I ask a question: Were there no guarantees? And did my honourable friend consider those guarantees insufficient?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, one gentleman said they had \$18,000 in the bank and we told him we considered that insufficient. And I ask you how long \$18,000 would last in taking care of any large number of people who came into this country? My honourable friend pleads for tolerance and national unity and says in the same breath that the Government was animated by narrow racial concern and suggests that we are, in this instance, unfair. I say it is unworthy of him, and unworthy of this Province and of the House that he should so suggest. We did not deal with this matter because we thought any single race, creed or any class of people should be militated against, but because we believed at the present time, in the interests of the people of the Province, this matter should be dealt with as it was dealt with, and, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this Government is prepared to stand or fall on its record in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) hurled a "defy" at the honourable gentleman who leads this Government in connection with a statement attributed to the Prime Minister that since coming into office the Government had expended \$500,000 in relief for these people. I think his quotation is not correct. The

real fact is, or must be, apparent to everyone: This Government had not spent \$500,000 for Mennonites alone. As my honourable friend is aware the Government spent \$500,000 in relief and in the spending of that money on relief some of the money was spent for the Mennonite citizens in this province, very good citizens as they were.

Dr. Uhrich: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: We only spent one amount for relief and in the spending of that money some of those citizens who are of Mennonite descent, some Mennonites themselves, did receive assistance and they did not receive any more or any less assistance because they were Mennonites but they did receive it because under the plan that was in vogue, all these people who were in that district were to be assisted.

Dr. Uhrich: I do not want to intrude unduly in the course of my honourable friend's speech: But was not the statement made by the Prime Minister of this Province, when he made that speech in the southern part of the province, that \$500,000 had been spent in relief for these people?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I am explaining it to you now and I am confident that anyone with any intelligence in this Province should know, that it only spent money for one relief, in one amount—

Mr. Gardiner: Rising to a point of order: I do not think the honourable gentleman has any right to infer that anyone has not ordinary intelligence over here.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: If the remark was offensive I would withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. Uhrich: It is not offensive at all because we consider where it comes from.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Hear the honourable gentleman! And that is the response when I withdraw the remark! I wanted to explain that and that explanation is given and it is the proper explanation. I just want to say this in conclusion: In dealing with the question, whether my honourable friends like it or not, I think the people of the province want this matter dealt with fairly apart from sentiment and all that sort of thing, and in the appointing of this Commission there is the assurance that this Government is alive to the importance of and the attention which this great problem is getting and this Commission is doing its work in this Province at the present time.

Now, I want to refer just briefly to the question of Education. Just for a moment! Honourable gentlemen who were in the House during the past four years will remember how everything that was said by the members of the then Opposition, particularly by the present Leader of the Government, in reference to education was treated by the Government as being a mere fad or fancy and impracticable and unuseable. Now the Minister of Education and the leader of this Government is implementing those policies, as he has set forth in his address, by setting up a Director of Rural Education, abolishing the organisation branch, abolishing winter high schools and the encouraging of night schools. With all these things there is no real criticism.

Mr. Gardiner: We have not had a chance.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: My honourable friend complains they have not had a chance, and we have been here two weeks!

Mr. Gardiner: We would have been out of order if we had done.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: We will wait and we shall see what we shall see.

Mr. Hogan: We shall hear!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: What I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, was this: That while these reforms have taken place and while these reforms might surely have been discussed by honourable gentlemen since they were touched on by the honourable the leader of this Government, yet there was not a word of censure or condemnation, not a word from those, who, in other sessions and at other times, had termed them ridiculous and absurd. What is the reason, Mr. Speaker? The reason is that the people of the Province are agreed that these reforms are fit and proper reforms and were overdue.

I want to refer briefly to another matter which is of some concern to the people of the Province, a matter which was of particular concern to a great body of people in the Province during September and October of last fall. I refer to the question of the Doukhobors. This was one of the first problems that the new Government had to deal with and it was dealt with, and I can assure you that it was no easy or light matter to deal with, as my honourable friend from Pelly (*Mr. Parker*) will realise. I desire to compliment the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and particularly Assistant Commissioner Worsley, Superintendent Spalding and Inspector Ackland, for their firmness, good judgment and sound common sense. They upheld the traditions of the Force and their task was a difficult one. There was no desire on the part of the Government, or the people of this Province, nor on the part of the police that these people should be dealt with as offenders but when, finally, they had to be taken into custody, this was done because of humanitarian reasons lest they die of exposure. They were taken into custody and were in custody for some little time. During that time we endeavoured to ascertain from them what we could do; we endeavoured to reason with them and we endeavoured to find out their real ideas; and we pointed out that a group of 200 or more could not possibly fly in the face of the balance of the 800,000 people of the Province of Saskatchewan. We pointed out that the laws of the country, moreover, had to be obeyed, that their children would have to go to school, and that if the Government permitted these children to stay out of school then succeeding governments in this Province would find much difficulty in dealing with grown men and women later on, because we had failed to carry out our duty. Well, Mr. Speaker, they were in custody a little over a month and, finally, it was recommended to Ottawa that the balance of the sentence be remitted and that these people be let out, not all at once but in groups so that there would be no danger of all going home at once, with another flare-up occurring and more trouble for all concerned. This was done and the result was that they all went back to their homes and there has been no more real trouble since. I feel it is the desire of the House and of the Province that, while these people must be dealt with generously in the matter of their beliefs, yet they must be dealt with firmly and must be told firmly that the laws of the Province must be obeyed and that it is our duty to see that they do obey them. I think that is the attitude which this House expects the Department to adopt and I think that is the attitude that the people want adopted, because there was a great loss by fire of schools and we are endeavouring to find the perpetrators of fires in that particular district.

Mr. Davis: In commending the officers of the Mounted Police, I think there was another officer who deserves some credit.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Yes, there might have been another Inspector there afterwards.

Mr. Davis: I just thought I would mention it. He did good work.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I wished to be perfectly understood that all the non-commissioned officers and men who had anything to do with the Doukhobor situation, lived up to the traditions of the old Force.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition referred to the Liquor Board and the administration of the Board. He referred to, or said something about, patronage in so far as the Board and the new Government was concerned, and suggested that there was something sinister or shocking of which this Government had knowledge and to which it was a party; and I can only say this, that if he has information which he thinks will be to the discredit of this Government in this matter he should produce it.

Mr. Gardiner: In order to make the Honourable the Attorney General perfectly clear, it was something to this effect: That an examination of the affairs of the Liquor Board would prove that Board to be at least as much tempered by political patronage as they were under the old Government.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a lot different and I am glad the honourable gentleman has qualified it because, as I understood it (and I do not know that other members did not so understand it) according to the Leader of the Opposition there was something shocking, sinister, and that it was definite. He will know, as well as we do, that there is no department more difficult to handle than the Liquor Board and I think it is the bounden duty of any member, if he has knowledge of any wrongdoing in the Board to bring it to the attention of the Government, and that at once, and if the Government fails to act, then the Government should fall.

Opposition Member: Is that an offer?

Mr. Gardiner: How does the Minister of Public Works like that?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, I am not speaking for the Minister of Public Works. He can speak for himself.

Mr. Gardiner: There are not very many who will speak for him.

Government Members: Oh yes, there are!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I was going to say, Mr. Speaker: I did not know, as a member of the House, and I did not know as a citizen, that there were so many distillers and blenders in the world as I have found to be the fact since this Government came into office. I want to tell my honourable friends this, that one concern wrote me, personally, because my name happened to be what it is, because of the fact that this firm handled a brand of Scotch par excellence "MacPherson's Cluny"!

There is no question as to the difficulty of any government in administering a department of this nature, and I was glad to hear indeed the fine offer made to us in regard to this particular department of Government. You know, Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of questions asked in this House—some today—relative to the appointment of returned soldiers, and in order that we might have the figures and have them definite, and in order that we might know what the totals are, I asked for a statement of the Board and I will give this to the House because it is of interest to the House:

"What was the total male staff on September 9th? Answer, 398.

How many of these were returned soldiers? Answer, 113.

What was the total male staff on February 20th, 1930? Answer 403.

How many of these were returned soldiers? Answer, 212."

Mr. Gardiner: Just a little more than the increase!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: We practically changed the number of returned men on the staff from 25 per cent to over 50 per cent! That is what this Government has done in a few months.

"How many of these were beer vendors on September 9th, 1929? Answer, 181.
How many of these were returned soldiers? Answer, 38.

How many were beer vendors on February 20th, 1930? Answer, the same number, 181.

How many of these were returned soldiers? Answer, 95."

Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures speak for themselves, and there has been, practically, a doubling of the number of ex-service men in this one department of the government since this Government took over, and in the beer stores the number has been almost trebled since the 9th of September last.

My honourable friend from Gravelbourg (*Mr. McGregor*) referred, the other day to petitions that came in from two places in his particular constituency, Hodgeville and St. Boswell's. Well, I asked the Chairman of the Board why these men were originally appointed and he tells me there was no petition on file at all. We heard about these petitions. But I am going to point out to my honourable friend here that the remarkable thing about it is that, when he complains nothing is being done, he is the man in position to give the facts, he is the man who knows all about it and I wonder if the petitions in the first place emanated from my honourable friend or if he was anxious to see these petitions—

Mr. McGregor: Mr. Speaker, regarding the statement by the honourable the Attorney General, I did not know anything about the petitions at all until they were sent to him. I did not!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, I will accept the answer of the honourable gentleman. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, referred to agents of the Attorney General in this Province. As he knows, and as my honourable friend, the member from Prince Albert and ex-Attorney General (*Mr. Davis*) will know, an agent of the Attorney General is not a Civil Servant and I am taking full responsibility for my agents and I am not asking consideration from anyone in the appointments made by this Government.

One of the arguments followed, or one of the suggestions made by honourable gentlemen opposite as to why this Government should not receive consideration at the hands of the people—or rather, one of the reasons offered, is that the old Government was much more economical, because we have ten members of the Executive Council, eight with portfolios, whereas when it went out it had an executive of only seven. Now, that sort of argument might go in a rural school house but it will not go here in this Legislature, and I will tell you why. If any of the members will go into the Library, Mr. Speaker, they will see there a picture of the Leader of the Opposition, who was at the time the Leader of the Government—and his first cabinet in this Province. He had eight ministers with portfolio in his first Cabinet. Six of these were experienced ministers; six of these had been ministers for years in the Province. When the new Government was formed the day of the “superman” was gone. No “supermen” to go to now! We wanted the various departments to get the attention which their importance warranted and I think honourable gentlemen will agree that those of us, who are in the new Government, whether we do it poorly or whether we do it well, have certainly given our time and energies unsparingly since we have taken over. We may, sir, have made some mistakes and may in the future, but in any event we are trying honestly, frankly and fairly, on the questions that come before us, to give the best service to the Province without regard to ourselves. I am referring simply to this fact to show that when my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, or any other honourable gentlemen, criticises us for having an Executive Council of eight and two ministers without portfolio, that he had an Executive Council of eight when he became Prime Minister, though one was dropped later. The addition of two Ministers without portfolio in this Government, Mr. Speaker, means very little looking at it from the monetary point of view and adds very much to the considered opinion in the Executive of this Province. I can say this, that I consider, and, I think every honourable member of the Executive Council considers, that the judgment of the honourable member for Hanley (*Hon. Dr. Stipe*) and the judgment of the honourable member for Swift Current (*Hon. Mr. Smith*) make a very real contribution to the Executive of this Province.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacPhersons Well, my honourable friends say, “Hear, hear!” but the fact is that when you consider seriously this criticism which has been offered and is being offered in the country, you have an idea of the dire straits in which our honourable friends find themselves when looking for arguments with which to attack this Government.

I want to pass on to another subject, Mr. Speaker, the subject of Power. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) and my honourable friend the member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*), if you will, for he was the Minister formerly in charge of this department, dealt with this matter in the course of the debate, and I want to say that I am particularly sympathetic with my honourable friend for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) for the tears he shed on Friday last relative to the Moose Jaw plant situation. I can imagine the anguish he suffered when he, as Minister in 1928, signed all those permits to private companies, when he was so sorry for himself and for us and for the Province, when he signed permits for all those lines then. I want to say this, that as a result of the administration of the honourable gentlemen opposite, that as a result of the legislation of the honourable gentlemen opposite, legislation which was passed and for which they were responsible, there was not a statute, not a section, not a line, not a word passed by way of legislation by which this Moose Jaw sale could have been prevented by this Government!

Mr. Gardiner: You could expropriate.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: My honourable friend says, “You could expropriate!” And that is the last thing he told us here a year ago that he would do. We can still do that but what I want to point out is this, when they tell us, “You could have done this or done that,” so far as that sale was concerned they left us with certain legislation and that legislation had not a section or a line or a word by which that sale could be prevented.

Mr. Gardiner: In what way would you do it other than by giving this Government the right to expropriate?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: This Government intends bringing down legislation and I think this Government can set up some legislation which will assist in making the position of public ownership secure in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Gardiner: We will look at it then.

Premier Anderson: And won't support it!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: One of many interesting remarks made by my honourable friend from Maple Creek the other night, I could not understand. He made this statement, that the private companies in this province were not interested to any great extent in the matter of extension of their transmission lines. Now, I want to say as a Minister of this Government, from my own experience since I became a Minister of the Government on September 9th last, that there was no question which was being urged as strongly by the companies as much as the right to extend their transmission lines in this Province. That is the thing they wanted more than anything else. That is the thing they want to-day and when my honourable friend says they do not want it and are not concerned with it, I cannot understand him at all. I asked the Power Commissioner this morning and he informed me that his information corresponded with mine. And all my honourable friend did was to hang his head. It was stated in the report to the Power Commission that this Company in Moose Jaw did not want to extend out of Moose Jaw. Well, if it is like the other companies, it will be most anxious to extend lines out of Moose Jaw and into the province. All I can say in that regard is this, that so far as this Government is concerned, it has made a definite statement and enunciation of policy, that any transmission lines built in this Province will be owned by the people of the province.

Mr. Gardiner: What about the plants?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, the matter of plants is something that will follow in its trail. It is also the considered opinion of the Government that, if the Power Commission and the Government feel it is necessary that plants should be expropriated, they will be expropriated.

There is another matter in this connection, Mr. Speaker, which I wish to refer to here. When this matter was before the House last year, when the Power Commission Bill was before the House, there was an amendment introduced by myself having to do with the sale of a municipal plant. Here we have a municipal plant in the City of Regina. They have one in Swift Current and had one in the City of Moose Jaw. My intention was that if it was put to the burgesses it would act as a brake because as it was under the existing law there was no provision, and so if a private company wanted to take that plant it would have to be put to the burgesses. What I said then I say now. I think that is legislation that should be introduced and will be introduced in this House, so that neither the Power Commission nor a private company can take a plant, municipally-owned, without the matter being submitted to the burgesses of the municipality which owns the plant. We find this: that under existing legislation there is no provision whereby—and my honourable friends opposite will agree—whereby the franchise as such and the agreement as such is passed on by any department of Government. It is not passed on. There is no advice given, no consideration given. The land and the money that goes with it is protected, but there is no passing on the agreement itself; no suggestion in the matter of adequate depreciation in the matter of the plant being taken over; no consideration of that at all! I can say this: The Government intends to submit to the Legislature legislation which will serve, we believe, as a brake to protect those plants which are municipally-owned and prevent impossible or inadequate prices being paid for such plants in the Province of Saskatchewan.

A great deal of attention has been devoted in this debate to the Farm Loan Board and we have heard expressions of opinion from gentlemen opposite and from members on this side of the House. My honourable friend from Prince Albert (*Mr. Davis*) decided that the best method of attacking the Farm Loan Board report was to attack the auditor. He told the House and through the House the public, something derogatory to Mr. Weston and of his capabilities as an auditor, and something of a certain action in the City of Saskatoon. But—he only told half the story! Here is a telegram which I have received from Mr. Weston, a telegram which he wrote and sent immediately after he had seen the attack made upon him by my honourable friend, and this can be verified by the facts:

"Letter read by Davis yesterday re Haffner action gives only one side of settlement of action, Haffner versus myself. Related correspondence shows that bond company paid large sums on bonds, thus recognising Haffner's shortage . . .

My honourable friend gave this House to understand that not a dollar was paid by the bond company in respect of the shortages of this Mr. Haffner. The telegram further states:

"All items in list in my affidavit were included by me on the advice of competent solicitor and were in my opinion undoubtedly owing by Haffner and he was liable to account for whole. My statement was accurate and action turned on inference to be drawn from the word 'default' in affidavit and my retraction referred only to this phase of matter not to amount found owing. I was not required to pay any costs to anyone in connection with this action. Correspondence filed in court with minutes of settlement confirms this."

So the whole thing hinged upon the use of the one word "default." It was on that one word that the retraction was made and not as to the amount owing.

Mr. Davis: The thing speaks for itself.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Yes! It speaks for itself! My honourable friend stated most explicitly that he (*Weston*) paid the costs and I, as a lawyer, give it as my opinion that he did not have to pay the costs because his statement was correct. If he had had my honourable friend as his solicitor, he certainly would have paid the costs, but *Mr. Weston* says this in his telegram: "I was not required to pay any costs to anyone in connection with this action." His statement was accurate.

Mr. Davis: I am told he did pay them.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: He did not pay one dollar—not a cent! When my honourable friend attacks *Mr. Weston* as not able to do his job, when he attacks him as an incompetent accountant, let me tell him this: In the last three years, *Mr. Norman*, a supporter of the late Government and a supporter of their candidates (in fact he had been mentioned as a candidate himself) has been Mayor of Saskatoon and, during these three years, this "terrible" man was Auditor of the City of Saskatoon. He was also auditor for the Saskatoon Brewing Company whose executive officials are certainly not supporters of this Government, but always have been strong supporters of my friends opposite . . .

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of privilege, *Mr. Speaker:* They may have been supporters of ours, but they certainly supported your friends in Saskatoon, this last election. I have heard that the first man to congratulate the First Minister on his victory was the manager of the Saskatoon Brewing Company.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: That does not alter the situation a bit. I warrant he had his whole staff out working against the Honourable Premier on June 6th last!

Then, *Mr. Speaker,* this "incompetent" auditor was also the accountant for the Pinder interests (*Mr. Pinder* being another strong Grit) and also for *Mr. Estey* who was Crown Prosecutor in Saskatoon.

Mr. Davis: You soon fired him!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: We are prepared to accept responsibility for that. But last, but not least, to show that this man was able and competent in his business, he was auditor for *J. O. Hettle*, a former member of the Farm Loan Board. *Mr. Hettle*, presumably, thought *Mr. Weston* the best auditor in Saskatoon. When therefore, this *Mr. Weston* has been engaged by all these supporters of my honourable friends, surely that proves he is competent.

Mr. Davis: That is to say, he audits for Grits, therefore he must be competent?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Not necessarily, but when this man was charged with being incompetent, I simply cite these cases just to show the facts. We could easily have brought Conservatives and proved more conclusively his ability as an auditor, but I only brought forward his Liberal clients, men who are well-known to my honourable friend, to show reasons why he should take back the derogatory statements he made with respect to *Mr. Weston*.

I have before me an editorial from the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald* of February 19, 1930, which charges in the most extravagant language, I think, *Mr. Speaker,* that has ever been brought onto the floor of this House, a "diabolical plot to kill the Farm Loan Board."

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: They say "Hear! Hear!". I am going to read a few extracts from this editorial. After complimenting the late Provincial Treasurer (*Mr. Patterson*) on his speech the other day, it goes on and gives a brief history of the Board. Then it goes on:

"After the war the Board's policy altered. It then adopted the policy of the regular loaning companies of requiring adequate security for all loans made . . ."

"Adequate security," Mr. Speaker! Now, the implication in that statement is that, before the period referred to, the Board was not requiring adequate security for all the loans, in spite of the fact that, by the very Act under which the Board was operating, it was allowed to loan only up to 50 per cent of the value of the borrower's land. If they did loan without "adequate security" then with every loan they made they were breaking the law—and they have been breaking it every day.

I have no doubt the gentleman who wrote this editorial was closely in touch with the Farm Loan Board and its intentions. Surely then, he must remember that the Farm Loan Board from its very inception, was definitely restrained from loaning more than 50 per cent of the value of the land. Then we come to this statement:

"And so we come to the deliberate attempt on the part of the Anderson Government to destroy public confidence in the Farm Loan Board through the employment of an auditor, etc."

Mr. Speaker, what the Government of this province is trying to do, what the Government of this province is pledged to do, is to restore confidence of the public in the Farm Loan Board and not destroy it. I say this: The confidence of the public in the Board was destroyed, years ago, by actions of former Governments, and we are trying to restore that confidence but we cannot do that by simply flouting the evidence contained in the report which has been submitted.

Here's another extract, Mr. Speaker:

"Secondly, it seeks to pave the way for crippling, possibly abolishing, the Government's Farm Loans scheme and thus pay off its own political debts to the moneyed interests who backed Tory candidates in the recent election."

My experience with loan men in the city of Regina is this: There are many loan men who are Liberals and supported the late Government in the last election; and there are many who are Conservatives and voted Conservative on June 6th. Let me repeat: During the election of last summer, many of the loan company men were supporters of this Government and I would say this that the loan man, whether he is a supporter of this Government or not, is not a bad citizen. The old line loan man will tell you what has been told from this side of the House. They do not want to wreck the Farm Loan Board at all. They want to co-operate with it. They recognise that it has a place, and they are not trying to drive it out of business. The thing the Government is trying to do, and what, I am convinced, it ultimately will do, is to restore public confidence in the Farm Loan Board.

Here is an interesting thing: This Government has announced that it has a policy that there will be no large loans and that there should be no loans over \$5,000. The honourable member for Turtleford (*Mr. Ayre*) (he is not in his seat at the present moment, I am sorry to say) does not agree with that. He wants larger loans, rather than smaller . . .

Mr. Gardiner: For his district . . .

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is advocating that there should be large loans, that is loans in excess of \$5,000 . . .

Mr. Gardiner: Where necessary.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: You would give larger loans where necessary but what about the small loans where necessary! There seems to be some line of cleavage, some difference of opinion on that. But whether necessary or not, we believe that no loan should be greater than \$5,000. We voted so much money at the last session of the Legislature for loaning purposes, and the Legislature in the near future will be asked to vote just as much to the Board. But if, instead of satisfying one man with a loan of \$10,000, you can help out two men with the same amount, we believe that policy, as advocated by this Government, is the policy which has the approval of the people of Saskatchewan today.

Mr. Hogan: That is not so.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: The honourable member for Vonda says it is not so. If he says so, then I must be right. But here is the real titbit of the Editorial:

"It is not surprising that mutterings are already heard in the Government ranks, and that, at a recent party caucus, certain members told the two Saskatoon City members to drop the political partisan report of their friend Weston like a hot potato."

Let me inform the members opposite, that the Government is going to clear up the situation and in that it receives the unanimous support of all the gentlemen on this side of the House.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had a very interesting address the other night from the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) in which he dealt with the Farm Loan Board report and in which he suggested that the report was a "submarine attack" on the Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Spence: So it was.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: The honourable gentleman repeats it, so I am right. But, Mr. Speaker, and here, as he borrowed a metaphor from naval warfare let me borrow one from the military service. Instead of a "submarine attack," the only thing honourable gentlemen opposite have done is to try to throw up a "smoke-screen" and, by levelling their attack against the auditor to make the people of the province forget the principle of the report and to hide the matters which they do not want to be discussed.

Mr. Gardiner: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not going on to discuss a report which we understand is to be referred to a Committee of this House! Now he is going on to review the whole circumstances and says we do not want to discuss them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have had no opportunity of discussing the report.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: It is all right for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to object now . . .

Mr. Gardiner: I objected at the very beginning.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: You did not object when the Honourable Member for Maple Creek was speaking on the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. Gardiner: But, Mr. Speaker, I did object as you very well know, when the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and the Honourable the Minister of Public Works discussed reports in their speeches in this debate when the reports were not properly before the House and before members had a chance to study them.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that in attacking the auditor they were simply throwing up a "smoke-screen" to blind the eyes of the public to the facts disclosed in the report.

Mr. Gardiner: Well—but do not say that we are not going to reply.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I know he will reply, Mr. Speaker. That is one thing we know he will do—reply!

We are all interested in the remarks of the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*), for his predecessor in the House was here for one purpose and one only, and that was to put Saskatchewan coal on the map. He was known on our side while he sat beside us over there, as "Lignite Jimmy," and I would say this: He did more to attract the attention of this House, and through the House the attention of the people of Saskatchewan to Estevan lignite coal than any man in the House. I was interested, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in hearing the honourable gentleman deal with the same subject the other afternoon, and particularly so, as this Government is pledged to use our own Souris coal wherever possible in the public buildings of the province. I would tell him further (I do not know if he suggested it, or if the suggestion came from another quarter) that the Government is giving consideration to the matter of advertising the coal throughout the Province, thus teaching the people more about our coal, how to use it most economically and to the best advantage, and so encourage the use of coal

dug in our own mines by our own citizens. Furthermore, the Government intends to do this: Having regard to the fact that this is a lignite coal and of admittedly inferior grade, and that a reduction in the matter of freight rates per ton mile in this Province would be of material benefit to the industry, this Government is giving consideration to the matter and will endeavour to secure this consideration from the Railway Companies. I submit this, Mr. Speaker: If in Manitoba, which has not grown so much as this province in the last ten years, they can burn twice as much Souris coal as this Province does (and my honourable friend can correct me if I am wrong) then, having account of the fact that this province's population has increased almost twice as much, it is the duty of the Government to encourage the greater consumption of our own coal in our own province and thereby develop one of our great resources and provide work for our own people. I say this, Mr. Speaker: The Government would be remiss in its duty if this industry is not given every chance to succeed, and if it (the Government) did not give a great deal of attention to the matter of encouraging the wider use of Souris coal. This is something the people of Saskatchewan are vitally interested in, and which they will approve.

Mr. Garner: May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that 10 per cent of the coal used in Saskatchewan is lignite. In Manitoba, they have used eight per cent lignite but only half of that is Saskatchewan lignite.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: You mean that they use more in Saskatchewan? That is very different from the figures I have here.

Mr. Garner: The figures I gave are correct. The Manitoba consumption was equivalent to, in heat value, 5,000,000 tons of Saskatchewan coal, and the Saskatchewan consumption was equivalent to 2,500,000 tons of Saskatchewan coal in heat value. But Saskatchewan supplied slightly more than six per cent. of the coal requirements of the two provinces. The latest figures for Manitoba show an annual consumption of 2,580,000 tons, and only four per cent of that came from Saskatchewan, 26 per cent from Alberta and approximately 70 per cent from the United States.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I think the honourable gentleman will agree that the situation should be remedied. If Manitoba can use Souris coal in their public buildings, then 75 per cent of our public buildings could use Souris coal to a large extent.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the course of this debate, in the various prophecies made on both sides of the House. In listening to them, I was reminded of many others made in years gone by. If you turn to page 203 of the 1927 Sessional Papers, you will find there one made by the present Minister of Agriculture who was then plain member for Tisdale (*Hon. Mr. Buckle*). It reads:

"Several prophecies have been made in this House and now I wish to make one. I well remember reading in a Toronto paper the Premier's (*Mr. Gardiner's*) speech made in Toronto in which he said it was just as easy to grow Liberals in Saskatchewan as it was to grow No. 1 hard wheat. He forgot to tell them that a lot of our wheat goes tough and smutty, and that we also grow a rejected grade of wheat, and after the next general election my prophecy is that some of these Liberals will grade 'rejected' also."

Now, I have in my hand this famous "Little Red Book" and my honourable friend from Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*), being something of a prophet, will know what I am going to read. It is this passage on the inside page, in which my honourable friend from Kinistino, in impassioned accents, comes to the defence of his Leader and makes a prophecy. I am going to read it just to show that the Minister of Agriculture is a much better prophet than the member for Kinistino. I won't read all he says here, but here is the closing sentence:

"I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I am confident of this, that when next the people of this Province have an opportunity to pass judgment upon the Prime Minister and his Government, and upon the Liberal party, the whole of Canada will echo with the sound of our triumphs."

Mr. Gardiner: It sounded better a year ago!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: No doubt it did. I was interested in hearing from the honourable member for Willow Bunch (*Mr. Johnson*) that he had looked up the Dictionary for a definition of "Political Groups." Let me tell the honourable member again that this is not the first time these groups have co-operated. They co-operated last year in

support of the amendment moved to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. So, Mr. Speaker, the idea of co-operation between these groups is not new. May I, therefore, in all seriousness and in all earnestness suggest to him that it is perilous to advance a rule or shape a rule in that way. So far as this Government is concerned, it is not in its name alone that its strength lies, but in the unanimous conviction of members of the co-operating groups which comprise the Government that, in working together they are serving the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. Opposition speakers who have participated in this debate have not seriously criticised the policies of the Government, but they have directed their remarks at the Progressives and sought to sow seeds of distrust among members of the co-operating groups. They have offered nothing real, nothing substantial, in the way of criticism but have endeavoured to sow discontent with the Government among the people. They have suggested in this House that they would condemn any effort to throw suspicion on any class in the community, but they come here to emulate those they would condemn. They come here with two arguments: First, that the Government is a "Tory" Government and not a "Co-operative" Government, and second, that there are no farmers in the Government. They are not concerned with the merits of the Legislation which is proposed. They are not concerned with that at all. They are only concerned with sowing the seeds of discord but they will find that, out of their own mouths, their arguments are condemned. Let them attack the policies of the Government and nothing else! But they will not do that for the reason that they know that, behind this Government, among members on this side of the House and the people of the country, there is the growing conviction that the Government is honestly, conscientiously and sincerely trying to do what is best for the Province of Saskatchewan. Because I share that conviction, Mr. Speaker, because it was the sovereign will of the people on June 6th that the new Government come in and the old Government be turned out, and because I believe the Government as at present constituted has the interests of the people at heart, I am going to support the Motion.

SPEECHES
ON
THE BUDGET

THE HONOURABLE HOWARD McCONNELL
(Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Municipal Affairs)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—Before moving the time honoured resolution "That you do now leave the Chair that Supply be granted to His Majesty," it becomes my duty to present to honourable members of this Assembly, a statement of the financial affairs of the province.

The new Co-operative Government assumed office on the ninth day of September last, about six months ago, so that this Budget will embrace a period of over four months during which the former Government was in office. As a consequence, I shall give not only a review of the transactions for which the present Government is responsible, but also of the transactions carried on by the late Government.

As the principal industry in our province is agriculture, I wish first of all, to deal with this important subject. The spring of 1929 opened under conditions which were far from favourable for good growth. The reserve of soil moisture was low due to the dry weather which prevailed in Saskatchewan during the late summer and fall of 1928. The weather last spring was too cool to promote good growth. The continued dry weather was the outstanding characteristic of the growing season of 1929. While the deficiency of rainfall was fairly general over most of the province, the districts most adversely affected were those in the southern central portions of the province. The yield of all grains was much below the average and the total production stands out in striking contrast to the large yield in 1928. This decrease in yield, however, is offset to some extent by the superior quality of the grain produced. Our crop correspondents estimate that over 95 per cent of our wheat will grade No. 3 Northern or better, as compared with an estimate of 36 per cent or better in 1928. There was no appreciable damage from frost or rust in 1929. The total value for field crops for 1929 was \$248,000,000.00 as compared with \$350,000,000.00 for the preceding year.

A continued decrease in the total number of livestock is reported. Horses and beef cattle showed a decrease while milch cows and sheep showed an increase in numbers. The decrease in the number of horses can be accounted for by the large increase in the use of tractors, combines and motor trucks.

Dairy production showed an increase of over \$1,000,000.00 during the past year. The thing to be noted, however, is that the dairy industry and livestock industry made such a creditable showing in face of such adverse conditions.

The outstanding feature in Western Canada's development for 1929 was the completion of the Hudson Bay railway to tide water. With the driving of the last spike, half a continent has been given a new and closer outlet to the sea. As a result, the development of Canada's great unexplored Northland has been brought nearer realization. New mineral areas have been opened up for the prospector; new water powers, new timber limits and new fur and fish resources have been brought closer to us. The completion of this route and the operation of same should mean more to the farmers of Saskatchewan than to the farmers of any other province. Eagerly we look forward to the fulfilment of our hopes which have been built on the completion of this route. Forty years

ago, Canada was referred to as a few shreds and patches forming a fringe along the northern border of the United States. The Canadian Pacific railway converted this fringe into a very respectable one-storey country. The National Transcontinental gave Canada a second storey. The completion of the Hudson Bay railway and other railway developments in other western provinces will add a third storey to our country and make accessible the extreme north.

Railway mileage was increased in this province during the year 1929 by 332 miles, representing 139 miles of steel laid down by the Canadian Pacific Railway and 193 miles of steel laid down by the Canadian National Railway. The total railway mileage in Saskatchewan is 7,898 miles. Generous extensions are promised by both roads for 1930.

Building activity in Saskatchewan last year was unprecedented. The total building permits for our three major cities amounted to over sixteen million dollars, while the total building activities for the entire province amounted to over thirty-four million dollars, more than ten million dollars greater than any previous year in our history.

While no major industries of the magnitude of General Motors' plant, established in 1928, were secured for the province last year, the natural increase in our population has been responsible for considerable growth in practically all established industries and an addition of a large number of minor new industries, which, although small in themselves, make a considerable contribution to the industries of our province. The flour and cereal industry is an established industry which is expanding. Robin Hood Mills in Saskatoon doubled its capacity last year. Agricultural expansion, too, is demanding more packing houses, creameries, cold storage plants, fruit houses and other facilities to provide for expanding production in diversified farm products.

In addition to the growth of these established industries, many new industries have been established in the province, including fur farming, the straw board industry, a new sodium sulphate refinery plant at Ormiston, a new clay export industry, the beginnings of a pottery industry, a new seed house at Moose Jaw and a paint and varnish industry.

The growth of the light and power industry is another example of an established industry expanding to keep pace with a growing population. The late Government caused to be passed in January 1929, *The Power Commission Act*. Owing to the fact, however, that it did not make any attempt to regulate in any way the prices to be paid by private power companies for power franchises in our urban centres, some of our villages and towns sold their electric light plants at prices in excess of their actual value. As a consequence of this failure of the late Government to regulate the sale of power franchises, there had been bought by such private companies at the time the Co-operative Government took office, 113 power plants. To-day, these companies own 114 power plants, the largest of which is in Moose Jaw. To-day the Provincial Government through its Power Commission, is competing in this field and is supplying to the people in various districts power at cost. The Power Commission to-day owns ten power plants, the largest of which is the new, recently completed \$2,000,000.00 power plant in Saskatoon. The activities of the Power Commission will continue to expand because the Co-operative Government is committed to the policy of public ownership in the production and distribution of electrical power. Three million dollars are placed in the estimates this year for this purpose. The Co-operative Government proposes at this session to introduce legislation, which had same been in effect, would have discouraged the sale of some of such power plants. The Hydro Electric plant at Island Falls on the Churchill river in the northeast portion of Saskatchewan is rapidly nearing completion. This plant will develop 42,000 horse power with provision for further units to be added.

The failure of the Canadian Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company to take up its option at the Rotten Stone and Lac La Ronge properties was a disappointment last year. This is characteristic of the mining industry. Additional important developments however, have taken place. The Dominion Explorers Limited has completed preliminary diamond drilling operations in its copper-nickle find at Stony Rapids near Athabasca lake. A similar drilling program has been completed at Montgomery Lake by the Canadian Consolidated Company, 190 miles north of Prince Albert. The Nippissing Mining Company has freighted supplies and drilling equipment during the winter to its claims at Missto-Ah-Sook Lake near Reindeer Lake.

Coal production in Saskatchewan increased from 467,131 tons in 1928 to 568,759 tons in 1929, an increase of 101,628 tons. The Government proposes to do all in its power to assist in the development of this industry.

Incomplete returns from our clay manufacturing plants would indicate that 1929 was the most successful year the operating companies have ever experienced. It is expected that 1930 will see the first Saskatchewan-made pottery on the market.

Volcanic Cleansers Limited at Swift Current carried out experimental work in their new plant in 1929 and expect in the near future to supply the market with polishes, cleansers, sodium silicate and fuller's earth.

The practice of former provincial treasurers when presenting their Budget Speeches, has been to deal with provincial finances under three headings. I propose to follow this plan. First, I shall deal with the last fiscal year ending April 30, 1929. Second, I shall deal with the financial standing of the province for the current fiscal year ending April 30, 1930. Third, I shall deal with the estimates for the coming fiscal year 1930-1931.

1. With reference to the year ending April 30, 1929, the cash receipts on Revenue Account totalled \$16,052,418.00. The cash expenditures on Revenue Account totalled \$15,971,231.00. This left a cash surplus of \$81,187.00 but this was only made possible by the application of liquor profits amounting to \$1,550,000.00.

2. For the current fiscal year now shortly ending, I may tell honourable members that the province's finances are not buoyant. It is anticipated that there will be a drop of approximately \$800,000.00 in the amount of \$15,953,000.00 estimated to be received as revenue. On the other hand estimated expenditures of \$15,947,175.00 will be greatly exceeded. May I say however, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, that 1929 was an exceptional year. The drought experienced by our province adversely affected the revenues of our people. The diminution in revenue of \$100,000,000.00 in field crops alone is a serious matter. Agriculture is our basic industry. When the farmer prospers the whole community prospers. When the farmer suffers all others are adversely affected.

May I illustrate how this decrease in the income of our farmers has decreased the revenues of our Government? The Farm Loan Board collected \$144,000.00 less last year than it expected to collect. The revenue from our Public Revenue Tax will be \$60,000.00 less than estimated. Motor licenses are expected to suffer a decrease of \$772,000.00 although a part of this decrease may be attributed to a reduction in license fees. The Public Works Department expects a decrease of \$51,000.00 occasioned by a drop in receipts for hospital sustenance. Fur royalties will be decreased \$28,000.00 and steam boiler inspectors' fees will be decreased \$13,000.00.

Notwithstanding this reduction in revenue occasioned in the main by drought and for reasons beyond the control of any Government, the finances of our province would have been in a much better position than they are had it not been for the additional heavy expenditures authorised by the late Government, both by Special Warrant and by commitments not provided for by Special Warrant. Some of these additional expenditures, of course, could not be avoided. An example is the increased cost of Old Age Pensions amounting to \$417,000.00. I submit, however, that the major portion of such extra expenditures was made on account of the fact that last year was an election year and further, on account of the result of that election. Some of the expenditures were made right up to the time that the late Government left office and with its full knowledge of the fact that some sections of our province were experiencing a drought, with the result that revenues must fall. Such practices cannot be too strongly condemned. The Supplementary Estimates of over five million dollars, recently tabled in this chamber and approved, will bear out these statements, because of this total, the present Government has been responsible for approximately \$800,000.00 occasioned principally on account of relief measures.

The greater portion of these additional expenditures made by the late Government, which could have been postponed or deferred, was made on highways. The Legislature voted for Highways at its last winter session approximately \$4,000,000.00. The Government not only spent this amount, it went further, and spent an additional \$1,900,000.00 which had never been appropriated by the Legislature at all. Honourable members should note in this connection, that all these expenditures made on highways were not such as would make toward a systematic development of our highway system as has been the course followed in other provinces.

The estimates of the Treasury Department disclose an estimated revenue of \$15,118,000.00 instead of \$15,953,000.00 as placed in the estimates in last year's Budget. An estimated expenditure of \$20,254,000.00 is shown instead of \$15,947,000.00 as placed in the estimates of last year's Budget. On the face of things, these totals show a very undesirable state of affairs. A balance on the wrong side of the ledger of \$5,136,000.00 is a large enough figure to give rise to the most sober reflection. The question which naturally arises is: "Are we trying to provide too many services with our revenues? Are we becoming extravagant? Are we losing sight of the fact that political expediency must not be allowed to too great a degree to influence the spending powers of our Government?" I shall endeavour to show that the picture is not as gloomy as it would at first appear. The reasons are these:

1. To assist in balancing our Budget I expect to make use of all of our anticipated liquor profits and reserve liquor profits. Honourable members will recall when Mr. Dunning was Premier, the policy of the Government was to regard the revenue from liquor stores as extraordinary and not as permanent revenue. It was treated as such. The major portion was used to retire bonded indebtedness when the bonds matured. It was felt at that time, that this was sound business practice. It WAS sound, for were the people of this province by their votes to decide to go out of the liquor business, the financial structure of the province would not have to be suddenly changed. New imposts and new forms of taxes would not have to be levied. It was found impossible, however, in succeeding years to adhere to this practice. In the passing of years, expenditures increased. Our people demanded more services and these services cost money. The Government of the day did not wish to become unpopular by imposing new forms of taxation, so it took the easier course. It had recourse to the liquor profits which were being piled up year by year. In 1927-28 it took the sum of \$600,000.00 from these profits and placed it in Revenue Account. In 1928-29 the sum so appropriated was increased to \$1,300,000.00, although to make its budget balance, the Government subsequently appropriated \$1,550,000.00 of these revenues. In the last budget brought down by the late Government for 1929-30 a sum of \$2,000,000.00 was taken from anticipated liquor profits and placed in the estimates as revenue. Had the Co-operative Government wished to do so, it could have, and I submit with justice, insisted, for the purpose of rolling up a very large deficit, that only \$2,000,000.00 of liquor profits for this current year should have been placed in revenue account. Well, Mr. Speaker, while that might have been fair and just, it chose to be generous. The financial reputation and standing of the province abroad was of more importance to the new Government than any other considerations. So, Mr. Speaker, I propose to place in the revenue account of our province for this current fiscal year, the total estimated liquor profits for the year which are \$2,300,000.00 and I propose to add to them the reserve liquor profits of \$1,430,000.00. These both total \$3,730,000.00.

May I state in passing that these profits would have been larger this year had it not been for one thing. A few days prior to relinquishing the reins of office, the late Government reduced the price of the commodities of our liquor stores. This reduction was not one that did credit to a great political party, certainly not to the great Liberal party. It was not done with the primary object of making liquor cheaper to the consumers individually, as the reduction was negligible. It was an ungenerous gesture at the most. It was done we feel, for one reason, to embarrass the new Government and to make its problem of financing this province more difficult.

2. The Co-Operative Government has gone further to maintain the credit of this province abroad. As stated before, the late Government without the authority of the Legislature, spent on highways \$1,900,000.00 over and above that amount which was appropriated by the Legislature. Instead of charging a portion of this extra expenditure of \$1,900,000.00 against revenue, I have, for the purpose of making the estimated deficit on the current year's operations as small as possible, charged the expenditure of that portion of this amount used for gravelling against capital account, instead of against revenue account. In other words I have charged the whole of this extra expenditure of \$1,900,000.00 against capital account. The policy that the late Government followed in this connection is clearly set forth in the Budget Speech of the Honourable W. J. Patterson, Provincial Treasurer, delivered January 17, 1929. This reads as follows:

"In the matter of highway construction, the Government has followed a sound and proper policy. Only those expenditures which are of a permanent nature are charged to capital, while revenue account provides for surfacing and similar items, although in many states such work is also charged to capital."

Had I chosen to follow the policy of the former Government as set forth in this speech, then the deficit on revenue account for this current year's operations would have been over one half a million dollars greater than it is.

3. To maintain the credit of the province, the Co-operative Government has gone even further in this matter of being generous to the former Government. Although, in so far as I am aware, the old Government never brought forward a surplus in former years to make its budget balance on the right side, I have decided to do so. In so doing, I have been able to add to revenue for this present fiscal year the accrued surpluses of former years totalling \$219,000.00.

4. As an additional measure to reduce this deficit, I have had recourse to an Act of this Legislature. As far back as 1923, the Legislature passed an Act known as "The Deferred Charges Act." This Act, and amendments thereto, made provision that money advanced by the province in implementing guarantees and on account of expen-

ditures which may be declared to be extraordinary by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, could be capitalized over a period of five years. Keeping this Act in mind, and acting within the spirit of its provisions, I purpose treating as Deferred Charges, certain expenditures incurred on behalf of relief measures, certain aids to agriculture and certain expenditures made in implementing guarantees. It must be remembered Mr. Speaker, that when treating these expenditures as Deferred Charges, the present Co-Operative Government is making it more difficult to balance its budgets in coming years, because provision will have to be made by five annual payments for the redemption of the securities sold to provide the required funds to reimburse current revenue account.

In estimating the revenues and expenditures for the present fiscal year, honourable members will appreciate that they are only estimates at best. With respect to estimated revenue I may have been too optimistic. On account of untoward circumstances over which no one has any control, revenue may be less than anticipated. On the other hand, it may slightly exceed our expectations. Some variations may also take place with reference to some expenditures; some unforeseen calls may be made upon us. I may tell honourable members this, however, that in an effort to determine as fairly as I can, the estimated revenues and expenditures of the province, I have consulted with Treasury officials and departmental officials. With the information placed at my disposal, I have forecast the financial position of the province as of April 30th, next. After considering all these things, I have estimated a deficit on the current fiscal year's operations of approximately \$400,000.00.

I come now to the task of placing the responsibility for this deficit. Can it be placed upon the shoulders of the new Co-Operative Government which assumed office on September 9th, last? The answer is quite obviously, no! The new Government has found it necessary to make a large number of emergent expenditures occasioned for the most part by poor crop conditions. The majority of these expenditures, as I have previously stated, may be capitalized under the authority of our Deferred Charges Act. I may say in all fairness that the unsatisfactory conditions of our crop have had considerable to do with the reduction of our revenues and in causing our ledger to balance on the wrong side. The bad crop conditions and consequent decreasing revenues were not however, the major cause of this deficit. My judgment is that this deficit has been caused in the main, by the policy of the former administration in allowing political considerations to influence its policy affecting expenditures to too great a degree. Not sufficient regard was paid by the former Government to possible unforeseen contingencies. The past Government spent right up to the hilt. The responsibility therefor for the estimated deficit rests squarely on the shoulders of the former Government.

As of August 31st last, nine days prior to the date, the new Government took office, the province's total indebtedness to the banks was \$7,800,000.00. In spite of liquor profits in reserve and totalling \$1,430,000.00 we found a bank over-draft on Consolidated Fund account of \$1,205,000.00. We found further, that Treasury Bills for \$6,567,000.00 had been sold to the bank. We found further, that expenditures on Revenue Account exceeded receipts of revenue by \$2,394,000.00. Finally we found that the late Government had issued Special Warrants for \$997,000.00 on Revenue Account and \$230,000.00 on Capital Account to provide for expenditures which it had failed to ask the Legislature to vote.

By the end of October our indebtedness to the banks had increased to \$10,400,000.00. This increase was occasioned by borrowings made necessary to a great degree to take care of the expenditures of the old Government. In view of these circumstances, the Government concluded that it would be the path of wisdom to retire most of the indebtedness by issuing debentures in an amount sufficient to take care of Treasury Bills issued on Capital Account. This was accordingly done. To date the new Government has sold securities of this province amounting to \$9,465,000.00.

The following are particulars of these sales made to a syndicate composed of the Dominion Securities Corporation, Wood Gundy Limited, A. E. Ames & Company, The Royal Bank of Canada and the Canadian Bank of Commerce:

1. \$2,000,000.00 worth of 5% thirty year debentures were sold at a purchase price of \$98.737 yielding 5.08%.
2. \$1,500,000.00 worth of 5% thirty year debentures were sold at a purchase price of \$98.737 yielding 5.08%.
3. \$1,500,000 worth of 5% thirty year debentures were sold at a purchase price of \$98.92 yielding 5.07%.
4. \$3,500,000.00 worth of 5% thirty year debentures were sold at a purchase price of \$99.27 yielding 5.05%.

5. \$965,000.00 worth of thirty year 5% debentures were sold at a purchase price of \$99.27 yielding 5.05%.

The price obtained for these securities was, on the whole, the best price obtained by any province west of the Great Lakes for securities issued during the same period.

The syndicate purchased, the day before yesterday, from the province \$3,200,000.00 worth of thirty year 4½% bonds payable in Canada and New York at 91.77% at a cost to the province of 5.03%. This is the best price obtained by any province in Canada for long term bonds during the past 8 months. This also is the first time for over a period of two years that we have issued 4½% bonds. The sale is particularly gratifying in view of some adverse criticism which has appeared in eastern newspapers with reference to the action of our three Prairie Provinces in guaranteeing certain Wheat Pool margins with Canadian banks.

The gross public debt of the province as at February 28, 1930, was \$69,270,135.00, or a per capita gross debt of \$80.56 computed on the population of 859,900 being the last estimate by the Dominion Government. The net debt at this date was \$38,892,057.00. or a per capita new debt of \$45.22.

The estimates for the coming year are now before honourable members. Our anticipated revenue will be \$17,764,935.00 as against an estimated revenue for the current year of \$15,953,000.00. This estimated increase in revenue is accounted for principally by an increase of two cents per gallon in the Gasoline Tax. The estimated expenditure for the coming year on Revenue Account is \$17,740,552.00 as compared with a similar estimated expenditure for the current year of \$15,947,175.00. This increased expenditure is accounted for principally as follows:

1. Public Debt charges are up \$842,000.00 occasioned largely by capital borrowings to provide for increased highway expenditures during the current year and proposed highway expenditures for the coming year and an additional advance to the Power Commission of \$3,000,000.00.
2. A normal increase for the Department of Education.
3. A considerable additional increase for Agriculture particularly in connection with the Department's campaign against weeds.
4. A considerable increase in the expenses of the Department of Public Health made necessary on account of the setting up of the proposed Cancer Commission and on account of increased hospital grants.
5. An increased expenditure under the Bureau of Child Protection to provide for Mothers' Allowances.
6. The necessity of providing additional \$450,000.00 over last year's estimates for Old Age Pensions making a total provided in this year's estimates of approximately \$1,000,000.00.

The Government proposes to institute a yearly independent audit of the finances of this province. This is in keeping with its undertaking and with the policy inaugurated by other provinces.

The requirements of the Farm Loan Board for the current fiscal year have necessitated the issuance of Treasury Bills for \$1,750,000.00. An endeavour is now being made to pay off, at least in part, these bills by local sales of 5% Farm Loan debentures which are now being sold to the public at 99.5 or yielding 5.03 per cent per annum. The sales to date total \$1,000,000.00 and the Government expects to make further sales of this class of security.

The affairs of the Farm Loan Board have been recently investigated by a special auditor. In any reorganization which takes place, the recommendations of the auditor will be kept in mind. There appears in the estimates for the coming year, already tabled, a further appropriation of \$500,000.00 for the use of the Board. The Co-Operative Government feels that the Board is serving a useful purpose in the interests of agriculture in Saskatchewan. It feels further, that the Board's activities should be continued. It also feels that as a result of this special investigation which has been conducted, the Board's activities will serve a greater purpose than ever before.

Th Supplementary Estimates for the twelve months ending April 30, 1930, contain this item: "Advance to the Saskatchewan Co-Operative Creameries Limited in protection of matured mortgaged debentures \$159,200.00."

The future of this concern was one of those unsettled problems left on the doorstep of the new Government by the late Government without leave or consent of the new Government. The Co-Operative Creameries Limited is an amalgamation of the former Caulder's Creameries Limited and the Co-Operative Creameries Limited. There was apparently not sufficient field for both competing companies to operate with profit. Certainly, the Co-Operative Creameries Limited with few exceptions, over the years it operated, never made any money. The information given the present Government by Mr. Caulder, is that on the initiative of the present Leader of the Opposition in this Legislature, the two organizations were amalgamated in 1927, by special Act of the Legislature.

At the time of the amalgamation of these companies, the liabilities of the Co-Operative Creameries were greater than its assets. It has been set forth in the auditor's statements (and in fairness to Mr. Caulder it must be said that he has denied this) that at the date of the amalgamation, the same state of affairs existed with regard to his company.

The reason that the Government to-day is so vitally concerned with this project is because it is interested in co-operative marketing of dairy products and because past Governments have invested large sums of our people's money in this project.

The Co-Operative Creameries Limited was incorporated in 1917 by special Act of this Legislature with a capital of \$1,000,000.00 divided into 50,000 shares of one dollar each and 47,500 shares of twenty dollars each. Caulder's Creameries Limited was incorporated in 1925 under the Dominion Companies Act with a capital stock of \$800,000.00 divided into 80,000 shares of ten dollars each, of which \$600,000.00 consisted of 7% cumulative, participating, preferred, non-voting shares and \$200,000.00 worth of common shares.

As a result of the amalgamation, new stock was issued to the former Caulder's shareholders in exchange for stock which they already held, with the following classifications:

1. Saskatchewan Co-Operative Preferred (Old Caulder's Preferred)
2. Amalgamation Series A (Old Caulder's Common)

3. To take care of the amount the Government was compelled to pay to the bank, over and above the amount secured by mortgage, the government accepted governmental redeemable shares. The original Saskatchewan Co-Operative shares remained intact as they were.

The portion of the former Caulder's common shares already issued, which was voting stock and which was replaced by Amalgamation series A, totalled \$108,000.00 At the time of the amalgamation of the two companies, Mr. Caulder did not own a controlling interest in said voting stock. The information of the Government to-day is, however, that he does now control a major portion of this voting stock. As a consequence, Mr. Caulder controls the election of seven directors and the shareholders of the old Co-Operative elects the other seven. The total value of the holdings of Mr. Caulder in the new company, were said valuations placed at par, total around \$58,300.00.

Since the amalgamation, Mr. Andreasen has been made President and Managing Director. Under the Act of amalgamation, the capital expenditures of the Company can only be made with the consent of the Local Government Board. It is only possible for the company to continue operations with the support of the Government. In other words, were the Government to withdraw its support, the company would have to cease operations. As a consequence, the Government today guarantees a line of credit at the company's bank. As at the thirty-first day of December last, the interest of the Government in this project totalled \$2,451,661.33, made up as follows:

Governmental Funds Directly Invested.

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Advances from Government secured by mortgages | \$897,800.00 |
| Bonds—1944—held by Provincial Treasury | \$159,200.00 |
| Government redeemable preferred stock | \$355,083.35 |
| | <hr/> |
| Total direct liability | \$1,412,083.35 |

Government Guarantees to Bank.

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Guaranteed bank loans | \$499,828.48 |
| Advances by bank (special) | \$100,000.00 |
| Portion of general advances from bank guaranteed by Government | \$439,750.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| Total indirect liability | \$1,039,578.48 |
| Gross liability on both accounts | \$2,451,661.83 |
| | <hr/> |

Since the new Government took office various propositions have been made to it concerning this company:

1. It has been suggested that the Government sell the concern to private interests.
2. It has been suggested that the Government have the entire assets of the company valued by competent valutors, then turn the entire enterprise over to the producers of this province at its actual valuation.
3. It has been further suggested that the Government purchase Mr. Caulder's shares and in this way secure control of the voting stock held by the former Caulder shareholders.
4. Finally it has been suggested that the Government take no action at the present time but that it continue to guarantee a line of credit at the bank to permit the company to carry on its operations.

Since the amalgamation, the Company has continued to pay dividends to the former shareholders of the Caulder's Company. The Government does not approve of this action of the directors, because the Government believes and feels that any profits made by the company should be used to assist it in retiring the Company's large indebtedness to the Government and in this way to endeavour year by year to bring this concern nearer a condition of solvency.

I may tell honourable members, finally, that the Government is giving the solution of this problem its best attention. It is advised that the Company made more genuine progress last year than it has far many years. Whatever it does, the Government will do what it believes to be in the best interests of the dairy industry of this province.

As in all budget speeches, many references are made to receipts and expenditures, per capita Public Debt and other matters, detailed particulars which cannot readily be included in the address, I shall ask permission to have them included in schedules to the address.

Increasing expenditures by various departments of the Government are taking place and have been taking place for the past number of years. Our ideas of what a government is for are continually changing. People are demanding more and more services from their governments than ever before. May I say that our people should have these services if the public treasury can pay for them. But Mr. Speaker, this expansion can only keep pace with our expanding revenues. Direct taxation, which is the only form of taxation which the province can resort to under its constitution, is never a popular form of taxation. Our people, I believe, recognise that if more services are being continually asked for and given, then our taxes must become heavier. New imposts will have to be made and new methods devised to raise this necessary revenue. We cannot eat our cake and have it too. If people insist on certain services, then we shall have to insist on more and heavier taxes to pay for those services. Any government which unduly expands its expenditures because it is not able to resist unreasonable requests for increased appropriations, is derelict in its duty. It is sometimes the duty of a government to refuse such requests. It must ever keep in mind that the financial reputation of the province and its ability to pay as it goes are in its keeping.

The manifold activities of government are entering more closely and more intimately into the lives of our people. One note that it should emphasize at this time is that of economy. Thrift is not only an attribute in individuals but in governments as well.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I assert our fundamental belief in the future of our province. Our people came here from many lands. They spoke many tongues. For them the great adventure was their migration. They came here because they believed

a brighter future was their lot. I believe that every one wants to contribute his and her small share in making our province a great province and our country a great country to the end that Canada as a nation will have a place in the sun.

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair.

SCHEDULE 1

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES

| | 1927-1928 | | 1928-1929 | |
|---|-----------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| Percentage | | | Percentage | |
| 1. DOMINION GOVERNMENT | 27.1594 | \$3,172,015.72 | 21.93644 | \$3,115,974.03 |
| (a) Subsidy | 17.4033 | \$2,032,575.00 | 14.41745 | \$2,047,935.00 |
| (b) School Lands | 9.7561 | 1,139,440.72 | 7.51899 | 1,068,039.03 |
| 2. TAXATION | 30.3116 | 3,540,157.19 | 33.78906 | 4,799,713.42 |
| (a) Public Revenues (Less Commission) | 16.0527 | 1,874,832.73 | 11.97960 | 1,701,649.13 |
| (b) Wild Lands (Less Commission) | 3.1774 | 371,075.92 | 2.07599 | 294,884.43 |
| (c) Supplementary Revenue (Less Commission) | .1751 | 20,454.79 | .17248 | 24,500.13 |
| (d) Inheritance | 3.1098 | 363,201.52 | 2.84986 | 404,810.10 |
| (e) Corporation | 4.3490 | 507,936.24 | 3.98165 | 565,576.06 |
| (f) Timber Berth | .0752 | 8,783.20 | .03424 | 4,863.14 |
| (g) Railways | 2.9882 | 349,000.00 | 3.40736 | 484,000.00 |
| (h) Fur Royalties | .3842 | 44,872.79 | .47587 | 67,595.24 |
| (i) Gasoline | | | 8.81291 | 1,251,835.19 |
| 3. LICENSES | 21.8320 | 2,549,804.91 | 19.16283 | 2,721,994.21 |
| (a) Detective | .0034 | 400.00 | .00140 | 200.00 |
| (b) Auctioneer | .0817 | 9,537.50 | .05809 | 8,252.50 |
| (c) Peddlers | .2568 | 29,990.00 | .18174 | 25,805.98 |
| (d) Marriage | .1779 | 20,774.00 | .16079 | 22,840.00 |
| (e) Motors | 19.4005 | 2,265,836.26 | 17.13770 | 2,434,335.04 |
| (f) Moving Pictures | .3099 | 36,193.71 | .26266 | 37,309.65 |
| (g) Circus | .0428 | 4,993.14 | .01163 | 1,652.86 |
| (h) Company | .1070 | 12,500.00 | .09391 | 13,340.00 |
| (i) Insurance | .7279 | 85,014.85 | .61405 | 87,223.24 |
| (j) Fur Dealer | .1567 | 18,297.30 | .12211 | 17,345.84 |
| (k) Game | .2332 | 27,239.96 | .23354 | 33,173.25 |
| (l) Slaughter House | .0385 | 4,502.00 | .02971 | 4,220.00 |
| (m) Plumber | .0040 | 470.00 | .00347 | 493.00 |
| (n) Undertaker | .0028 | 326.00 | .00191 | 272.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| (o) Steam Boiler | .1257 | 14,685.00 | .08427 | 11,970.00 |
| (p) Cow Testing & Creameries | .0070 | 810.00 | .00461 | 656.00 |
| (q) Trappers | .1519 | 17,738.19 | .15764 | 22,392.85 |
| (r) Dog Trainer | .0043 | 497.00 | .00306 | 435.00 |
| (s) Collection Agents | | | .00054 | 77.00 |
| 4. FEES | 8.3607 | 976,463.07 | 8.63980 | 1,227,245.64 |
| (a) Notary Public | .0289 | 3,370.00 | .02330 | 3,310.00 |
| (b) Commissioner of Oaths | .0048 | 562.00 | .00528 | 750.50 |
| (c) Police | .2080 | 24,285.10 | .21593 | 30,672.51 |
| (d) Succession Duty Fees | .0479 | 5,598.00 | .04095 | 5,816.00 |
| (e) Land Titles | 5.1233 | 598,358.17 | 4.31880 | 613,465.67 |
| (f) Court and Sheriff | .8716 | 101,795.53 | 1.96087 | 278,533.30 |
| (g) Company | .2521 | 29,442.50 | .30705 | 43,615.50 |
| (h) Examination (Education) | .7497 | 87,562.51 | .65081 | 92,444.05 |
| (i) Teachers' Certificates | .0174 | 2,034.51 | .01888 | 2,681.42 |
| (j) Normal School | .2464 | 28,779.85 | .20856 | 29,624.81 |
| (k) Brands | .0311 | 3,633.05 | .02066 | 2,934.50 |
| (l) Stallion Examination | .0149 | 1,737.00 | .01048 | 1,489.00 |
| (m) Stallion Registration | .0224 | 2,617.80 | .01699 | 2,413.95 |
| (n) Vital Statistics | .0561 | 6,556.09 | .05078 | 7,213.17 |
| (o) Administration of Estates of the Mentally Incompent | .1577 | 18,416.40 | .12500 | 17,755.98 |
| (p) Steam Boiler's Act | .1327 | 15,501.67 | .11046 | 15,690.60 |
| (q) Liquor Permits | .1198 | 13,995.00 | .09479 | 13,465.00 |
| (r) Transmission Line Permits | | | .04280 | 6,078.75 |
| (s) Miscellaneous | .2759 | 32,217.89 | .41741 | 59,290.93 |
| 5. REPAYMENTS OF ADVANCES AND LOANS (Other than on Capital Account)..... | 2.4044 | 280,815.88 | 1.54403 | 219,322.25 |
| 6. INSTITUTIONAL REVENUE | 1.6799 | 196,198.62 | 1.50846 | 214,270.57 |
| 7. FINES, FORFEITURES AND ESTREATED BAIL.... | 1.0325 | 120,587.06 | .75801 | 107,672.01 |
| 8. MISCELLANEOUS | 7,2195 | 843,183.70 | 12.66047 | 1,798,362.99 |
| being Interest, Sale of Publications and Materials, Liquor Profits, Etc. | | | | |
| | 100.00 | \$11,679,226.15 | 100.00 | \$14,204,555.12 |

THE BUDGET

SCHEDULE 2

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF DISTRIBUTION OF EXPENDITURES

| | 1927-1928 | | 1928-1929 | |
|---|------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|
| | Percentage | | Percentage | |
| 1. ADMINISTRATIVE | 3.8875 | \$ 452,274.52 | 3.45282 | \$ 487,016.37 |
| 2. LEGISLATIVE | 1.6532 | 192,331.61 | 1.36629 | 192,713.58 |
| 3. PROTECTIVE | 12.6527 | 1,471,999.82 | 10.98155 | 1,548,935.38 |
| (a) Police | 3.9243 | \$ 456,548.53 | 1.90168 | \$ 268,229.49 |
| (b) Courts | 2.0638 | 240,104.90 | 2.99367 | 422,253.32 |
| (c) Gaols | 1.6125 | 187,596.00 | 1.51783 | 214,088.73 |
| (d) Land Titles | 2.8635 | 333,133.61 | 2.49421 | 351,806.54 |
| (e) Miscellaneous | 2.1886 | 254,616.78 | 2.07416 | 292,557.30 |
| 4. DEVELOPMENTAL | 76.6822 | 8,921,103.63 | 79.69374 | 11,240,714.11 |
| (a) Education | 35.1613 | 4,090,617.25 | 29.02191 | 4,093,508.65 |
| (b) Public Health | 15.0047 | 1,745,620.53 | 13.56240 | 1,912,961.56 |
| (c) Child Protection and Old Age Pensions | 4.5760 | 532,369.14 | 6.26709 | 883,965.59 |
| (d) Promotion of Agriculture & Commerce: | | | | |
| 1. Agriculture | 4.3742 | 508,889.66 | 4.09690 | 577,863.23 |
| 2. Highways | 16.4106 | 1,909,189.77 | 25.38227 | 3,580,141.93 |
| 3. Labour & Industries | 1.1554 | 134,417.28 | 1.36317 | 192,273.15 |
| 5. MISCELLANEOUS | 5.1244 | 596,175.30 | 4.50560 | 635,510.26 |
| | 100.00 | \$11,633,884.88 | 100.00 | \$14,104,889.70 |
| | 100.00 | \$11,633,884.88 | 100.00 | \$14,104,889.70 |

SCHEDULE 3

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

STATEMENT OF PUBLIC DEBT

AS AT FEBRUARY 28, 1930.

| | | | Per Capita |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| PUBLIC DEBT—GROSS | \$69,270,134.78 | | \$80.56 |
| Public Buildings | \$21,458,857.84 | | |
| Public Improvements | 18,317,693.46 | | |
| Telephone System | 11,911,318.17 | | |
| Saskatchewan Pool Elevators Ltd. | 2,425,218.63 | | |
| City of Regina—Cyclone Loan.... | 586,351.55 | | |
| Drainage Districts | 384,099.58 | | |
| Patriotic Aids | 153,542.53 | | |
| Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries Ltd. | 673,076.95 | | |
| Farm Loan Board—Farm Loan Debentures, Etc. | 10,767,332.75 | | |
| Lignite Utilization Board | 279,684.73 | | |
| Agricultural Aids | 196,209.50 | | |
| Saskatchewan Power Commission | 2,116,749.09 | | |
| | <u>\$69,270,134.78</u> | | |
| Less: Debt created for utilities, etc., which carry public debt charges: | | | |
| Telephones | \$11,911,318.17 | | |
| Saskatchewan Pool Elevators Ltd. | 2,425,218.63 | | |
| City of Regina | 586,351.55 | | |
| Drainage Districts | 384,099.58 | | |
| Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries Ltd. | 673,076.95 | | |
| Agricultural Aids | 196,209.50 | | |
| Farm Loan Board—Farm Loan Debentures Etc. | 10,767,332.75 | | |
| Saskatchewan Power Commission | 2,116,749.09 | \$29,060,356.22 | |
| Sinking Funds created for the re- demption of debt incurred for pur- poses other than utilities etc.: | | | |
| 4% Stock 1951 Sinking Fund.... | 800,315.48 | | |
| 4½% Stock 1954 Sinking Fund | 262,693.27 | | |
| | <u>1,063,008.75</u> | | |
| Less portion of above Sinking Funds allocated to Telephone System on account of payments and accruals of interest | 420,547.52 | | |
| | <u>642,461.23</u> | | |
| Patriotic Aids Sinking Fund | 161,209.12 | | |
| General Sinking Fund | 514,050.75 | 1,317,721.10 | 30,378,077.32 |
| Net Debt | <u>\$38,892,057.46</u> | | <u>\$45.22</u> |

THE HONOURABLE J. F. BRYANT, M.A., LL.B., K.C.

(*Minister of Telephones and Public Works*)

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—I rise with feelings of trepidation to support the motion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. I do so, Sir, because I feel that it is dangerous to feel too safe even in this Chamber. The battle of September was a strenuous affair but it was nothing to that bloodless battle of the other evening, when the champion of a once-great tribe, known as Chief Heap Big Talk, was vanquished and made our Braves rejoice.

Then, Sir, apparently the habit was catching because we find that shortly after some one, egged on by what had taken place in Saskatchewan, got up in the Quebec House and challenged the whole Assembly. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that under these circumstances it would be conducive to the peace and harmony of this Assembly if you would cause to be hung on the walls a facsimile of that harp that once hung on Tara's walls so that our Irish friends, when looking at the emblem, would think of the instrument they would be carrying in some far future time in that Vale of Peace, Perfect Peace!

Now, Sir, while our friends may be a little quick of temper their disposition is sunny. They are gifted with humour, and have such bright dispositions that we forget all these little things and I think I can say, on behalf of the members on this side of the House, that with all their faults we love them still. And, Sir, I feel that when the question of immigration to this country is taken into consideration that the Premier will not overlook the fact that we should have a very fair sprinkling of our friends from the Emerald Isle.

Now, for a number of years there has been a growing dissatisfaction with telephone conditions in this province, particularly in connection with rural lines. There have been many rumours of graft, excessive prices, of waste, incompetence and of mal-administration. We desired as a Government, therefore, to have a Government Audit, an independent audit, and we retained the services of O. J. Godfrey and Company, a firm of long standing in this province, a firm that had a very wide experience, the senior member of which was formerly the head of his profession in this province, and I think also the head of his profession in the Dominion of Canada, and is held in high repute all over the country. We asked him to conduct a cost accounting of the capital account, and also to carry on an examination of the loan account, and the relationship of the department with the province, and also to conduct an audit of last year's telephone business. Later on, we instructed Mr. Godfrey to investigate the rural telephone branch.

As a result of the evidence found by Mr. Godfrey, some of which was outside of the scope of an ordinary auditor's report, and, owing to the information given to me by employees and by members of the rural telephone companies and others as to the situation in the Telephone Department and the situation in connection with the rural telephones of this country, we resolved to conduct a general inquiry and to make a thorough investigation. To do so we retained the services of G. B. Munnoch & Company of Calgary and Winnipeg. Mr. Munnoch is a man of large experience in connection with, accounting and investigation work. He was formerly the head accountant for the Home Investment and Savings Association for thirteen years, in Winnipeg, and latterly, for a number of years has been employed by the largest financial firms in western Canada in connection with inquiries, having particularly to do with insurance matters and specialising as an insurance adjuster. I have had experience with Mr. Munnoch and I can safely say that he is a most efficient and a most capable, competent and thorough investigator.

Now, Mr. Munnoch examined documents and records and books of the system; he examined many of the employees and sent out circular letters to the rural telephone

companies, and, as a result, acquired a great deal of interesting information. There were, however, difficulties in the way, as stated by Mr. Munnoch in this letter with the report, many difficulties. Many matters could not be inquired into, the matters were all old and it was too expensive to follow them up, many of the principals were dead and many of the witnesses were outside of the country. Many of the documents were missing, the files clearly had been stripped in many instances and documents of some ten years' standing, most of them by Order in Council.

Now, the Munnoch report is frankly a political report! I am making this statement, Mr. Speaker, at the present time to save the breath of some of our friends on the other side and to do away with the necessity of their making a repetition such as has been done so often by the honourable member from Pipestone (*Mr. Patterson*) in connection with the Weston Report. It is a political report, Mr. Speaker, in that it reveals something of the political activities of the Liberal party. During the twenty-five years of Liberal Administration in Saskatchewan every move that they made was a political move. As a result of their political activities they lived, and moved, and had their being.

"Politics was the Liberals' vital breath,
The Liberals native air,
Their watchword at the gates of death
And now they do not care;
Save in that Happy Land, far, far away,
Where saints in glory stand,
Just like this array."

Now, the member from Pipestone (*Mr. Patterson*) has given us some criticisms of the Budget Address. As far as I could follow that criticism, he was in my opinion extremely weak and it was a laboured effort. He tried to leave with the people of Saskatchewan the tale that the Co-operative Government was responsible for the increase in the public debt, when the responsibility for that increase rested upon the Government of which he was a member, for it actually spent the money. According to the honourable member for Pipestone, the Co-operative Government was responsible for that increase and he said this Government in so increasing the public debt was following the practice of all Conservative Governments. I think he made that remark. Might I inform the honourable member that his references to history are no better than his analysis of the Budget Speech. The Conservative Governments in Canada have been called Conservative because during the whole history of that party they have husbanded and conserved the resources of the country and have been very frugal in their expenditures.

Mr. Davis: Hear, Hear!

The honourable member from Pipestone, or the honourable members that follow in his place, need not say that the report is full of office "tittle-tattle," for I may say to the honourable member that when you read in the Munnoch Report, "I am told", he has been told by a responsible party and he has a statement in writing over the signature of one or more parties to back up the statements.

My honourable friend will no doubt say it has cost the province \$3,288.10 to prepare material for my speech and that the investigator has written this speech for me. I do not mind the gentle impeachment of the mild member for Pipestone or from some others in that respect. The investigator has been of great help to me in assembling the material for this speech and I have used facts and figures as unearthed and tabulated by him. The way in which the Telephone Department has functioned under the Liberal regime has cost the people of this province well over \$6,000,000 more than it should have cost and the people of this country will not begrudge the spending of a comparatively small sum in endeavouring to get a statement of what has taken place, with a view to remedying the conditions in the future and with a view to placing the telephone administration, both of the Government system and of the rural systems, on a sound financial and economic basis.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The Liberal Governments have been called Liberal for the opposite reason. The Liberal Governments have been extravagant, wasteful and illimitably liberal with the money of the people of this country. It will take more than the *ipse dixit* of the honourable member for Pipestone to convince the electorate of this country. The member from Pipestone complained last night that the Government was unfair to him in that they desired him to proceed with his speech at eleven

o'clock and did not allow him the courtesy which he says has been usually extended to members of the Opposition speaking under similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House on many occasions as a spectator during the last twenty-five years but I have been unable to see any traces even of courtesy in the treatment of members of the Opposition by the members of the then Government. When the honourable member spoke on the Budget he did not desire to do so late one afternoon for fear he would not get his flaring headlines in the *Regina Leader*, or his fair share of red ink in the *Regina Star*. He desired to break into the Saturday issue if my memory serves me right, and I speak subject to correction, and that courtesy was extended to him by the House. In view of that fact, I say that it did not sit well on the honourable member last night to try and raise a grievance, for he had no grounds for complaint. The member from Pipestone was very anxious to tell the world that on the ninth of September, when he surrendered office, the public debt was \$65,000,000 in odd figures, and that now it had suddenly increased to nearly \$70,000,000 under the present Government. He was very careful not to mention in connection with that part of his speech, although he did in another part of it, the millions that were owing at the bank in the shape of Treasury Bills and overdrafts by the late Government and that it was for the purpose of clearing away this indebtedness that the additional amount was added to the debt.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the statement of the honourable member, I must correct him. What I said was that the amount of the public debt was just under \$70,000,000.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: In this I stand subject to correction. The friends of the honourable gentleman and the honourable gentleman himself have been complaining that the Minister of Public Works has been very extravagant in connection with the draining of Wascana Lake, but the extravagance amounted to the sum of 21 cents. Well, I have only drained the lake but the honourable member from Pipestone and his friends have drained the Provincial Treasury, and, while the snows of winter and the gentle rains of summer will fill Wascana Lake, yet the dollars that have been drained by the honourable gentleman and his friends are lost and gone for ever! Yea, lost and ye shall weep in vain for them!

The Saskatchewan Government Telephone System dates back to 1908 when the Government purchased the Bell Telephone Company plant and the Saskatchewan Telephone Company plant. In 1908 The Rural Telephone Act was assented to and various rural telephone companies commenced their activities. The rural companies are not part of the Government system but the Government assisted them by the granting of free poles between 1908 and 1913, and by maintaining a department for their supervision.

In 1913 a new Rural Telephone Act was passed. The system of granting free poles was abandoned and the companies were authorised to borrow money for plant construction by way of debentures.

The Government system has cost to date \$13,223,838.05, which represents the amount borrowed from the Treasury Department for capital expenditure. The rural companies have issued debentures amounting to \$17,076,337, but did not pay their interest out of the earnings of the company but collected both principal and interest by way of taxation; the interest running from five to eight per cent. and the term of debentures being in most cases fifteen years.

The total cost of rural companies, when all debentures and interest have been paid, will be \$25,576,537. Add to this the present capital expenditure on the Government system and the amount paid by the Government under the free system of poles and the total actual cost of all telephone systems in Saskatchewan is \$41,195,859. In view of this enormous expenditure and in view of the present condition of the majority of our rural companies, and in view of the campaign now being engineered by interested parties with the object of trying to force us to sell our whole system, both government and rural, to private corporations, we have given very careful attention to a survey of the whole situation.

The purchase of the Bell Telephone Company was an issue in the election of 1908 and, although the matter was placed before the electors, it is interesting to note from the correspondence that the Government never ascertained the price of it until after the election. The Government entered the telephone field at the time according to their own statement "to lessen the prospects for and make less inviting, the further investment of capital by any private company."

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman spoke of interested parties trying to force the Government to sell the system. Who made the offers?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I am not telling you; the situation then with reference to the Telephone System being somewhat similar to that of the Power System.

The auditor shows from an examination of the department that the reports of the Department of Telephones as published in the Public Accounts are incorrect and misleading. He first calls attention to the fact that section 25 of The Telephone Act provides for the setting aside of a sum of money annually from the receipts of the public telephones system for "Replacement" and section 26 provides for the setting aside of a sum annually from the receipts for "Reserve" to provide for extraordinary expenditures incurred by storms, fires, lightning and other causes. This had not been done and there was only one credit to either of these funds in the whole history of the department.

The Saskatchewan Government Telephone System is the result of money advanced by the Treasury and invested in plant. In Alberta and Manitoba the capital advance for telephones is looked upon as a permanent investment of the province not subject to repayment. The telephone systems in those provinces are required to maintain sufficient cash reserves to keep the system up to one hundred per cent. of its original value, and up to date at all times.

When the Government system in Saskatchewan was organised it was not the intention that the capital borrowed be repaid. It was intended that loans from the Treasury Department were to be used for capital expenditures only, and thus the province would have an asset of the plant against the Treasury loans.

In 1923, a change took place on the recommendation of the Hon. Charles A. Dunning, and the repayment of capital to the Treasury was authorised. Since that date, the Telephone Department has repaid to the Treasury on account of loans advanced \$2,895,699. The auditor states as follows on page thirteen of his report:

"Shareholders only look for a return on their investment, without any repayment of capital. Present system would, if carried to completion, result in telephone users buying their own system, and handing the same over to all the citizens of the province as a free gift."

In view of the fact that Manitoba and Alberta are financing their telephone systems on an entirely different basis to Saskatchewan, the auditor suggests that a decision should be made as to whether the department is to repay its capital to the Government or not, and if the capital is to be repaid that a settled policy be immediately adopted.

The total revenue received by the Telephone Department from 1909 to 1929 was \$30,530,616.23. The total operating expenses during the same period \$17,013,214.17. The revenue therefore available for distribution amounted to \$13,517,402.06. The total revenue distributed was \$9,866,866.72. Adding to this amount repaid on capital of \$2,643,178, there should have been available for reserves from the revenue received \$1,007,357.34.

The cost, however, of the Government Telephone System was not just the amount of loans from the Treasury Department as shown by the statement as \$13,715,111.63. The Telephone Department made use of its current revenues for capital account purposes. The Telephone Department did not consider itself governed by legislative appropriations to the amount of expenditures on capital account, an action which was entirely illegal according to the opinion of the Deputy Attorney General in reply to the query of the Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

The cost of Government Telephone System is as follows:

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Loans from Treasury..... | \$13,715,111.63 |
| Paid from Revenue | |
| Depreciation on material plant..... | 659,203.42 |
| Renewals and construction of exchanges..... | 717,550.12 |
| Renewals and construction on toll lines..... | 527,457.76 |
| Total Capital in plant..... | \$15,619,322.93 |

Each year the Public Accounts show the Department of Telephones over-expended. For example for the year 1918, the over-expenditure as shown in the printed accounts is \$437,826.39. None of the other departments are shown as over-expended. The state-

ment is not true because they were not over-expended. In that particular year they made \$260,000 profit. The custom was to estimate their income. They then stated that this was what they were going to spend.

In 1928 their income was \$437,826.39 more than they estimated. They say they over-expended that much. This is one of the most ridiculous assertions. The money was in the bank and was not spent at all. Either they wanted to conceal their profit so as to spend it on some other source next year, or they did not know their profit and did not want people to know that they did not know. On the first of May, 1928, they transferred the over-expenditure and other moneys to reserve. What was shown on the Public Accounts as an over-expenditure and a deficit is transferred to reserve as a profit! It is an impossible and unheard of situation and is the method they employed of concealing the profit. It is most misleading on the face of it. I have never seen anything so misleading in a public statement. I am advised that this is the Dunning method of finance as he would not allow a proper 'profit and loss' statement.

Now, I want to deal briefly with the relationship of the Department of Telephones with the Treasury Department of the province. The Treasury Department retains the premiums on the telephone bond issue for telephone purposes, amounting to over \$225,000. They say that these were not specific telephone bonds yet the money was raised for the purpose. Though they retained the premiums, they charged the Telephone Department with the losses on the bond issues amounting to \$343,306.26. Why keep the profits on the bonds and charge the Telephone Department with the losses? It would make the capital debt that much less if the premiums had been turned over.

The "capital receipts" of the Government from the Telephone Department, according to the Public Accounts, go into general revenue of the province and are used to finance the Government. This method of "high finance" is definitely wrong—

Mr. Patterson: Did you say the capital receipts went into the general revenue of the province?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: According to the Public Accounts. That is as I read the report of the auditor and I stand subject to correction.

Mr. Gardiner: Is that Mr. Godfrey's statement or the other man's?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Yes, Mr. Godfrey's. The "capital receipts" go into the general revenue of the province and are used to finance the Government. This method of "high finance" is definitely wrong and has been used by the Provincial Treasurers of the late Administration to tide them over many difficult financial situations.

Mr. Davis: What page of the report is that on?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I am reading from notes on the report.

Any rural telephone company under the old Act could get free poles from the Government. In this way the Government spent \$350,000. It was spent on rural telephones and was a non-revenue producing expenditure. Although spent on rural telephones and having nothing to do with the Government plant, it was falsely carried on the books of the Telephone Department as plant until 1923 when it was then set up separately and later cancelled by Order in Council. This sum was, therefore, charged against the surplus earnings of the Telephone Companies as shown on the books.

Page seventeen of the auditor's report shows that an item of \$141,000 was carried on the books as a capital expenditure for many years and then simply wiped out without Order in Council in 1924-25, the explanation being that moneys spent for maintenance in 1913 were charged as capital expenditure as there was not enough revenue to meet the expenditure. This is fraudulent bookkeeping of the worst kind.

Mr. Davis: The report does not make the statement about "Fraudulent Book-keeping"!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I make it. A definite loss is shown as an asset and put on the wrong side of the ledger to cover up! When they get a little money in the profit account they wipe it out. If a man did this in a private business, he could be arrested, because as a result of such fraudulent entry they would be paying dividends out of capital.

Mr. Davis: That is not in the report.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: No, but cannot I think for myself! I want to speak now of the general financial standing of the department.

The books of the Telephone Department make no allowance for depreciation. In ordinary business practice, a portion of the profits is charged in the books for depreciation in the plant, and to take care of renewals. This has never been set up in the books of the Telephone Department. According to the finding of the Board of Railway Commissioners in the matter of the Bell Telephone Company on February 21, 1927, the amount which was properly chargeable against profits for telephone depreciation was 5.41 per cent. of the total capital assets. Our auditor, acting you will agree on a conservative basis, set aside for depreciation only 4.83 per cent., which in twenty years amounted to \$5,778,774.18, of which \$1,970,281.02 has been used for renewals and replacements. They have paid to the Treasury from the Telephone Department \$3,303,967.93. This sum should have been available for renewals and replacements, as it is in both Manitoba and Alberta.

If the proper reserve had been set up and maintained, as is done in all telephone and public utility practice the world over, the books of the Department would show an accurate statement of the financial position instead of the false and misleading balance sheet shown in the Public Accounts. The balance sheet as published could never occur in any business. The assets exactly balance the liabilities year after year. In every business there must be either a surplus or a deficit. In the case of the Telephone Department, the deficit amounts to \$918,049.72. In spite of the department having an absolute monopoly, with power to fix their own rates, in a wealthy province like Saskatchewan, the system has been so mismanaged in the earlier days prior to the very efficient administration of the honourable member for Pipestone, and the present efficient Deputy Minister, Mr. Warren, that instead of showing a profit, there has been a very heavy loss which will have to be made up in succeeding years. But, since the member for Pipestone took over, it has been placed in an entirely different basis. At the end of 1926 this loss was approximately \$1,600,000. On the 30th of April, 1929, there was an operating deficit of \$918,049.72.

On page twenty-one of the report a peculiar situation is revealed. The Department of Telephones has from time to time very large sums on deposit at the Royal Bank from which it receives $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest. At the same time the bank lends the Government of Saskatchewan this money back and other sums at a very much higher rate of interest, sometimes as high as $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the bank making 2 per cent. on our own money. These sums on deposit have amounted at times to as high as \$800,000 while at other times they were lower. If the telephone money was deposited with the Treasury at call a saving of at least \$10,000 per year could be saved on interest alone.

In the matter of the capital borrowings for the Telephone Department, there is a further leak in the matter of interest so far as the Telephone Department is concerned. If, for example, the Telephone Department is voted one million dollars for capital expenditure, the Treasury assumes that it will need that soon after the first of May. The Treasury charges the department with the rate of interest it pays on its borrowings from the bank or elsewhere although the Telephone Department does not usually get the money till April 30 of the following year. The Treasury allows them $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the moneys not used. The Telephone Department should not pay any interest on its borrowings until it actually gets the money. It often loses as high as 2 per cent. on the full amount for nearly a year. In the year 1927, this loss of interest in the Telephone Department amounted to nearly \$15,000.

This is the method followed since the regime of that "Napoleon of Finance" the Hon. Charles A. Dunning. It shows that the Provincial Treasurer should never be the Minister of Telephones, as this method of finance helped to produce a provincial surplus, which without such financial manipulation might have vanished into thin air. I am told also that in the Farm Loan Board money has been travelling in similar circles, as if the watch dog of the Treasury was always trying to make the head catch up to the tail. The honourable gentleman instead of being the wizard of finance which he is supposed to be is shown by the Godfrey report to be only a common financial muddler, as even a school boy at a country fair could tell under which walnut he hides the little ball.

From 1908 to April 30, 1929, the respective Treasury votes for Telephone Department purposes amounted to \$18,577,208.10, of which the department called \$13,715,111.63. The difference of \$4,862,096.47 was voted but not called by the department but on this

the department was required to pay interest, unnecessarily, amounting to \$243,354, or nearly a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Davis: But would not the Government be paying interest on the same money?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Yes.

Mr. Davis: Then the Government would not get any benefit from the money it got from the department. It would be passed straight through the Treasury.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I am saying the whole thing was unnecessary. The department never got that money.

Now I wish to refer to the matter of automobiles. The auditor's report on automobiles shows that on April 30, 1929, the Telephone Department owned thirty-three automobiles, consisting of eight passenger cars, the rest being trucks or light delivery. The Deputy Minister had a Buick valued at \$2,300 with a chauffeur at \$145 per month. While the Deputy Minister was ill the chauffeur used the car for his own purposes, using Government gasoline on trips to country points with his friends. One of the engineers took a three weeks' holiday in Alberta with the Government car and filled it up with gasoline before he left. Two of the Government employees pay \$12 per month during the winter for live storage on the government cars supplied for their use although they are never out of the city. One of the employees took his car and used it for his holidays out shooting and the Government paid the expenses. The cars are standing outside the building from nine to twelve and one to five each day, being used to bring these employees to and from the office. Another of the employees living in Moose Jaw used his car for a trip through the mountains on more than one occasion. The expense bill of these employees for one year for dead storage and repairs was \$529.78, a very large portion of which, I am advised, was for repairs for the car after the holiday trip through the mountains.

Harry Sherman and Leach, the construction engineers, took the Deputy Minister's brand-new McLaughlin-Buick car and went shooting with it. They backed it up to a straw pile and when the engine was started it back-fired and the car burned down.

Mr. Davis: Burned up!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I stand corrected. The car burned up. There was no insurance on the car and no attempt ever made to collect from these parties through whose negligence the new government car was burned. Sherman left the employ of the department and got a bonus of \$1,000. Leach is still in the Government employ and nothing was deducted from his salary. The loss was written off and a new McLaughlin was bought and nothing was said. This is only a sample of what was going on in the Telephone Department.

Now, let us look at the Purchasing Department: An examination of this department shows that tenders have been called for and then some of the companies have been allowed to change the tenders after they were opened, but the lowest tenderer in the first instance was not allowed such a privilege. There is plenty of evidence on file that tenders were not let in a fair and honourable way by the Purchasing Agent. For example, turn to page 36 and you will find among the things not stripped from the records, there is a wire from W. G. Chaney & Company of Spokane dated the 21st of June, 1918, as follows:

"Will make 6-25s at \$2.25x. If this does not get business will leave it to you to make prices. Wire our expense."

From the same firm on the 22nd of December, 1918, the following wire:

"Quick now! Please wire me. I will treat message as confidential."

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Is he still on the staff?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: He is still on the staff, but he is not going to last very long after the session.

After a few days investigating in this department the auditor ceased as he could not get anywhere owing to the condition of the files. I have a declaration from the former assistant janitor of the telephone building on Albert Street, Regina, who was there from the year 1926 to the spring of 1929, to the effect that, under instructions from Mr. Pratt, the Purchasing Agent, he burned on many occasions official records,

accounts and tickets and other documents which he would not put in the waste basket with the scrap paper which was sent down to be burned.

In August, 1929, a large quantity of documents were burned. The janitor was instructed by Mr. Pratt, the Purchasing Agent, and Mr. Naismith, the Superintendent of Rural Telephones, to do so. Important documents were destroyed and files were stripped although there was no Order in Council for this. There is also evidence to show that after the old Government was defeated and just before the new Government got in, records were destroyed and the auditor could not trace many things in the Purchasing Department. The records relating to the acquisition of property and construction of buildings were destroyed and the auditor could not vouch for capital assets.

Mr. Gardiner: That is not in the report.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I have an affidavit from the night watchman.

Now I want to speak briefly in connection with the Stores Department. The Telephone Department carries a large amount of material in the Stores Department, sometimes as high as several hundred thousand dollars' worth. Several adjustments have had to be made in various years to bring the store inventories into balance with the control account. Overages in the line of goods were off-set against shortages in another line. There were no doubt grave irregularities and the general situation was bad.

On April 30, 1921, when stock was taken the value of the overages was \$34,451.15. The value of the shortages was \$60,903.11, making a net shortage in the stock of \$26,451.96. A new starting point was arrived at, yet within one year it was necessary to put through a further adjusting entry of \$55,650.33 to adjust the stores with the books. On April 30, 1920, the general ledger account, merchandise and supplies, was \$24,001.09 out. District Store No. 1 was \$14,000.69 out. On April 30, 1921, the difference between the stock and general ledger accounts was \$10,493.16; \$7,440.97 and \$18,855.38.

On April 30, 1919, a report over the signature of the Chief Accountant states, and I am quoting from page 17 of that report:

"District stores in very bad shape and ledger figures do not appear to have been reconciled or adjusted with inventories for years and there were very big differences."

Now with reference to the purchase of materials and supplies: When the Government purchased the Bell Telephone Company system in Saskatchewan, a proviso was made with reference to the purchase of supplies in future by the Province of Saskatchewan in a letter of February 4, 1909, from C. F. Sise, president of the Bell Telephone Company. The letter contained this condition:

"The Northern Electric Manufacturing Company and The Wire and Cable Company were organized with the object of manufacturing and supplying telephone apparatus and material to the Company throughout the Dominion. In view of this fact it should be a condition of a sale if in the purchase of apparatus and supplies the Province would give preference to the goods of these companies as against the goods of competitors when terms and conditions were otherwise equal."

Even a cursory examination of the records shows that the province did give preference to the goods of these companies, when the terms and conditions were by no means equal.

The Northern Electric Company, which is associated with the Bell Telephone Company, has profited to a very large degree from this condition. There has been direct discrimination in the matter of placing orders with this company and other favored companies. The experience of Saskatchewan with the Northern Electric Company has been very costly to the people of this province. From April 30, 1911 to April 30, 1929, the purchases from the Northern Electric Company Ltd. amount to \$3,693,910.18.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| The purchases from the Automatic Electric | \$967,310.55 |
| The purchases from Canada Wire and Cable Co. Ltd. | 383,992.74 |
| The purchases from Canada West Electric Ltd. | 263,775.41 |
| The purchases from Midland Electric Ltd. | 123,568.63 |
| The purchases from Imperial Wire and Cable Ltd. | 193,763.85 |

The Imperial Wire and Cable Limited merged with the Northern Electric and the Canada Wire and Cable Company is affiliated with it. We are advised that an agreement exists between the Northern Electric, the Canada Wire and Cable Company and the Standard Underground Cable Company to handle all copper wires insulated or bare at the same price, and that the effect is along the lines of a combine.

The automatic equipment was chiefly purchased from the Automatic Electric Company Ltd. of Chicago, while there was little or no Canadian or American equipment along this line there was a competitor in England, who, however, until in comparative late times was not given a chance.

In 1922 Manitoba decided to instal two new automatic exchanges in Winnipeg. The Northern Electric Company tendered for about \$110 per line installed. The Northern Electric later on brought their price down to meet the Siemens figure. On one exchange alone a difference between the original tender and the competitive tender with Siemens in the field of over a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Davis: Who got the contract?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Each got a part of it.

Mr. Patterson: Each got one exchange.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Yes! When the other company came down to the lower price. Manitoba has found the English equipment equally as good as the Automatic Electric.

Mr. Patterson: We have English equipment too!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The Department of Telephones paid for automatic equipment the following prices: In 1918-19, 500 lines, \$24,013.24; in 1919-20, 500 lines, \$31,285.98; in 1920-21, 500 lines, \$34,513.71. The cost went up ten thousand dollars in three years for the same number of lines. The Siemens equipment came into the field in 1926. On April 30, 1927, the department paid the Automatic Electric for 900 lines \$57,479.90. On July 10, 1929, the department paid for 900 lines to The Northern Electric, who then had the rights of the Automatic Electric, \$39,500. Within two years after competition had come into the field there was a saving of \$17,979.90 on 900 lines.

The Siemens price in 1926 was \$50.84 per line. The automatic installation of 900 lines worked out at \$63.86 per line. There was a saving of \$13.02 per line in favour of the British Company. This is an indication of discrimination as against the British company.

Again in the matter of contracts, the contract with the Automatic Electric Company gave wide scope as to date of completion of contract. There was no penalty for non-completion on a certain date. However, the contract with the Siemens Company of Great Britain provided a penalty of \$25 per day after the specified date and a \$20,000 bond was required from that company and no bond required from the Automatic Electric. The Siemens Company was clearly discriminated against in the matter of contracts.

When the automatic telephones were installed in the city of Regina no tenders were called for. The contract price for three thousand line equipment with power and installation was \$159,433.00 or \$54.00 per line.

Mr. Patterson: When was that?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I think it is around 1911 and 1912. It is in the report. The Canadian Independent Telephone Company sent L. Varcoe from Toronto to Regina with a view to tendering on the above contract. He stated that his company could have installed the complete system for \$78,000 or \$26 per line, which was less than one-half the price paid. The price quoted by the Canadian Independent Telephone Company included telephone sets. The Automatic Electric Company of Chicago supplied one thousand complete phones and two thousand dials. Two thousand telephones less dials were purchased from the Canada West Electric Company at \$8.62 each; an additional cost of \$17,240. In addition, the department had to pay duty on the American material.

The Department of Telephones did not call for tenders for the installation of the automatic telephones in the city of Regina, yet they had on file letters from the Canadian Independent Telephone Company and the Peel Telephone Company of England asking that they be allowed to tender. The difference between the Automatic Electric

price and the Canadian Independent price taking all factors into consideration was \$112,562.70. The Telephone Department could have saved this sum if they had purchased this equipment from the Canadian company but they preferred to purchase it from the American company at an additional cost of over \$112,562.70.

As another example, on December 28, 1929, the Northern Electric Limited quoted for moving the battery charging unit at Moose Jaw and re-installing, a price of \$940. The Acme Electric Company undertook to do the work for \$139.50; an excessive cost of \$800.50 on the job on which they quoted a price of \$940.

As another example, a motor general unit was being moved in Moose Jaw. The engineering branch of the Department of Telephones prepared an estimate of the cost of \$300, intending to have local electricians undertake the work. Instructions, however, were given by the officials in charge to turn this over to the Northern Electric who quoted a price of \$900. In view of the estimate this price was queried and the Northern Electric blamed the head office for the price and asked to quote a figure of \$295 to take the place of the \$900 figure they had formerly quoted.

As still another example, the Regina Fire Department ordered a switch board with a mahogany finish equipped with special fire circuit. All material was in stock and it was found that it could be installed by the department at a cost of \$250 complete. Instructions were given to the Northern Electric to supply and instal the material. The special apparatus was prepared and shipped to Regina at a cost, not installed, of \$500. On asking how the price was made up, the Northern Electric Company stated—Material \$200; engineering \$300. I don't know the present cost of installing it. I believe it would be in the neighborhood of \$700, when the same work could have been done and the installation effected by the Telephone Department itself for \$250.

A contract was entered into between the Automatic Electric Company of Chicago and the Department of Telephones that they would supply certain equipment and supplies for use in the telephone service in the city of Regina at a certain maximum price. Goods were supplied at these prices which were certainly high enough. The Northern Electric later purchased the Canada rights of the Chicago Automatic Company. In 1922 the company raised the point that they could no longer supply the goods at the maximum contract price and the department granted their request to submit other prices, and the Executive Council agreed to waive those parts of the agreement which provided for maximum prices.

After reviewing the correspondence and Orders in Council and all the documents in connection with this matter at the time, Mr. Munnoch says in his report, at page 78:

"We find in many, many instances that orders have been placed with the Northern Electric without prices being obtained either from them or by way of competitive prices, and the accounts are paid. Apparently the Northern Electric can pretty well charge as they wish for goods and no questions asked. There may be some exceptions to this but, as a rule, it appears that the Northern Electric had it pretty much their own way. If it were necessary to concede to the Northern Electric a price in excess of the maximum per contract, keeping in mind that the Order-in-Council is dated over a year previous to Mr. Martin's letter to Mr. Hopkins, there is no question but that the Northern Electric were paid excessive prices."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said something a little while ago with reference to missing documents. I want to refer to this now, as it was carefully investigated by Mr. Munnoch. A great many of the files have been stripped and important letters are missing and among them many of the vouchers. Files are destroyed every ten years according to the Order in Council on one occasion, according to the records, seven hundred vouchers were missing when the files were being destroyed.

Mr. Gardiner: When was that?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: It is in the report.

Mr. Gardiner: What year?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: It is some time a little while back when the files were being destroyed.

Mr. Gardiner: 1913?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: No, I think it is after that. Owing to the condition of the files it was impossible to trace many of the matters, and when it was found impossible, owing to the missing documents and the dilapidated condition of the files to check the prices with the invoices, a member of the firm G. B. Munnoch & Company endeavoured to get the price list from the Northern Electric Company, and the manager of the company refused to give him the information.

A large number of documents and correspondence was burned in the Regina office in the furnace there since June 6. We have also a declaration from a former night-watchman that he had seen large numbers of documents destroyed on different occasions in the two or three years previous. In connection with the refusal by the manager of the company to give to the agent of G. B. Munnoch & Company the price list there must be a very strong reason why the records are missing and why the vendor company would not furnish the investigator with particulars. Everything must be presumed against them.

A gentleman who is in a position to know advises us that the Northern Electric Company quotes prices to different people of 25 per cent., 30 per cent., 40 per cent. and even 50 per cent plus 10 per cent. off the price list. Be that as it may, the company refused to give the investigator a statement of the prices paid by the Saskatchewan Government. It was impossible for the auditor to make a cost accounting of the capital account on account of missing documents.

The existing practice in connection with the destruction of records should be changed. The Interstate Commerce Commission laid down regulations governing destruction of records of Telephone, Telegraph and Cable Companies, and the following are ordered kept permanently:

- (a) Records and memoranda of the cost and of the inventory value of plant and equipment;
- (b) Paid and cancelled vouchers;
- (c) Invoices for materials and supplies purchased;
- (d) Price records of materials and supplies received and issued.

Records were not kept along these lines by the Saskatchewan Government Telephone System.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask the honourable gentleman a question?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Yes.

Mr. Gardiner: Is not it stated in the report at page 74 that the files and vouchers were transferred from the department for the purpose of the Hamilton Commission?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: He said some of them were, but we have obtained signed statements. There is a reference there that correspondence was stripped from files before they were delivered for the purpose of the Commission, but that was not taken into consideration and they did not go into that at all. And I was there and saw the files.

Mr. Gardiner: As a solicitor.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: And I saw that documents were missing which should have been amongst the others.

Mr. Davis: Was that brought to the attention of the Commission?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The Telephone Department matter was not entered into. The election was sprung after the report came in on other matters.

Mr. Gardiner: Read what Mr. Haultain said.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I was there and heard what he said. Well, now I was talking, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the documents that were missing. A check on the missing documents showed that 700 documents were missing when documents were being destroyed some years ago by Order in Council, and it showed that those missing related mostly to payments to the Automatic Electric Company, to the Northern Electric Company, expenses of different employees, payrolls, etc.

Now, with reference to the sites of Exchanges, and the titles to property, there are, according to the auditor, no files relating to the acquisition of sites of Telephone Exchanges at Saskatoon, Saltcoats, Weyburn, Swift Current, Arcola, Estevan and Moose Jaw. But I took at one time, when there were records, a memo. from them and I have found my old notes. The Government bought the sites for the Telephone Exchange at Swift Current from the late F. J. Robinson, former Deputy Minister of Public Works, and Sid Porter, former Deputy Minister of Telephones, for \$30,000, a sum greatly in excess of its actual value.

The Government bought the site for the Telephone Exchange at Weyburn from a good party man, and paid \$3,000 more than the price paid to the real owner, the late Frank Moffet, on the very day.

It might be interesting to note that the Government bought the site for the Regina Jail through the late F. J. Robinson, former Deputy Minister of Public Works, from J. E. Elliott, a Liberal member of Parliament in Ontario, on February 27, 1913, for \$185 per acre. The same land was purchased by the said Elliott on November 22, 1912, for \$125.00 per acre.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I suggest this to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, I sat as a member of a Committee of this House thirteen years ago and listened to all these matters investigated into and they were turned over to the Royal Commission, who, after investigating the matters presented to them for inspection, made a report which was dealt with on the floor of the House and the honourable member brings them up thirteen years after.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the remarks made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, I might say that the Royal Commission did not deal with the Telephone matter and it did not deal with the Regina Jail matter.

Mr. Gardiner: They might have come to the conclusion that there was nothing to them.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: They did not, because, after they brought in one, the Liberals asked for an election and—

Mr. Davis: And won the election!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: There was a profit, Mr. Speaker, of \$38,400 in three months and five days made by a Liberal member of Parliament in Ontario.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable gentleman does not want to mislead the House, but that election was held in 1917 and at the extreme end of that term of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The election was sprung at any rate and I accept the statement of the honourable gentleman. At the same time, to get back to this profit of \$38,400, made by a Liberal member of Parliament in Ontario on the advice of the former Deputy Minister on the purchase of the Regina Jail site —

Mr. Davis: Were not profits at that time being made, much bigger profits being made, out of real estate by private citizens?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I have no knowledge of the subject.

Mr. Davis: Did my honourable friend buy some real estate himself?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: In the city but on information which was reliable.

Mr. Davis: How much did my honourable friend make on his deal?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Very, very little profit.

The Weyburn and Swift Current are but two of the files that are missing. These files were destroyed under Order in Council according to the statement of the Purchasing Agent.

The Canora Telephone site on June 10, 1919, was offered to the Government for \$1,297, on which date the Chief Engineer said that the price quoted was out of all

reason; yet after a few years the Government acquired the same site. They paid \$1,800 for it to the same vendor who had formerly asked \$1,297 for the property.

A great deal of brick used in the Government Building was purchased from the International Clay Products Company Limited, and, as of the 21st of July, 1925, Maurice W. Sharon, Provincial Architect, was the holder of 1060 shares of a value of \$10,600 in the said company.

Now, there was a large number of companies participating in telephone expenditure in which officials of the Government and telephone contractors were interested. And I think I will refer to these more particularly.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask a question now?: Would the honourable gentleman say there was anything wrong with the price?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I know nothing whatever about the price. I am just referring to the assertions in the report that the auditor or investigator has made.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask, then, what is the inference?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I would say that the inference was that a great deal of this material was purchased as a result of the connection. I am not saying anything about the prices.

Mr. Patterson: I would put in an interjection: I do not think that the department was in the habit of employing the services of the companies nor does the auditor say that it was their practice.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I do not think that it's in the record and I stand subject to correction. But that is not the information I got.

Now, with reference to the specifications and conditions for new construction, they were often purposely made such that the favoured company got the business. This is the finding of the investigator and the investigator has gone into it carefully and knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Hogan: You won't fire him!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Not for a little while yet. The specifications and conditions, as I have said, were so made that certain favoured companies got the business. For example, take the new main office at Saskatoon: For the new equipment there the Siemens Brothers Company of Woolwich, England, could easily have outbid all others in the matter of new equipment. Specifications called for the successful bidder taking two thousand lines out of the old office and putting them into the new office. The Northern Electric Company had certain patent rights. The equipment was of their manufacture, therefore, they were the only ones who could tender and handle the job.

It was interesting to note how specifications often worked out. New work or extensions were talked over by the Government officials with the Northern Electric Company. The latter company then prepared a proposal. The department copied these proposals verbatim and changed the word "Proposal" to "Specifications" so as to make it appear that the specifications originated from the department. The Northern Electric Company then underbid and got the contract. They later on called the attention of the department to errors and omissions in the specifications. The department issued orders to rectify it on a time and material basis. The lowest tender under these circumstances did not lose on such a deal!

Now, there is another matter I would like to deal with, with reference to the telephone system here. I was going to deal with Rural Telephone Companies, but I understand that it is your intention, Mr. Speaker, presently to call it 6 o'clock in order that the members of the Legislature may be the guests of the local Board of Trade. There is just one matter I would like to deal with. Over in the Regina yards there is a number of yard-arms, I mean cross-arms, I was speaking in nautical terms, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Strath: Wascana Lake!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Wascana Lake, that is right! I went over and looked at these with the Deputy Minister and we could not see anything wrong with the cross-arms.

They were all hardwood, not real hardwood, but something like spruce. They were taken down from the poles. There would be the expense of taking them off and they would be then taken out to a country point and the freight was paid on them from the city of Regina by the department. The time of the employees in taking the arms off was paid for by the department and the haulage of the cross-arms had to be paid by the department, and they were then sawn up by a machine bought by the Telephone Department, operated by men on the time of the department and then were given away free in hundreds of loads to the employees in this —

Mr. Patterson: Hundreds of loads?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Virtually hundreds of loads of these were given away.

An Opposition Member: Make it thousands!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I will tell you something about thousands after we get back at 8:30.

Resuming at 9.05 p.m., the Honourable Mr. Bryant said:

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to offer a few more observations in support of the motion moved by His Excellency "The Duke of Deficits," (*Hon. Mr. McConnell, Provincial Treasurer*), I want now to refer to the Rural Telephone Companies and discuss the history of those companies. Prior to the election of 1908, the Government of the Honourable Walter Scott employed Francis Dagger to prepare a report on the telephone system. This was given to the Legislature on or about April 3, 1908. The report stated that it was undesirable that the same private interests should control both the long distance lines and local exchange system. It was suggested that the Government should own and control all long distance service. There was need for 2,057 miles at the average cost of \$250 to \$300 per mile, or a total cost of from \$514,250 to \$719,950.

According to the report the local telephone service in cities, towns and villages should be left to the municipal councils. The rural or farm telephones were of a different class and could be constructed at \$150 per mile. If capital was supplied at 5 per cent. the service charge to farmers should be \$15 per year.

It was recommended that the Government should select three or four sparsely settled districts and establish a complete rural service at a cost of about \$2,500 for each system.

The Rural Telephone Act was assented to on June 12, 1908, the election being on August 14, of the same year. Under this Act companies could be organised, the amount of capital being divided into shares of \$25 each, and was not to exceed \$150 for each pole mile constructed. No subscriber could take less than one share or more than twenty. Before the company proceeded to construct a line \$20 per pole mile had to be collected from the subscribers. Provision was made by which the Government could furnish the company with free poles. The Act did not provide for borrowing powers. There was no restriction on the sale of shares and there was no provision for the raising of money by debentures. There was on April 30, 1929, still in existence 267 companies formed under this Act having 6,802 miles of line. The Government advanced \$350,368.18 by way of free gift to these companies in the matter of poles and inspections. As there was no restriction on the sale of the shares this was a free gift not to the municipalities but to the shareholders.

In 1913 a new Rural Telephone Act was passed permitting the companies to borrow money for construction purposes under Government supervision. The secretary treasurer was to be bonded and the bonds were to be held by the Government to secure the proper expenditure of the moneys raised by debentures. The interest and the debentures were to be repaid by a tax levy of the rural municipalities by assessment on the quarter sections adjacent to the pole lines. The debentures were limited to \$350 per mile proposed to be constructed but the debentures were not guaranteed either by the municipality or by the Government.

Under the Act of 1913 the money received from the sale of shares was for organisation purposes. The shares were \$5 each and no one could subscribe to more than four shares. The capital of the company was limited to \$10 per mile. Neither the Government of Saskatchewan nor the rural municipalities have any asset in the plant of the Rural Telephone Company.

In March 1924, the Act was amended to provide that "shares shall not be transferable."

Although the principal and interest payments are met by taxation levied on the lands adjacent to the pole lines by the rural municipalities, the system and telephone property is owned by the Rural Telephone Companies and their shareholders, and no property in the systems is vested in the taxpayer as such or in the Government. Although the rural municipalities have raised and are raising by taxation for rural telephone purposes the sum of \$25,576,537, yet the rural municipality has no asset in the telephone company.

The Government prepares plans and specifications for Rural Telephone Companies, but lets the shareholders, who are mostly inexperienced in telephone matters, enter into contracts for construction, with little or no supervision until the plant is completed.

The Government had a Rural Telephone Branch to supervise and look after the Rural Telephone Companies. This Branch was maintained at a cost of \$27,867.98 in the year 1928-29. A great deal of dissatisfaction exists in the operation of rural telephones under existing legislation. Some companies have made no returns for a number of years to the department. Three hundred and seventy-four of the secretary treasurers are not bonded as required. Nearly four thousand quarter sections of land that have been gazetted for payment of telephone taxes have been exempt from taxation, and one thousand nine hundred and seventy-one quarter sections are being illegally taxed for telephones.

An examination of three hundred and fifteen statements of Rural Telephone Companies taken at random was made. Only five were correct in every way. One hundred and fifty-eight were arithmetically incorrect. Ninety of these companies have not followed the correct procedure for financing. Many of the companies are in bad shape financially. In one group of companies operated by the same man, there is a cash shortage of \$10,000 and many of the companies, according to the records, have not had a financial audit.

In connection with the letting of contracts for construction of rural telephones, this was left to the directors, most of whom had no experience in such matters. In many cases there was no tender for contract, the contractor would organise a company, would buy the debentures and get the contract at an exorbitant figure. Certain favoured contractors were given advanced information from the department before the plans and specifications were prepared and would solicit the work and get it at their own figures without tender. The pickings were so good and the directors were so easy, that many of the contractors would not try for Government work as there was so much money to be made on the rural jobs.

Many of the favoured contractors were formerly employees of the Saskatchewan Government or of the Bell Telephone Company. When doing Government work some of them had sufficient pull that they did not need to tender. Many of the favourite contractors specializing in rural telephone work were directors and shareholders in the companies selling the material for the rural lines.

Mr. Patterson: Just before the honourable gentleman leaves that, might I ask him to give us again the figures with regard to the quarter sections of land which are illegally exempted from taxation or are being illegally taxed. Does the report not say 400?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: If it does, the copy you have is incorrect and has not been changed. My copy says 4,000.

Mr. Davis: Would the minister give us the names of these favoured contractors?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Well, I have not the names of all, but I can give you some of them.

Mr. Davis: Would you give as many as you have got?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Among others, G. W. Berswick; F. Miles; J. T. Burnett; R. McLeod; F. G. Miles; A. L. Platt, and T. D. Rourke, shareholders of the Canada West Electric Company, and W. T. Pirt; T. P. Taylor; J. F. McLeod; R. P. Berwick and George Foley, directors of the Midland Electric Company Ltd.

Mr. Davis: What were the names of the contractors?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Those are all I took. I think I took the names of those who were shareholders in these companies.

Mr. Davis: And there are some names the honourable minister does not like to mention.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I was not making a list of all the contractors and I was not naming the contractors, except those stated in the report.

Mr. Gardiner: You have not read all of them who are shareholders!

Premier Anderson: Order!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The farmers could have purchased the material themselves and hired men to do the work with a saving of millions of dollars on the rural lines of this province. Without knowledge of the facts they let the contractors buy the material from themselves and sell it to the farmers and the Liberal Government of the province stood idly by and watched the farmers being fleeced.

Fabulous profits were accumulated by the contractors not only in connection with the sale of material but also in connection with the actual construction. This was most evident during the earlier years of construction. The contractors arranged among themselves the allocation of work and the districts in which the contractors were to get their contracts. This favoured clique was of the nature of a "family compact." They met together and decided the work and who was to get it and the others put in friendly tenders to show that there was close competition and that the price of the successful contractor was right.

A circular letter has been sent to all the rural companies asking for a list of the contractors who tendered in each case with the figures quoted. These have been carefully examined and they have verified the statement I have just made.

In many cases the successful contractor has retained the services of a sub-contractor to do the work. Statements have been obtained from several of the sub-contractors that their margin of profit on these rural telephone contracts was figured at 50 per cent. and that the successful tenderer in many instances obtained 100 per cent. in excess of that. A fair profit on a contract is usually figured at 10 per cent. of the cost of material. To say that the rural telephones cost 40 per cent. more than they should is well within the mark. Forty per cent. on \$17,000,000 is over \$6,000,000. The rural telephone system cost the farmers of Saskatchewan over six million dollars more than it should have.

The Liberal Government failed to protect the rural companies by making a fair estimate of the cost of construction in each case on the plans and specifications and by seeing that the work was done at a fair price. The pickings were so good in connection with the sale of telephone material that even officials of the department and Deputy Ministers could not resist the temptation and formed a company to sell to the Government and to favoured contractors. Among the original shareholders of the Canada West Electric Company were D. C. McNabb, late Deputy Minister of Telephones.

Mr. Patterson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, Mr. D. C. McNab is dead and in his grave. I am not in the position to state authoritatively that he was not a shareholder in the company, but I think I am right in saying he was not.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Well, I may say that I am so advsd by the investigator, S. P. Porter, late Minister of Telephones, and F. J. Robinson, late Deputy Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Spence: All dead!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The contractors in the "ring" handled most of the work. It was very difficult for an independent contractor to break into the game at all. Those controlling the telephone material supplies charged different prices to different men. The inspectors made it difficult in the matter of inspections and certain Government officials always recommended the favoured few.

The Rural Telephone Companies paid for the material on delivery —

Mr. Cockburn: I would like to ask the honourable gentleman the question: Who were the shareholders of the Canada West Electric Company?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The present ones?

Mr. Cockburn: No, the ones at that time?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Well, I do not know just who they were, but the present ones are in the report.

Mr. Cockburn: Who were they then?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Originally?

Mr. Cockburn: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Well, now, I have not a list of them but I know them all.

Mr. Cockburn: I think it is only fair that you should give them all.

Premier Anderson: Go on with your speech.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The Rural Telephone Companies paid for the material on delivery. The contractors could draw advances as the work progressed up to 80 per cent. of the work. Plans and specifications were often altered and a telephone contractor of thirty-five years' experience, who could not break in on the "ring" but who did a great deal of that work as sub-contractor, and admitted doing so at a 50 per cent. profit, is authority for the statement that for many years the telephone contractors figured on making enough profit out of "extras" to pay for the labour on the contract.

Coming down to a recent example: The North Forres Rural Telephone Company is situated near Maple Creek. The lines of the company were destroyed by storm and the Rural Company was unable to rebuild. Shortly before the recent provincial election, the Government agreed to give assistance. The Telephone Department passed an appropriation of \$15,000 after making an estimate of the work and tenders were called for. Tenders were received from the following contractors:

| | |
|-----------------------|----------|
| R. O. Berwick..... | \$19,850 |
| Thomas P. Taylor..... | 20,300 |
| H. Milross | 19,450 |
| G. W. Langdon | 12,600 |
| G. T. Brender | 21,000 |
| J. Burnett | 19,200 |

All of the above contractors belonged to the favourite group with the exception of G. W. Langdon. H. Milross was the successful tenderer. He was formerly foreman for Pirt & Pirt, Telephone Contractors. Mr. Pirt is now manager of the Midland Electric and Millross is the medium through which the Midland Electric operates contracts. The successful contractor was \$6,850 higher than G. W. Langdon and \$4,450 higher than the Government estimate. Langdon was an experienced contractor and was financially sound.

The Ponteix Rural Telephone Company presents another example of how tenders were let. Plans and specifications for construction were filed with the Rural Telephone Branch. Information leaked out to favourite contractors who solicited the work before tenders were advertised. When tenders were called for only two, who worked on the basis of advanced knowledge, tendered. On March 2, 1926, the following tenders were received:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Burnett & Burnett | \$41,600 |
| Fred Miles | 41,300 |
| T. P. Taylor | 41,800 |
| Ross | 42,050 |
| Somerville | 42,400 |
| R. McLeod | 41,970 |

A strong attempt was made to close the contract on these figures. The directors of the company got suspicious and called for tenders by advertisement. When the secretary of the company wrote to the first bidders and stated that they were calling for tenders, the letters were returned "not called for."

Mr. Gardiner: Might I just ask a question: I would like to know what the honourable gentleman means by "information leaking out"? I understood it took weeks to form a rural telephone company and in that time it would be common knowledge among all the people of the district!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Yes, I know, but they would not have the plans and specifications.

Mr. Gardiner: They could go and get them.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: They cannot get them. The point in connection with this case is, the directors became suspicious that the first bids were "faked" tenders. New tenders were received, and only two of the original tenderers put in their figures. The contract was let to Pirt & Pirt for \$31,448, a saving of \$9,852, when the actual tenders were called. In a great many of the cases, the contractors got away with it without tender on advance information.

Mr. Davis: Might I ask the honourable gentleman who calls for these tenders and who opens them?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Entirely by the Rural Telephone Company. It calls for and opens the tenders. In a great many cases the contractors got away with it without tender on advance information. In the Pouteix case this did not work.

Many of the rural companies are becoming alive to the situation and the fact that they were overcharged. One company writes in, in reply to my circular letter, stating that they could not get a list or the cost price of material supplied, either from the contractors or the vendors, with the intention, they thought, that there could be no check on the amount charged for materials, labour and administration. Another company writes in that the price of material is excessive and the local telephone companies need more protection than they are getting. The contractors get too much information. They know how much the companies are allowed to borrow, and they act accordingly and the companies, ignorant for the most part of the technique of construction, fall an easy prey.

When this latter company was a private concern, it built its own lines; 27½ miles for \$3,500. They re-organised and came under the Act. Four extra miles with one or two minor changes for an extra circuit on the old line cost them \$5,300.

These four extra miles cost \$5,300, Mr. Speaker. The twenty-seven miles built by the farmers cost \$3,500. *O tempore; O mores!* It is dangerous, Mr. Speaker, to be safe in this Assembly.

One farmer advises me that he owns land near Yellow Grass. The farmers built their own line. His telephone cost him only \$18.25. This same farmer owns another farm not far from Rosetown. A contractor built this line. His telephone cost him \$48.50 per year; \$18.25 on one farm and \$48.50 on another, where the service is no better! Something is radically wrong somewhere.

In many districts of Saskatchewan, the Rural Telephone Companies are in bad condition. The subscribers are falling off. In some districts there are miles of unused lines. One district reports approximately one-half of their subscribers are gone.

The method of financing employed was the cause of a great deal of woe. Under the debenture scheme, it was easy to borrow money and everybody wanted telephones, because credit was good. They were easily paid for and there was not the proper and careful supervision of expenditure which should have prevailed. Many of the debentures will be paid within the next two or three years. The rural lines are very much the worse for wear and in many cases no proper preparation has been made to meet repairs or replacements. When money was easy to borrow everything was all right. When the time of payment comes many communities are in trouble.

An examination of the books of some of these Rural Telephone Companies shows that matters are not as they should be. To give a few examples: The auditor found that one company had received \$4,129 from taxes. Only \$2,621.66 was paid on the

taxes account, \$509.77 on current account, and he could find no trace of the balance of \$997.57. In another case, the cash according to the auditor's statement should be \$4,175.51. The only cash asset in balance sheet amounted to \$1,797.05. There was a shortage of \$2,378.46. Another company had a total diversion of funds of \$7,443.55. In some cases the companies are in arrears in their statements to the department for three or four years.

Mr. Hogan: You are referring to the construction tax only. You are not referring to the maintenance tax!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I am referring to the debentures.

Mr. Hogan: You are not referring to the maintenance tax?

Mr. Bryant: I am going to deal with that.

A shortage in the accounts was apparent in very many cases according to the reports. Yet, we find that the superintendent of the Rural Telephone Branch of the Saskatchewan Government on June 14, 1928, wrote one company as follows:

"As long as the Directors are satisfied not to have the Secretary bonded there will be no objection from the Department."

This, in spite of the fact that the law requires that all secretaries of rural telephone companies should be bonded!

Mr. Patterson: Might I correct the honourable gentleman: Only so far as the debenture proceeds are concerned is it correct, Mr. Speaker, but if the company is not issuing debentures the bond is not required.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Now, an examination of the expense accounts of the inspectors and others of the Telephone Department shows that there was gross extravagance. The chief inspector of the Rural Branch for example, was exceedingly extravagant. We find him charging up C.N.R. fare to Saskatoon on the night train when he held a C.P.R. pass and could have gone up for nothing. He lives down town a few hundred yards from the station, yet, we find him charging for taxi cabs from his house to the station, with parlour car seats to and from Moose Jaw on the same date and time and again charging for meals at Regina hotels and restaurants when he has his home in the city. These are but examples to show what was going on.

Without any question the Rural Branch of the Department of Telephones did not function as it should in the matter of administration, in the matter of assistance to the Rural Telephone Companies, in connection with the construction of their systems at the least possible cost, and in connection with a proper supervision of the administration of those companies.

The entire history of the Rural Telephone Companies has been nothing but a comedy of errors. Instead of the system being built on a utility basis, in the interests of all the people of Saskatchewan, every turn and every move was controlled by political expediency and was evidenced by lack of foresight rather than by sound business judgment. Instead of the province gaining a utility and a valuable asset as a result of the alleged supervision of the construction, the moral backing of the debentures and the raising by taxation of the sums necessary to pay the principal and interest on said debentures; instead of that, the province has no asset and the taxpayers are still required to pay an enormous debt. The Government deliberately evaded all responsibility except the supervision of the debentures and a supervision of the construction of the lines, yet they gave to companies incorporated under The Rural Telephone Companies Act the authority to issue debentures secured by a lien on lands, and, indirectly, powers of taxation.

The rural company presented to the secretary of the rural municipality a list of lands on and adjacent to the pole lines, and a statement of the principal and interest accruing due for the current year. The rural municipality struck the rate, collected the tax and made a donation of the amount to the telephone company owned by shareholders and the municipality has received neither security for the amount of money nor an asset.

There has been in the meantime a depreciation and obsolescence of the rural telephone plants. I have recently written to all the rural telephone companies to

ascertain the amount expended on repair and upkeep during the past five years. The replies indicate that very little has been done in this regard, and many of the rural systems are in exceedingly bad shape both physically and financially. When the debentures are all paid, they will have to issue new debentures and start it all over again.

The rural telephone systems that cost the farmers of this country \$25,576,537 at the most liberal estimate are not worth more than eight to ten million dollars today.

Mr. Davis: How much is principal and how much is interest?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The taxpayers having paid for the plant and interest, will still have to go on and tax themselves to keep the plant in workable condition, although it is not owned by them.

Now, an examination of the records, the expense accounts and the payrolls of the department (and I am now going back to the Department of Telephones and am not dealing with the rural telephones at this time) shows that the moneys of the department were illegally used in connection with the last Federal Election in the city of Regina, where the Honourable Charles A. Dunning was the Liberal candidate and was elected as Federal member.

Estimate No. 70 of 1926 was for Toll Construction at Shaunavon, Frontier and Val Marie. The following items are charged to this estimate: September 13, to September 15, and perhaps some of you are wondering why I asked the auditor or investigator to get a list of the names and expenditures, and why it is in the first part of the report.

Mr. Davis: It was to try to "get" Mr. Dunning!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Not necessarily. Only to show what was going on.

Mr. Hogan: Co-operation! That is the object of the whole speech.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Just as an example of what we knew was going on all the time, but now we have got the goods. Estimate No. 70 of 1926, Champs Hotel, Regina, meals for E. Spencer, J. Charlesworth, B. McKessock, A. McRae, and W. Linahan, foreman, \$5.00; E. Cook, Regina, meals and lodging for E. Spencer, J. Charlesworth, B. McKessock, E. Butterfield and A. McRae, \$19.50; Albert Ott, Regina, lodging for W. McGaughey, \$2.00; wages, W. Linahan, \$15.00; E. Spencer, \$14.25; J. Charlesworth, \$13.50; and B. McKessock, \$12.00; total \$54.75. An account was rendered by the C.P.R. for train fares, six tickets, September 13, from Shaunavon to Moose Jaw and one ticket Shaunavon to Regina, \$64.55, making a total of \$145.80.

There was also return tickets for which no voucher could be found and neither McRae nor McGaughey appear on the payroll of the Telephone Department, although the auditor finds they were paid their expenses by the Telephone Department.

Mr. Davis: Where do these men live? Regina?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Supposed to. Linahan, Spencer, Charlesworth and McKessock were shown as in Shaunavon for breakfast on September 13, and again on the 16th. The vouchers are initialled —

Mr. Davis: Does my honourable friend know?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: —are initialled by the proper officials of the department.

Estimate No. 25 of 1926, was for Saskatoon Exchange Extension. The following items are charged to this estimate: September 12, upper berth Saskatoon to Moose Jaw for T. Summerford, \$2.25; September 14, lower berth, Regina to Saskatoon for J. Cowherd, \$2.75; September 14, Savoy Cafe, Regina, breakfast and lunch for R. Lovatt, J. Boyd, J. Laird, P. Crawford, W. Jackson, T. Summerford, W. Norris and J. J. Walker, \$8.00; September 14, supper at Lanigan for the same men, \$4.00; Savoy Cafe, Regina, 3 meals, J. Cowherd, \$1.50; wages for these men, September 14, \$43.00; an account was rendered by the C.P.R. for fares for these nine men, \$90.00, making a total of \$151.50.

Premier Anderson: Election day was on what date?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Election day was the fourteenth of September and these accounts were for the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth of September.

Mr. Davis: Is it not the practice of C.P.R. to bring their employees back on an election day to where they vote?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I do not know whether it is the practice or not. That is no excuse and it is not legal.

Mr. Davis: It is not illegal at all.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: It was done at the public expense.

Premier Anderson: They acknowledge they have done it.

Mr. Davis: No, they do not.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The vouchers were initialled by the proper officers of the department.

Estimate No. 51 was for re-construction on Moose Jaw to Herbert; and there are the following charges: Champs Hotel, Regina, meals for Ben. Keefe, Andy Horne, Allan Obre, Joe Eagen, Louis Halbardier, J. O'Connor and Lloyd McDonald, \$7.00; Metropole Hotel, Regina, rooms for same men, \$7.00; Paris Cafe, Moose Jaw, meals for same men, \$3.50; railway fares, no dates given, \$71.65; wages for September 13, and 14, H. Millross, \$11.00; B. Keefe, \$9.50; A. Horne, \$9.00; A. Obre, \$9.00; Joe Eagen, \$9.00; L. McDonald, \$9.00; L. Halbardier, \$8.50, and J. O'Connor, \$8.00; total for wages \$73.00. And the total for the estimate was \$163.15. These vouchers also were initialled by the proper officers of the department.

Mr. Hogan: What year are you referring to?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I am referring to the year 1926.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask the honourable gentleman if it is his intention to disfranchise all the employees of the Telephone Department who happened to be away from Regina on election day?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: There is no intention of disfranchising anyone, but we are not going to bring them here at the expense of the Government on an election day, and charge their expenses to capital account.

Mr. Speaker, these vouchers indicate that twenty-two men were brought into Regina at a total expense to the people of this province of \$459.45. They were here September 14, 1926, election day, and one of the parties concerned has signed a statement that these men were brought in to vote for the Honourable Charles A. Dunning.

Mr. Hogan: Might I ask the honourable gentleman if he read a name there, Joe Eagen?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Yes, there is a Joe Eagen there. I read the name.

Mr. Davis: What evidence is there that these men came here for the purpose of voting for Mr. Dunning outside that statement.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I have the statement of one man.

Mr. Davis: That is all?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: That is enough.

Mr. Davis: It is enough for you.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I have seen the vouchers and on the vouchers is written "in Regina voting."

Mr. Davis: Why did you not tell us that?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: And that is enough for the people of this province. An examination of the vouchers in connection with some of the other Provincial and Federal elections in the past shows the same state of affairs. The action in so doing was an illegal practice and there was charged to the capital expenditure of the Department of Telephones the sum of \$459.45, expended in connection with the election of the Honourable Charles A. Dunning. This in itself, together with the information which we have with reference to the use of liquor in the election, would have been sufficient to upset the election of the honourable member if the matter had been discovered early enough.

Mr. Davis: Would you give us details of the liquor?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Now that provision has been made for the Royal Commission to inquire into all matters pertaining to the handling of liquor under the late Administration, I do not mind telling the honourable members that we have full information with reference to the liquor supplied by some of the liquor stores in Regina for election purposes both in the Liberal Committee rooms and in private houses, during the Federal campaign of the Honourable Charles A. Dunning, with signed statements by employees as to the time, and the vouchers are conveniently locked up in a vault in this city; and with signed statements as to the liquor being obtained by them through the use of fictitious names at the request of the manager of one of the liquor stores as a result of visits from members of the Regina Liberal Executive. They asked these employees to sign fictitious names in order to get this liquor for the purpose —

Mr. Davis: Who were they?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Several of the employees in the Government liquor stores in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The expense bill above quoted had camouflaged the men as having been guying, erecting cables, and messenger wire, etc. The proper entry should have been "Guying the Conservatives and pulling wires for Dunning."

In view of those and other facts, Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to support the motion of the Provincial Treasurer.

THE HONOURABLE J. A. MERKLEY

(Provincial Secretary)

and

(Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries)

FRIDAY AND MONDAY, MARCH 20 AND 23, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In arising to speak on the debate, I do so with a feeling of temerity because this is practically the first speech I have made in this Assembly. However, I feel it my duty tonight to lay before this Legislature certain of the matters that pertain to the Department which I have the honour to administer.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my honourable friends opposite and, of course, it is only human nature that we want to defend the actions of our Departments and the actions of the Government as that Government has been carrying on in the past. That is only human nature, as I say, and, of course, their statements satisfy themselves though they do not satisfy the majority of the people of this province.

In the face of all the criticism that has been directed at the Provincial Treasurer (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*) in his Budget which has been brought down, I want to say that I was very pleased indeed at the presentation made in connection with that Budget Speech. This is the Honourable Minister's first Budget and it shows that, during his short time in office, he has got a fairly good grasp of the Department he has the honour to administer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with some of the things which pertain more particularly to the Department over which I preside. I shall try to be as brief and concise as possible.

Upon assuming control of the administration of the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries it was found that certain branches, particularly the Game Branch, were in need of thorough overhauling and re-organization. The Game Commissioner had resigned his position on September 1st. Consequently a new Game Commissioner was appointed immediately we assumed office. In addition to this appointment several necessary changes were made in the outside or field staff of the Branch.

Under the new organization of the Branch we propose giving considerable attention not only to the preservation of the wild life of the province but also to the development of fur bearing industry.

Private game and fur farms are being established in the province and the experience of the men operating these farms has convinced the Department that there is no better climate or natural conditions existing on the North American Continent for the propagation of fine full-furred pelts than that of the Province of Saskatchewan. We have now approximately 300 fur farms in operation in the province, which, of course, vary all the way from a small plant of half a dozen animals on a vacant town lot to a million dollar organization in the Kisbey district, which is probably one of the best equipped, best stocked and progressive fur farms in the Dominion of Canada.

Fur farms in Saskatchewan can be turned into a very profitable side line by a great many of the farmers of the province. In fact, I sometimes have a vision of the day when the small fur farm will be to the agriculturist of Saskatchewan the same as the orchard is to the farmers of Ontario; a profitable side line from which ready money is easily available. In order to do this, however, the Department must devote at least some of its appropriations to the collecting and publishing of information concerning the habits of our various fur-bearers.

The Department proposes extending the activities of its Game Branch to the study and compilation of all the available data on fur-bearers for the benefit of the rapidly growing industry of fur farming. Considerable money is lost each year to the trappers of the province because of their lack of knowledge of the proper skinning and preparing of pelts for market. We are informed by the fur trade that thousands of dollars worth of pelts are shipped to market each season from Saskatchewan which are not properly prepared and in some cases not only represent a total loss to the trapper but also the additional expense of paying express on a useless shipment. In this matter the Department has, with the co-operation of the Federal Natural Resources Department, secured a very large edition of a special pamphlet on handling furs entitled "The Preparation of Pelts for Market."

In 1928 the estimated sum paid to trappers was \$1,821,493.00. The muskrat leads with a value of \$773,609.00. The coyote next with a value of \$396,975.00, and the badger third with a value of \$269,195.00.

In 1929, the total value of pelts in the Province of Saskatchewan was \$2,206,224.90, the muskrat leading with a value of some \$968,892.50. This sum we believe could be greatly increased by a campaign of education bringing home to the people the potentialities of our wild life as well as insisting upon the more rigid enforcement of the game laws.

Saskatchewan is probably the greatest game-bird province of the Dominion. Ducks, geese, prairie chicken and partridges are extremely plentiful. Some idea of the importance of the game birds of the province may be obtained from the fact that between two and three million pounds of wild fowl are taken by the hunters each season.

The Department has under consideration at the present time the establishment of bird sanctuaries at different points throughout the province, and I am in hopes these will be established shortly.

Now I want to say a word about the Gasoline Tax. Some of us have different ideas how it was put on, why it was put on and so forth. According to the last census of 1926 the total number of people settled in Saskatchewan was only 320,738, of which 578,206 were rural and 242,532 urban. The population may now have increased to around 860,000.

In the preparation of legislation creating a new form of taxation, namely the Gasoline Tax, the importance of these figures become evident, particularly so in relation to ratepayers of farming communities, who are the heaviest users of gasoline. The statute creating the Gasoline Tax is based on the principle that the user of the highway should pay an equitable share towards the construction and maintenance of same. What is commonly called "the Gasoline Tax" is in reality therefore a tax for the use of the highway by the owner of an automobile, truck or other vehicle propelled by gasoline, insofar as this statute is concerned.

Automobile registration of private and commercial cars in 1927, totalled 104,909, and it is estimated that 50 per cent. of these were owned by farmers. It was clearly indicated also that farmers as a body were the heaviest users of gasoline in a manner other than in the propelling of vehicular traffic on the highways. In 1929, 108,630 private licenses were issued and 18,671 truck licenses. I think it must be conceded that the automobile business in Saskatchewan has now reached such proportions as to place it next to agriculture, the principal industry of our citizens. It and kindred businesses such as automobile accessories, tire firms, oil companies, gasoline companies and garages are the means of circulating a tremendous sum of money through their employees. Just what the pay-roll of companies, firms and individuals engaged in this work is I am unable to estimate, but I am sure it will run to a very large sum.

Taking the average valuation of the better class cars and heavier trucks as being \$1,000.00 and the smaller cars and light trucks as being \$600.00, both of which sums I think are conservative, there is at least \$85,000,000.00 invested in automobiles by the citizens of the province. This does not, however, include cars purchased by dealers and on their premises.

Again there is the investment by companies and owners of garages in buildings, equipment and machinery.

In keeping with the increase in the number of automobiles there is an increase in the revenue of the Motor License Branch. Collections for 1928, totalled \$2,184,032.10 and in 1929 a total of \$2,407,000.00 was collected.

In regard to the Gasoline Tax, I am pleased to report that we have received, with possibly two exceptions, splendid co-operation from those appointed agents for the purpose of collecting the tax. We have 76 contracts in operation with 69 companies and individuals for the collection of this tax. During the year 1929, these agents collected \$2,350,589.26 and the commission paid in this connection was approximately \$58,750.00. In this respect, believing that the workman is worthy of his hire, the Government pays all agents a commission of 2½ per cent. on the amount remitted.

Roads in Saskatchewan fall into three classes—Provincial Highway System of 7,300 miles, the Main Market Road System of approximately 35,000 miles, and 178,000 miles of lateral roads. The Government is directly responsible for the Provincial Highway System as soon as constructed, the Municipalities for the construction and maintenance of the main market and lateral roads. Grants to municipalities to assist them in creating and maintaining their system are met from revenue of the Provincial Government. Increased use of the automobile created a demand for the speeding up of the highway system programme, and in the spring of 1928 The Gasoline Tax Act was enacted.

In regard to refunds, I have to say that these are much in excess of what was ever anticipated. As you are aware, many difficulties exist and I feel quite satisfied that if a system of exempting was in use instead of the present system of refunding similar difficulties would be encountered and abuses now practised would probably be increased.

The total number of applications received and dealt with during the period from November 1, 1928, to October 31, 1929, was 54,000 and the total amount refunded during that period was \$920,665.60. The amount refunded during the fiscal year 1928-29 was \$778,901.20, approximately one-third of the total tax collected.

We are still dealing with refund applications for the year 1928-29 and I feel satisfied that during the fiscal year ending April 30, 1930, close to \$1,000,000 will be refunded.

I have not the figures of other provinces for last year, but I am certain that the number of refund applications received during the three-month period just closed will be nearly double the number received by the officials of any other province in a full year. I would also draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that applications for refund in Saskatchewan during the fiscal year 1928-29, already referred to, totalled approximately the combined number of applications received in any three of the other provinces of Canada during the preceding year, and was approximately three times that received by the next highest province. This is due largely to farming operations, as it is estimated that 42,157 farm tractor are in operation in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Refunds, at present, are made four times a year, namely on August 1, November 1, February 1 and May 1, or as soon after these dates as it is possible to get the cheques out to the applicants. I might say in this connection that the Government is considering the advisability of making these refunds at the end of every month instead of every three months, so as to avoid many of the complaints received from farmers.

For your information I would like to say that the net amount of money produced by the Gasoline Tax in the United States for the year 1928 was \$305,233,842.00. Most, if not all, of the amount mentioned, went into the building and maintenance of the public highways of the United States. The Gasoline Tax and the building and maintaining of public highways have an interesting relationship to one another. The more gasoline taxes paid the more roads can be built and the better they can be maintained. The more roads built in the Province of Saskatchewan the greater will be the amount of travel on the highways and consequently a larger amount of gasoline tax will be collected.

Examination of the statistics on the available supplies of petroleum might lead one to believe that the time is close at hand when our supply of petroleum will be exhausted. However, the history of the petroleum industry has been such that when the demand has been increased new wells have been found and new improvements have been made both in the production of crude and of the gasoline from crude. Approximately 56 per cent. of the area of the United States is potential oil-producing area. Methods of locating oil have been placed upon a scientific basis, so that the outlook is brighter than ever.

It has been estimated, also, that the recovery of motor fuel from the known deposits of bituminous coal would supply the world for the next 800 years at the

present rate of consumption. The cracking of wood tars and tars from peat, lignite coal and straw, present an attractive appeal in that one might consider without much stretch of the imagination, the original source as having been cultivated for producing gasoline.

The Gasoline Tax is very much like the measles — it is spread over a wide area and everybody has it. Today we find in Canada three provinces with a three cent tax and six provinces with a five cent tax. I understand that Manitoba is bringing in the five cent tax this year so that will leave only two provinces retaining the three cent rate. In the United States, we find nine states with a two cent tax, nine with a three cent tax, 19 states with a four cent tax, eight states with a five cent tax and two states with a six cent tax. When, however, we consider "gallons" in Canada, we must bear in mind that it is Imperial measure, and not wine measure as across the border, and, consequently a four cent tax on the other side is equivalent to a five cent tax in Canada.

Probably in no province of the Dominion is interest in industrial development more marked than in the Province of Saskatchewan. The bringing in of large organizations which depend for their chief raw materials upon one of the natural resources of the province is one of the activities of the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries. In this work is involved a tremendous amount of research into markets, railway facilities, freight rates, water and power supply together with a mass of carefully prepared data on the particular resources in question, be it coal, clay, sodium sulphate, volcanic ash or any other natural resources. The public frequently does not appreciate the time required nor the amount of detailed work involved in satisfying large industrial corporations of their chances of success to such an extent as to induce them to make heavy capital expenditures in the construction of new plants.

As my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer has stated, the outstanding feature of western development during 1929 was undoubtedly the completing of the Hudson Bay railroad. With the driving of the last spike at Churchill, half a continent was given a new outlet to the sea. Canada's great unexploited northland was opened up to the prospector, new water powers, timber lands, fur and fish resources brought within reach of development, and in general, the foundation laid for unprecedented industrial growth and expansion. At this point, I wish to say in connection with the Hudson Bay railway, that I have had many inquiries as to the possible opening of the route. Consequently, I have taken on myself the duty of writing the Minister of Railways at Ottawa, Hon. T. A. Crerar, to see whether or not he could give me some information on the subject. I did this for the reason that many people in this province are anxious to arrange for a special train to run to Churchill for the opening of the route. From what I can gather, the interest is so great that many special trains will be required to accommodate the many citizens of Saskatchewan who want to be present at the opening. I am in full accord with the honourable member for Prince Albert (*Mr. Davis*) that members of this Assembly should go in a body or as individuals to attend the opening. It would be good for all of us.

In addition to the growth of the established industries many new minor industries have been established in the province, including the fur farming (to which I have already referred), strawboard industry, a new sodium sulphate refining plant at Ormiston, a raw clay export industry, the beginning of a small pottery industry, an industry based on the bentonite deposits of the province having to do with the refining of oil, a new fruit house, registering and grading of seed at Moose Jaw, concrete products, a paint and varnish industry and so on through a long list of minor industries.

Passing on, I would like to say a word about our coal resources. Saskatchewan's coal reserve is estimated at 60 billions of tons.

The total consumption of coal in Saskatchewan for the year 1928 was 1,805,166 tons. Of this 1,566,531 tons was Alberta coal and only 235,460 tons Saskatchewan coal.

Lignite coal mined in Saskatchewan, in 1928, was 464,428 tons as compared with 568,759 tons in 1929, an increase of 101,628 tons. This increase was largely due to the operation of the new briquetting plant of the Western Dominion Collieries.

United States coal is no longer a factor in the Saskatchewan fuel situation, Alberta being chief competitor, holding 87 per cent. of the Saskatchewan coal market. The production figures from 1919 to 1928 show that since 1923 the Saskatchewan coal mines have been holding their own with difficulty. When we consider the growth in population

and industry since 1923 it is evident that the lignite mines of Saskatchewan have actually been losing ground. The factors that have tended to discourage the use of lignite in the past are insufficient advertising and lack of an educational propaganda to bring before the people the real merits of Saskatchewan lignite; also the lack of coal-burning equipment designed to burn high moisture lignites has probably contributed more than any other factor to prevent a more general use of lignite. Manufacturers are now alive to the situation that Saskatchewan coal is a factor in the fuel situation of central Canada and are directing their engineering and research staffs to the study of our fuel problem.

Probably no better proof of the suitability of raw lignite for domestic and power purposes could be given than the results obtained in North Dakota in promoting the use of lignite in that state. With an area of 70,000 square miles and a population of 640,000, the present annual production of lignite in North Dakota is 1,850,000 tons. North Dakota lignite varies very little from that mined in Saskatchewan, and has approximately the same heating value. The opinion that Saskatchewan lignite cannot be burned successfully in larger steam plants is falsely founded, and is a result of the general use of poorly suited grates and incorrectly designed furnace and boiler settings.

The honourable member from Estevan (*Mr. Garner*) has gone into this matter thoroughly, and I do not wish to elaborate on it further except to say that lignite must be sold to the public and this can only be done by constantly stressing the merits of this coal and keeping pace with similar advertisements of competitive coal. Advertising campaigns by the operators, dealers and coal organizations are suggested. It is the desire of the Government to encourage the use of Saskatchewan lignite by requiring it to be burned where possible in Government-owned and controlled buildings.

Concerning our clay resources, Saskatchewan's vast clay deposits are located close to the coal reserves and include practically the whole range from common brick and tile clays to high grade pottery and semi-pottery clays. An intensive survey of the clays of the province has been made and a Ceramic Branch has been added to the University of Saskatchewan. This Government assistance has enabled one company to perfect its manufacture of refractory clay products and to capture the western market for these materials, which, prior to 1924, were all imported from the United States. The United States is looking towards Saskatchewan for their supply of ball clays and a small raw export trade is growing up. They are finding Saskatchewan clays equal, if not superior, to the local and imported clays.

A new brick plant in the province was able to turn out 8,000,000 bricks in 1928, and preliminary reports indicate that this number will be greatly exceeded during 1929. The clay industry will grow and expand with the natural growth and industrial expansion of Western Canada.

Naturally occurring deposits of sodium sulphate are found widely spread over a large area of Saskatchewan. A single deposit north of Maple Creek contains more than 10,000,000 tons of Glauber's salt. Twenty of the larger deposits together contain more than 100 million tons of sodium sulphate.

Owing to the destruction by fire of the sodium sulphate refining plant of the Bishopric Lent Company, at Dunkirk, the production of anhydrous sodium sulphate fell off considerably during 1929. The prospects for this industry, however, never looked brighter than at the beginning of 1930. The destroyed plant at Dunkirk has been rebuilt. Conditions at the Alsask deposit were ideal for harvesting and a huge stock pile of the salt has been accumulated, while an entirely new refining plant is in course of construction by the Horseshoe Lake Mining Company, at its property near Ormiston.

With respect to our resources of volcanic ash, the Van Kel Cleansers Ltd., of Swift Current, carried out experimental work in their new plant during 1929 and expect to be in a position in the near future to supply the market with a number of products including a line of light abrasives, such as polishers and cleansers, solidum silicate and Fuller's Earth. These matters have been touched on by the Provincial Treasurer and it is not necessary for me to elaborate much on that, at this time. Similarly with our water powers, the Minister dealt exhaustively with that in his Budget Speech. Suffice it for me to say that the water power of the province is estimated at the present time at 1,032,531 horse-power. The first hydro-electric development in the province is now in operation at Island Falls on the Churchill River in Northern Saskatchewan. Power is now being supplied to the Flin Flon mines from this source.

I would like to make some reference to an important and growing industry in our province—our fisheries. Fish of excellent quality abound in practically all the waters of Northern Saskatchewan. The clear, cold water of the numerous lakes and rivers, some of which cover 100 square miles, is ideal for producing fish of excellent firmness and flavour. Great possibilities undoubtedly exist for the northern fishing industry, which will surely grow with increasing transportation facilities into the north.

The best known fish from these regions is the whitefish which makes up more than 70 per cent of the total catch. The value of this catch in 1928 was \$439,075 out of a total catch of \$563,533. In this connection I might say that a prominent fisherman informed me that a total of \$2,500,000 worth of fish were shipped out of the province, for which we got no credit at all. He also informed me that other shipments were made from our northern waters through other provinces, for which we got no credit.

Regarding lumbering, I might say that lumbering on a commercial scale has been carried on in the province for a quarter of a century, and the production reached a peak in the years 1913 to 1918, with a maximum yearly cut of 114,800,000 feet. Since then the two large mills that existed at that time have disappeared and the cut has now fallen to an annual average of about 65,000,000 feet. One-half or more of this is sawn outside the province, although the timber is cut within it.

So far as our pulpwood is concerned, no paper mills have, as yet, been established in the province but with new railway facilities into the forested areas of the north the date should not be far distant when the paper and pulp mill companies will find Saskatchewan a productive field for development.

In connection with mining, the Provincial Treasurer has gone into it very fully. I only wish, therefore, to comment briefly on two important discoveries made during 1929. Dominion Explorers Limited have completed preliminary diamond drilling operations on their promising copper-nickle find at Stoney Rapids near Athabaska Lake. A similar diamond drilling programme has been completed at Montgomery Lake by the Canadian Consolidated, 190 miles north of Prince Albert. An extensive drilling campaign is to be commenced with the opening of spring by the Nipissing Mining Company who have freighted supplies and drilling equipment during the winter to their several claims in the North.

Still further finds have been reported at widely separated points, which would indicate that the mineralisation is not localised. It is reasonable to assume that with greater activity in 1930, many more discoveries will be made.

Mr. Spence: At this stage, Mr. Speaker, and just for a point of information, can the Minister tell the House whether or not arrangements have been made with the Dominion Government in regard to the continuation of the aerial survey in the north? It was about this time that they usually communicated with us and we with them, relative to the season's programme.

Hon. Mr. Merkley: I might inform the honourable member, that the Dominion Government has not communicated with me as yet.

Mr. Spence: Have you communicated with them?

Hon. Mr. Merkley: No. Not yet.

Continuing, Mr. Speaker, I can safely state that Saskatchewan is destined to play a prominent part in Canada's new era of development and expansion. From raw prairie to the leading agricultural province of an agricultural country in the space of 40 years and now producing annually grain crops to the value of \$300,000,000, livestock \$140,000,000, farm products \$35,000,000, field crops \$12,000,000, is a record of growth and development unparalleled in the history of any country in the world.

Saskatchewan as a province ranks third in the distribution of the national wealth of Canada. Saskatchewan's wealth is estimated at \$3,003,000,000. While agriculture will continue to be the dominating activity of the province, the new period upon which we have now entered, will necessitate the development of those other great resources which up to now have been lying dormant. The great coal deposits, our reserves of sodium sulphate, volcanic ash, bentonite and less important minerals must be studied and markets found for them.

I just want to say a few words in connection with the building activities of the province: The Province of Saskatchewan increased the value of its buildings by a con-

struction programme of \$34,184,300 in 1929 as compared with the building programme of \$22,127,100 for 1928, a greater building programme by over ten million dollars than that of any previous year in the history of the province. Of this large building programme for the province, roughly speaking, seven and one-half million dollars was for residential construction, or, in other words, the building of homes; slightly over thirteen million dollars went into the construction of business buildings; and eight million dollars was spent in industrial undertakings, mainly engineering works in our various cities.

The prosperity as indicated in the building construction in Saskatchewan was general throughout western Canada as was indicated by the fact that the Province of Alberta increased its building programme from \$17,909,700.00 in 1928 to \$29,159,600.00 in 1929. To the east of us, Manitoba with a building programme of \$23,955,300.00 in 1928, had a programme of \$38,156,500.00 in 1929.

The building programme for the three larger cities of the province for 1929 totalled \$16,950,228.00 as compared with \$13,439,826.00 in 1928. In relation to building construction for the last year the three cities ranked as follows: Regina, \$10,022,631.00; Saskatoon, \$5,902,123.00; Moose Jaw, \$1,025,474.00.

Passing on to the transportation industry, referred to also in the Budget Speech. As was said the railway mileage in the province was increased during the year 1928 by 332½ miles, representing 139 miles of steel laid by the Canadian Pacific Railway and 193½ miles of steel laid by the Canadian National Railway. This new construction gives the province a total of 7,898 miles of railway divided between the two operating companies as follows: 4,097.79 miles included in the Canadian National System and 3,800.23 miles of Canadian Pacific Railway lines.

The outlook for 1930 in the matter of railway construction would indicate a continuance of the railway activities of the past two years, and there appears to be a well-founded optimism in the minds of the railway executives as indicated by the fact that there is apparently no thought of curtailing the construction of branch lines in the province either for improving the service to the present areas or in the development of the newer areas.

In a recent statement, Mr. E. W. Beatty, President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, said that it was the intention of his Company to extend the Sonningdale line towards Baljennie; to complete the extension of the branch which will eventually connect Nipawin and Prince Albert; to provide terminal facilities at North Battleford; and to complete the branch from Lake Johnston to Archive. The Company has applications to be considered at the present session of parliament for charter rights for a number of branch lines in the province, and, provided these charters are obtained, the company is prepared to continue its branch lines development in the province.

The Canadian National Railways, as is generally known, secure from Parliament authority for making the necessary capital expenditure on a three-year programme. The 1927-1930 programme provided for the construction of 242.26 miles of railway in Saskatchewan.

This programme, which expires at the end of the present calendar year, has been completed insofar as grading and steel laying is concerned with the exception of about 80 miles, which will no doubt be completed on time. The 1929-1932 programme, provided for the construction of 335 miles of lines and of this 187 miles have been graded and steel has been laid on 88 miles. The Company has the remaining 148 miles of grading still to be completed on their 1929-1932 programme and have all the steel to lay with the exception of the 88 miles already referred to.

Modern steam power has made a great change during the last few years in the transportation industry, relieving thousands of men from their positions and in this respect I would refer back a few years to show where and when the reduction took place.

The year 1920 witnessed the largest volume of business handled, the largest number of men employed, the greatest payroll costs and the highest gross earnings ever experienced by our railroads up to that time.

A comparison of 1920 with 1927 shows that during that period railway road mileage had increased by 1660 miles, that gross earnings rose \$7,000,000.00, that net earnings increased from \$356.00 per mile to \$2,573.00 per mile. Notwithstanding this substantial improvement, notwithstanding the fact that 4,000,000 tons more freight were handled in 1927, it is nevertheless true that 9,000 less men found employment on our railroads.

as compared with 1920. Payroll costs were reduced by over \$23,000,000.00—9,000 men lost their employment on our steam railroads alone, and \$23,000,000.00 in wages formerly spent to support these employees and their dependents is lost to them and lost to industry and commerce. Multiply this result by all the other industries where similar results are to be found and one quickly understands that this may be one of the reasons why immigration cannot be absorbed into Saskatchewan as quickly as we should like at the present time.

As the hour is getting late, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1930

Hon. Mr. Merkley, continuing said:

Mr. Speaker: When the House adjourned on Friday last, I had just finished speaking on the transportation industry and its contribution to the unemployment situation. This afternoon, I want to touch for a moment on the matter of immigration and its contribution.

In the face of the reduction of man power in the matter of industries to which I have briefly referred, immigration still kept pouring into Canada, increasing each year, and I am going to illustrate only by referring to the records for the last three years in connection with immigration. In the fiscal year 1926-27, ending March 30, 1927, 143,991 immigrants entered Canada. Of these, 73,182 were from foreign countries not including the United States, whose quota at that time was 21,025. In 1927-28, again the fiscal year, 151,597 immigrants arrived in Canada and of this number, 75,718 were from foreign countries and 25,007 from the United States. In 1928-29, the year ending March 30 last, 167,722 immigrants arrived and of this number 78,282 came from foreign countries and 30,560 from the United States, and I may say that the figures shown from foreign countries represent the vast majority as coming from central Europe. It is estimated by the Department that 50,000 of these came to Saskatchewan, and we have no record showing the number of people coming into our province from eastern Canada or from the other western provinces, which no doubt will run into a large figure.

Mr. Davis: What was that figure?

Hon. Mr. Merkley: 50,000—51,000 to be exact, and a few odd.

Mr. Gardiner: In the three years?

Hon. Mr. Merkley: Yes. In the last three years. Our estimate is 50,000 or a little over; these came to us in the last three years. Of course we have no record of the number of people coming into Saskatchewan from eastern provinces or from other western provinces, but, as I said, it will run into a large number and we have no way of telling exactly what it was outside the 50,000 delegated to this province to which I have referred.

Another feature that entered into the unemployment situation was the light grain crop of last year. In 1928, the wheat yield was 566,726,000 bushels, while in 1929 it was around 299,000,000 bushels. Statistics show that Western Canada loadings for 1929 showed a decrease of 221,111 cars as compared with 1928 figures, whereas Eastern Canada loadings showed an increase of 45,134 cars as compared with 1928. Now, most of us fail to realise what that means in connection with the unemployment situation, but I would just state, for the information of the House, that this difference of 221,111 cars means loss of two months' employment for the railroad men over our Prairie Provinces and, on account of that decrease, railroad staffs were laid off to a great extent on October 31, last. Had we had the same conditions as in 1928, the railroad men of the Prairie Provinces would have had three months' longer work. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that all these conditions combined to bring about a rather serious unemployment situation in the province.

A delegation representing the three larger cities of the province waited upon the Government in November last and requested my Department, through the medium of the Employment Offices to take a census of the unemployed in the province. This request was complied with and 3,610 unemployed persons registered.

This total was made up as follows over a five year period:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Unemployed Immigrants who arrived in 1929..... | 270 |
| Unemployed Immigrants who arrived in 1928..... | 346 |
| Unemployed Immigrants who arrived in 1927..... | 323 |
| Unemployed Immigrants who arrived in 1926..... | 200 |
| Unemployed Immigrants who arrived in 1925..... | 74 |
| <hr/> | |
| Total Immigrants, 5 years or less in Canada | 1,213 |
| Canadians and all others | 2,397 |
| <hr/> | |
| Total registered unemployed | 3,610 |

Among the unemployed there were registered 630 returned soldiers, of whom 334 were married men and 296 single.

Believing that the unemployment situation was greater than the cities of the province should be expected to take care of the Government decided to assist in the relief of the distress caused by unemployment by undertaking to pay to the cities two-thirds of the excess cost of winter construction over summer construction costs on any public works undertaken by the cities solely for the purpose of providing work for the unemployed.

This agreement is based upon the policy of relief for unemployment mutually agreed upon by the Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments during the acute unemployment situation conditions of 1920-1921, and which was carried out during subsequent years and which, as far as we know, has never been amended or rescinded by any of the parties to the agreement. This policy so far as the Government and the municipalities of Saskatchewan are concerned is still in existence.

This method of assisting the cities was adopted not only for the reason that it was the agreed policy, but also because, after carefully canvassing the situation, we concluded it was the most effective and economical way of dealing with the problem. Some of our sister provinces adopted other methods, but so far our policy has proved equally effective and efficient, but also much less expensive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to touch on labour conditions in the province for a moment or two. During the calendar year 1929, more than 44,000 applicants for work were placed in jobs through the agency of the Government Employment Service Offices in Saskatchewan. The total placements were nearly 43,000 fewer than in the previous year, the falling-off being accounted for by the fact that owing to the poor harvest only 17,869 farm labourers were placed as compared with 57,421 the previous year. In addition to the reduction of men required for harvesting because of the poor crop, one should note that employment conditions in Saskatchewan, both rural and urban, have been undergoing very marked changes during the past few years.

Until quite recently, a great army of workers, generally termed "common labourers," was required in the West for farm work, railway construction, civic improvements and building construction. This number, however, we expect to be much less in future, owing to the increase of modern machinery on the farms and the general progress of science with its labour-saving devices. On the farms in Saskatchewan, according to the 1926 census, there were 26,674 farm tractors; in 1929, there was a total of 42,157 which means that approximately one-third of the farms of Saskatchewan employ tractors. Not only do these tractors displace a number of men, but their operation requires men with some mechanical ability and some experience in the operation of tractors. This is evident from the fact that tractor companies conduct schools, throughout the province during the winter, in the handling and operation of tractors.

In addition to the tractors, there is a growing tendency for placing machinery on the farms. A newer development of farm machinery is the introduction of the combine. In 1926, there were 148 combines operating in Saskatchewan; in 1929, this number had increased to 5,500, a total of 2,279 being sold to Saskatchewan farmers in that year alone. Each of these machines will, at a conservative estimate, displace from four to six men, or a total of approximately 22,000 less harvesters. In addition to cutting down the number of men required on the farms, these machines also reduce the harvest operation on an ordinary farm for cutting, stooking and harvesting, from a period of possibly ten to fifteen days to five or six days. The total number of these combines in

the three Prairie Provinces in 1929, was 7,726. So, Mr. Speaker, with the displacement of men by these machines, you can readily understand why labour requirements will be much less in future.

In city labour, modern trenching machines employing one engineer and an assistant, will excavate basements and trenches that formerly employed a score of labourers. In civic improvements, modern concrete practice is to manufacture the concrete at a central plant, distribute the finished article to the place of construction, where it is poured on the larger jobs by compressed air, or in pavement construction handled by a "spreader," which displaces the scores of men that formerly worked around the little concrete mixer on the job, distributing the concrete with wheelbarrows and spreading it with large iron rakes.

This is what is giving us the unemployment situation we have today, and what we are likely to have with us in the future. Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that every man dismissed by industry is a loss to industry? Unemployment and low wage standards seems the surest methods of putting business out of business. Steady employment at good wages will cause the sunshine of prosperity and contentment to shine upon our people. One would think that our business men would realise the situation, and try to spread production over the whole year more than they do at present. It is true some of our industries realise this and try to compensate the workers with some form of insurance. Could industry not go further than that, Mr. Speaker, and co-operate with labour and governments (and when I say governments I mean Federal as well as provincial governments) to meet this situation?

We have heard a lot about unemployment insurance lately. This matter of unemployment insurance throughout the Dominion of Canada is a matter being given consideration by the Federal Government. The Minister of Labour of the Federal Government, Hon. Mr. Heenan, is heartily in accord with the plan. He does not, however, entertain the policy of the government being a party to the plan. This, in his opinion, should be saddled on the workmen and the provinces. I hardly think this would be possible at all. Insurance schemes now in force have been fairly successful and most of those contributing to the fund have been the State and Federal Governments, the employers and the employees. I hardly think the thing could be started in the provinces without Federal aid. The minute you start on that basis, one province will put it on at one time and another province at another time and you will find a rush to the province where the scheme has commenced. So, to be successful, it must come in all at one time. Our government will have to take its share of responsibility. Insurance schemes are in force in a number of European countries, and though that is the case, one should remember that the average worker is not a "jack of all trades" in these countries and so the schemes are much easier to handle than in a country like Canada, more so in Great Britain, for example, where employers and State make a contribution and where the State is heavily involved to keep the scheme solvent. Some such scheme as that will have to be tried in Canada, and it would appear to be better than opening soup kitchens which, no doubt, is the second alternative to be provided. I think, in view of the serious nature of the situation, my Department will be justified in studying the whole problem, in order to keep abreast of the developments. You will note that the Prime Minister of Canada said, at Ottawa, that Canada eventually would have its insurance scheme. The report of this statement appears in the *Regina Leader* as follows:

"Eventually Canada will have a system of unemployment insurance Premier MacKenzie King predicted today in replying to a deputation seeking federal aid to municipalities and provinces on unemployment relief. This he said was the only constructive way to deal with the unemployment situation and he hoped it would soon be possible to work out an insurance plan."

Now that was the statement of the Right Hon. W. L. MacKenzie King, in that debate.

Then the *Regina Post*, in an editorial on March 1 with reference to unemployment insurance, had this to say:

"There is some feeling in Canada that the time has come when the country should give consideration to unemployment insurance, and those of this view probably will be heartened by the statement of Premier King on Wednesday to a Western deputation seeking Federal co-operation in meeting the unemployment problem, that unemployment insurance is the only constructive way of dealing with this problem, and his intimation that it is likely to be adopted sooner or later. We feel, however, and we believe many will share this view, that unemployment insurance should not be resorted to in Canada until the problem it is designed to meet has been more thoroughly explored with a view to meeting it by other means."

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words on The Workmen's Compensation Act which we expect to bring into force at an early date.

The Workmen's Compensation Act was assented to on February 2, 1929. Thereby it was provided that the Act should come into force on a date to be determined by proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor. By Order-in-Council dated December 11, 1929, those sections of the Act necessary for the organisation of the Board were brought into effect. By authority of the Act, a Chairman of the Board was appointed by Order-in-Council, and the appointment became effective on November 20, 1929. The Chairman, however, did not actually undertake the duties of his office until December 1, 1929. The other Commissioners provided for by the Act were not, at that time, appointed, as it was considered that the Chairman could effectively make arrangements for the preliminary work and for the purpose of saving expense, the appointment of the other two Commissioners was left in abeyance. It is proposed that the provisions of the Act providing for payment of compensation shall become effective on July 2, 1930.

The first step towards bringing the Act into force was an industrial survey of the Province by which all employers of labour who come within the terms of the Act could be located. This work is being carried out as speedily as possible, and it is anticipated that the Board will be in a position to send out pay-roll forms by April 15. The other boards allow approximately three weeks for the employers to return their estimate of pay-roll completed. Upon the return of the estimate of pay-roll for the last half of 1930, the next step is fixing the assessment upon the pay-roll and sending notices to the employers of the amount for which they are assessed. The other boards allow one month for payment of the first instalment of assessment. It will thus be seen that it will be some time in June before any of the assessments will necessarily be paid.

An important part of the work of the Board is the fixing of the rates of assessment which is a lengthy task owing to the larger number of classes and groups into which the industries must be divided and the fixing of separate rates for each group.

This Board hopes to condense the industries into twenty classes comprising seventy-seven groups. The work of comparing the assessment tables in the different Provinces with each other and the rates charged by the Canadian Casualty Underwriters Association has taken several weeks.

The Chairman of the Board spent two weeks in Toronto and one week in Winnipeg conferring with the boards of those two provinces and endeavouring to learn the system of operation of the various department of those boards and the general principles followed in the administration of the Act.

Notwithstanding that the pay-roll of this Province will be smaller than some of the other Provinces mentioned, exactly the same work is necessary in the organisation of the Board and the steps preliminary to its paying compensation.

The following comparison will show that the Saskatchewan Board is not unduly slow in its work: In Manitoba, the Board was appointed on Sept. 1, 1916. The pay-roll of the province was not, at that time, greater than the anticipated pay-roll now for this province. The Manitoba Board did not begin to pay compensation until after March 1, 1917; that is, it was six months before the Board put its Act into force. In Alberta, the Board was appointed in April, 1918, and began to pay compensation in January, 1919, while in Ontario, the Act was assented to on May 1, 1914, and the Board began to pay compensation in January, 1915. In British Columbia, the Act was assented to on May 31, 1916, and the Board began to pay compensation on Jan. 1, 1917. From this it will be seen that the time for organisation in each of the provinces was as follows: Manitoba, six months; Alberta, eight months; Ontario, eight months, and British Columbia, seven months.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to place before you the activities of the Department I have the honour to administer. In doing so, I hope it will meet with your approval and that of the House.

I intend to support the motion.

THE HONOURABLE A. C. STEWART, LL.B., K.C.

(Minister of Highways)

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to speak in this debate, I would like, first of all, to make just a few comments on the remarks of the previous speaker (*Mr. McIntosh*) before passing on to the more highly interesting matter — the proposed highway expenditures and the programme of road construction for the coming year.

I was rather interested in the remarks of the honourable member for Kinistino in which he tried to ridicule the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, suggesting that he would not be a worthy successor to former Provincial Treasurers and when I asked the question he suggested that he would be a worthy successor. I would suggest to him that he look up the record of the present Provincial Treasurer and compare that record with the record of the former Provincial Treasurer when he took over. It will be interesting for him to learn that the present Provincial Treasurer administered the financial affairs of the City of Saskatoon with considerable success and, as mayor of that city, administered many budgets in Saskatoon and, consequently he has had more practical experience of administering finances than his predecessors in office.

The honourable member has said that members on this side of the House are lacking in administrative ability. I would challenge him in that statement. This is not the first budget introduced by members of this Government, for we all have had more or less experience in this connection, in conducting the affairs of different communities in Saskatchewan. However, the member for Kinistino is a genial fellow and we do not mind him very much over here. He has made other statements and we can judge from them what reliance can be placed on his present statements. We find, for example, that he is quite a "headliner" in the last Liberal Speaker's Handbook and we have to judge him now by the statements or prophecies he has made on previous occasions — including the one I am going to quote. He says, as quoted here in this Handbook:

"It is not necessary for me to defend the Prime Minister. In times past he has proved himself quite capable of defending himself, and in my opinion, he stands head and shoulders above all his opponents. We readily understand why they dislike him — he has spoiled their game too often. But it is just as well that *The Regina Daily Star* and other interested parties should understand that the Liberal party in this province is a united party behind the leadership of Hon. Mr. Gardiner, and that the strength, cohesion and solidarity of the Liberal party in this province remain unimpaired."

And what were the results in the last election? The Liberal party was split wide open under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. Gardiner. Then he concludes in this vein:

"I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but I am confident of this, that, when next the people of this province have an opportunity to pass judgment upon the Prime Minister and his Government, and upon the Liberal party, the whole of Canada will echo with the sound of our triumphs."

Now, then, I do not blame the honourable member for Kinistino for making these forecasts. We know how that one turned out — and now he is endeavouring to make the forecast that, because there is a new Provincial Treasurer who does not happen to be a Liberal, the province is going to be ruined. I am reminded that the Regina Board of Trade the other evening, gave some titles to some of us — we had the Duke of Deficits, the Earl of Wascana and so on, and it caused much amusement. Unfortunately, they omitted to give a title to the honourable member for Kinistino and, in view of that omission and because of the protracted nature of his preachings, I am going to suggest that he should be given the title of "Le Comte de la Babbling Brook." To illustrate why, I would just quote one or two stanzas from Tennyson's well-known poem:

"I come from haunts of coot and hern
 I make a sudden sally,
 And sparkle out among the fern,
 To bicker down a valley.

I chatter, chatter, as I flow
 To join the brimming river,
 For men may come and men may go,
 But I go on for ever."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to dwell at any great length on the shifts and devices of the gentlemen opposite to talk the deficit away for which they are responsible. In the course of this debate, we have heard from the north and I understand that we are going to hear further on that part of the province from the honourable member for Cumberland (*Mr. Hall*), and there is no one more competent than he to speak of that part of the province. We have also heard from the south — from the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*); but we have not yet heard of the Creeks, although we have heard from the member for Pipestone. His comments on the Budget reminded me of Pipestone Creek which runs through his constituency. It winds, it twists and it turns as it weaves its way through the muskegs that in places line its banks and a man has to step carefully if he does not want to be mired in the bog in the valley watered by the Pipestone Creek. It seems to me that the former Provincial Treasurer in weaving and threading his way so carefully between deficits and non-deficits, capital and revenue, must have been thinking of that muskeg for it must have been obvious to all that in being able to come into this House and make a speech to cover up a deficit for the last year, he was aware that at any moment he might be completely foundered. He endeavoured at great length to show that there really was no deficit, but it does not take much knowledge on our part to know that, in presenting the statement for a year's business if, at the commencement of the year there is \$1,000,000 in the bank and that \$1,000,000 is spent and at the end of the year there is not a cent in the bank, you cannot say you have a balanced Budget. Yet that was exactly the condition of affairs when the former Provincial Treasurer took over at the beginning of the last fiscal year. He had a surplus — an accumulated surplus of \$219,000 in the bank, and in addition to that he had a surplus of \$1,430,000 standing to the credit of the Liquor Board, or a total surplus in the bank of \$1,649,000. All that money was used, as explained by the Provincial Treasurer, to cover expenditures authorised by the late Government, and is no longer on hand. In addition there is a deficit of over \$400,000 after taking advantage of the provisions of The Deferred Charges Act to assist matters and reduce the deficit as far as it is possible for us to do. So what the honourable gentleman should have explained when he spoke in this debate was why it was necessary to do all these things, of which he approved, if there was no deficit. That there was a deficit is clearly explained by the use of these monies to cover that deficit.

Attacks have been made this year on the expenditures outlined in the Budget, and the late Provincial Treasurer had some comments to make in this connection. But it is one of the features of this Budget, in my opinion, that while it calls for the expenditure of some \$35,000,000, most of the items will never be a burden upon the people of the province. We propose to spend \$1,200,000 less on public buildings than last year and this amount is being put on to highways; and there is a matter of \$3,000,000 (\$1,500,000 more than last year) for power plant purchases — and that will never be a burden upon the people as honourable gentlemen well know. Approximately \$900,000 more is required to carry the public debt of the province as a result of last year's expenditures, while expenditures on agriculture are, very properly, considerably more than they have been. But I would point this out to my honourable friends: The total amount spent last year approximated \$31,000,000, so that there is only a difference of some \$4,000,000 between the expenditures proposed this year and those made by the previous Administration last year. It has been the practice of the former Administration, Mr. Speaker, not to bring down its whole Budget in the Legislative session. It has been their practice to bring down supplementaries each year and, the other day, we, on their behalf, brought down supplementaries of some \$5,000,000. Well, I would inform the House that it is the policy of this Government to take our losses at the beginning of the year, and to show in the Legislature exactly what we propose to spend and, where possible, show where we are going to spend it. The whole idea in bringing down the estimates in this way is to do away with the necessity of coming back and asking for supplementary votes as was the practice of our predecessors. We

appreciate the fact, of course, that occasionally it is necessary to bring down supplementaries, but not in the wholesale fashion of last year.

I propose to deal mainly with the Highway expenditures in this address, and for that reason I will dispense with any remarks I might have to make on other questions raised by the speakers opposite. The main attacks of the Opposition speakers seem to have been directed at the highway expenditures as proposed in this Budget — but just before finishing with the general question of budgeting, I wish to say this: The former Provincial Treasurer has been extolled to the skies by members on that side of the House but I think members on this side will agree and members on the other side as well, and also the Leader of the Opposition, that no man has real practical experience of budgeting until he has had experience in running a house. The honourable member for Pipestone has not had that experience . . .

Mr. Davis: What about the present Provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have already explained that he gained experience in running the city of Saskatoon, and he has that over the former Provincial Treasurer, and I think members opposite will agree that he is also more expert in the handling of ladies!

I would also raise this question: Attack after attack has been made by Opposition speakers on the proposed highway expenditures of the province, the idea back of them being to mislead the people into the belief that these expenditures will lead to increased taxation and that, therefore, they should not be made. They have sought to terrify the taxpayers with puerile and incorrect statements, for there is no attempt on the part of the Opposition to show where any increased taxation is imposed by the Budget now before the House. No new taxes are levied, and the only increase is the increase in the gasoline tax from three to five cents a gallon, and that is balanced by the reduction in the motor license fees. Honourable members opposite will have some difficulty, I imagine, in convincing the farmers of this province that they are being burdened with heavier taxation through the present Budget.

Their misleading statements in this connection are quite in keeping with the statement of the Leader of the Opposition in this House when speaking in the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to repeat again what he said on that occasion, and I would like the people of the province to realise that the statement he made then is in keeping with the statement now made that the whole attack was an attempt to show that the farmers were going to have to shoulder a heavier burden of taxation. I have what he said on that occasion, from the reporter's notes:

"I would like you to go down to that part of the country from which the honourable member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) comes and look over into the State of Montana, and you will see there the effects of that policy. If you run up a public debt, as this policy involves, you immediately incur high interest charges imposing a high taxation cost upon the land which drives the people off the land.

"If you cross over into the State of Montana and drive along their fine roads to a filling station and say to the people there: 'You certainly have got fine highways here,' they will tell you that that is all they have left. As you drive along, you will see large consolidated schools with their windows boarded up; you will see homesteads deserted and boarded up, the land abandoned. The people have been driven off because of high taxation costs. We are going to watch that the people of this province are not placed in that position where they, too, will be driven off their land."

Now, the conclusion he wanted us to take from that statement was obvious. It is: "Don't do this, it will increase the taxes and drive the farmers off their land." Scaring the farmers. But I wired down there, as I stated before, and I was informed that there were no schools closed in Montana. I have here a letter from O. S. Warden, Chairman of the Montana State Highway Commission, extracts from which I propose to read in answer to the honourable gentleman's statements:

"I have read with interest your letter of February 25, and the attached statement of J. G. Gardiner, Opposition Leader."

I had sent Mr. Warden a copy of the statement made by the honourable gentleman:

"It would appear to me that Mr. Gardiner has made some quite extravagant statements without sufficient information.

In the first place, it remains to be said that Montana has absolutely no public debt arising out of expenditure for highways. Our policy has been 'pay as you go'

ever since the State established revenues for matching Federal aid and for maintenance. So the first statement made by your friend of the Opposition falls completely to the ground.

Furthermore, anyone making the assertion that anybody has been driven off the land in this State by high taxation, is much in error. The State taxes with us are exceedingly low when comparison is made with other like units in the United States. Besides, the gloomy picture presented as to our prosperity, is positively incorrect. I have just returned from a trip to Chicago, New York and Washington, where I gave some study to the present situation in this country. I am prepared to say that I do not think there is a single State in the Union where general business conditions are better than they are in Montana.

Further, I am attaching to this letter a statement showing the natural production of this State for the year 1929. If the grand total is divided by our 600,000 population, you will note that our increase in wealth for the year 1929 is quite satisfactory per capita.

The people of Montana were never as enthusiastic over a progressive highway programme as they are at the present moment."

Now that is the answer of the State Highway Commissioner of the State of Montana, and he has attached to his letter here a statement of the revenues of his State, and those statements would indicate that there is nothing at all in the contention of the Leader of the Opposition.

The honourable member for Pipestone (*Mr. W. J. Patterson*) referred to certain "babies" being left on the doorstep of certain departments of the Government. Well, if babies were left on their doorstep, I would say that a big, bouncing boy of 15 years of age was left on the doorstep of the Highways Department, and that boy blessed with all the evils a boy of that age could well be blessed with, or could have accumulated in the time.

The statement has also been made that the former Administration followed a "pay-as-you-go" policy in regard to highways construction. That statement is made in the Liberal Handbook. I would say, positively, that they did not follow a "pay-as-you-go" policy. Not at all! Instead of taking over an asset in the highways from the previous Administration, the present Government has been forced to take over a liability, because the capital indebtedness standing against the highways and bridges built out of capital is considerably more than the actual values of these roads and bridges at the present time. I have here a statement which shows that the total value of the roads, including gravel, is placed at \$12,420,000 and the value of the capital bridges is given at \$2,000,000, making a total present value of \$14,420,000 as compared with an outstanding capital indebtedness in connection with these highways and bridges of \$15,003,910. But the actual capital indebtedness in this connection is not \$15,000,000. It now stands at \$20,445,824.78. That is the present bonded indebtedness in connection with highway construction and bridges paid for out of capital in this province. It stood at more than that, but \$1,553,089.63 has been redeemed, otherwise it would have been as it was around \$22,000,000 — and those are figures supplied to me by the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. I contend the late Administration did not follow a pay-as-you-go policy, and that this Government had to float a bond issue to get the thing straight. That is one of the vices of the young boy left on my doorstep, as I previously mentioned.

Mr. Gardiner: Does that amount include the two million voted this year in the supplementaries?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. That includes approximately \$3,000,000 for this year. The total before that was seventeen odd million. But, as I say, these figures prove that the statements that the previous Administration followed a pay-as-you-go policy are incorrect and cannot be justified in fact.

Furthermore, one would think that what they handed over in the nature of highways already built would be a real, tangible asset, but, as I have indicated, if the highways of today were capitalised, they would not pay the bonded indebtedness standing against them. I would say there would be a considerable deficit, when you take into consideration the cost of necessary reconditioning and rebuilding that will have to be done. The total of earth construction — standard earth construction — at the present time is 4,128.2 miles, but of this we find that approximately 1,000 miles will have to be reconstructed. Capitalised at the \$3,000 per mile set by the late Administration; this would run to \$10,000,000. Then there are some 839.5 miles of gravel — a considerable portion of which will have to be replaced — and if you allow \$2,800 per

mile for the gravel, that would make another \$2,000,000, or a total of \$12,000,000 capitalised at the present time as against a capital indebtedness of \$20,000,000. Even if you take the capital debt in connection with bridges, you are still several millions short. The figures I have quoted were worked out by the Department of the Provincial Treasurer. They are authentic and, I think, cannot be challenged, and they prove that the capital indebtedness is more than the highways are worth, today, if you built them new.

I would say, further, that this mileage has been scattered all over the province. The gravel has been spread in thirty spots all over the province, on no concrete system, with no system tied up in it at all. If you look at the Budget and consider the amount spent on earth construction and the mileage constructed, you will find that had it been placed in a proper system, the previous Administration could have constructed four completed earth roads north and south and six completed earth roads east and west. These could have been completed now, and be giving better service to the people of the province, and they could have been enlarged on a regular, set programme. Furthermore, you will find that two complete roads east and west could have been gravelled with the gravel spread in those thirty places to which I have referred.

We have, along the south boundary, twelve roads in Saskatchewan and only three to meet them from the American side. In the same way, we have on the west side of the province, eleven and on the east ten, and we have a total of 52 highways in this province. In that system, we find a great deal of duplication and there is no doubt that political lines have certainly been followed in a great many instances. We find roads built and gravel spread where they should not have been placed at all, and if the honourable member for Vonda does not believe in that principle he should have voted against it when it was brought down. We have, as I said, approximately 1,000 miles of earth construction which, to all intents and purposes, has been wasted in that manner.

I will give you an example: We have running south of Esterhazy through the Qu'Appelle Valley, a highway and bridge commonly known in that part of the country as the Christie Highway and the Christie Bridge. This bridge was constructed to carry the highway through the farm of a very estimable gentleman who was the Federal Liberal candidate in that constituency in 1921.

Mr. Gardiner: What year was the bridge built?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In 1927, 1928 or 1929.

Mr. Gardiner: It was in 1921, he ran. You are wrong there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I think you are wrong but in any event the honourable member knows he is the Liberal Federal candidate for Melville and is and always has been a "big gun" in the Liberal party in Esterhazy. We find that during the time the honourable member lived there a highway was constructed south of Esterhazy running through the Qu'Appelle Valley, range 1, township 18, past the farms of that Liberal member. A bridge was built across the valley and the highway and bridge cost \$42,476.37. Now, the peculiar part of the whole thing is this: No portion of that road ever was in the highway system of the province! It is isolated, absolutely, from any other highway in the Qu'Appelle Valley and it passes the Christie farm. It never will be in the system, because No. 9 Highway runs just a few miles away and this money which has been expended has been wasted.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask the honourable gentleman if he will build a couple of bridges across that part of the Qu'Appelle?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it is not only a case of a couple of bridges. It is a case of completing a highway at \$42,000 up both hills and three miles off the system.

Mr. Spence: You have to go up one hill if you go down one hill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is no possibility of connecting it up with No. 1, or any other big highway. It is an isolated piece of highway and it leads nowhere. Was it wise to build that road across that valley? There are other places it should have been built before. There is the Hazelcliffe hill for instance.

There is another thing I wish to comment on, and that is in connection with their bridge policy. There are around 3,015 bridges over 16 feet in length in the system

of 7,300 miles of highway, and these bridges form an important and indispensable part of that system. Of our total of 3,015 bridges, 1,350 are timber bridges and the general statement could be made that 1,330 of these bridges, which are over 15 years old, are too old for service. On our provincial highway system, there are some 350 bridges with spannage of over 20 feet, and of this number over 120 are too old and too weak to justify longer their existence. There are some 60 bridges over large rivers which are just about as useless and which are in need of reconditioning which, in addition, we must consider in the statement. This now construction must form, for many years a considerable part of the annual programme. We have to build new bridges. Under the system at present in vogue, the policy of the previous Administration was to make a grant to the municipality and they could use it for a bridge or main market roads, and the general idea seems to have been to make a good showing on the roads, and, as a consequence, the bridge maintenance has suffered. So we have over 1,000 of these bridges which should be rebuilt, and, under the budgeting of the new Government we intend to set aside \$250,000 for the particular purpose of rebuilding existing bridges and in addition to that, to make a municipal grant for main market road purposes. With the municipalities, except in the new areas, that, of course, will come out of their grant. That is the only way new bridge locations can be restricted.

Now the honourable member for Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*) was much concerned as to the policy, as was also the member for Touchwood (*Mr. J. M. Parker*), as to grants to rural municipalities. It is too bad for the sake of the rural municipalities that both those honourable gentlemen were not sitting in the Opposition years ago, and that they did not object before. I will tell the honourable member for Vonda that municipal grants, this year, will be in excess of any previous year — and that includes election years as well. The average municipal grant during the time the previous Administration held office, or at least for the last four years, was \$2,019.97. The average municipal grant, this year, and this includes the grant to Local Improvement Districts, as against \$2.019 will be \$2,314 which is spread over 402 municipalities, which will mean a considerable increase in the amount. I might tell the honourable member for Vonda that for roads it will be \$600,000 and the amount for bridges will be \$250,000.

Mr. Davis: How much was it last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Slightly less than \$800,000 last year.

Mr. Gardiner: Might I ask one more question: Does the honourable gentleman mean that what was spent under the past Government included the amounts spent through contractors where there was no agreement entered into with the municipality?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My understanding is they placed nothing in that particular, nothing on the main market road system. The total on the main market road system was \$464,280, and bridges \$123,788, and maintenance expenses \$40,068, a total of \$798,140.

Mr. Gardiner: What is it this year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: \$850,000.

Mr. Gardiner: And that was an election year, last year!

Mr. Hogan: Do you expect another election this year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not for four years! Now, I would also point this out to the honourable gentleman that while these two members, the swashbuckling member from Vonda and Rip Van Winkle from Touchwood, are trying to protect the farmers, we find this, that practically every application that has been made to the administration for highways and for gravelling has been made by rural municipal councils and by farmers; practically every application. Sometimes they were joined by Boards of Trade. And I would say that ninety per cent. have been councillors and reeves. I would also say to the honourable member for Vonda in reply to what he has said about all-weather roads, that he came down himself with a delegation asking that No. 2 be gravelled and besought me to build this all-weather highway through the Vonda seat. Then why cannot he continue to be consistent and give us the splendid reasons which he gave me for the building of No. 2? But he would wish to deprive other sections of the same benefit which he seeks to have conferred upon his.

Mr. Hogan: I did not give reasons for the building of this road, particularly in my seat. It was for the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The honourable member says that No. 2 is for the province. He hinted it was particularly for Vonda.

Mr. Hogan: Not at all!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Then he is much brighter than he appears. I would say that the people want all these things. They do not take the burden off the cities. They do take the burden off the municipalities.

It is the intention of the Government to alter somewhat the previous Government's policy. We are told that the rural municipalities have certain equipment and we intend to try and use some of their machines and their equipment in the building of highways, particularly elevated graders, where the road is level, if these municipalities will make arrangements satisfactory to the Government. And I say this, that on road No. 6 south of Regina the Government has practically made arrangements for work at \$1,000 a mile, whereas it cost under the old Government \$3,000 a mile, or in the neighbourhood of that. I might say, further, Mr. Speaker, that there are 7,300 miles in the Provincial Highway system as outlined by the previous Administration and the honourable members on the other side should know what it is to construct that 7,300 miles with the revenues as they are today. It is impossible. We find that the cost of maintaining that highway system alone would be \$1,825,000 a year.

Mr. Spence: How does the honourable member figure those maintenance costs?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a proper question. I would tell the honourable member from Maple Creek this, that there are 3,000 miles yet to be graded. That would cost you on the basis of what it cost the previous Administration approximately \$3,000 a mile, or a total of \$9,000,000 to completely grade the system. And there are a lot of other items to be remembered. To gravel that — — —

Mr. Gardiner: All of it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You would have spent \$18,200,000 on the basis of \$2,800 a mile. As the honourable members will see, these roads will have to be of lighter construction, if the taxpayers, who are called upon to pay for them, are going to see them completed in their time.

Mr. Gardiner: Am I to understand that \$2,800 a mile is for gravelling — for how much?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am making the figures as small as possible. We will say \$2,800 a mile for gravelling, though some will cost less, and the total \$27,200,000 for the 7,300 miles of the system.

Now the public debt charges in connection with that alone and without capital debt, without public debt charges on the public debt of twenty odd million dollars would be — — — well, the interest would be \$2,300,000, the maintenance \$1,825,000, you will spend a million on municipal grants and bridges, equipment and furnishings; ferries and general, would be approximately \$1,000,000 and replacements of gravel per year, you will have to allow a million for that, so the total amount would be over \$7,000,000 a year for carrying charges on the highways if you completed the whole programme. The total revenue from motor license fees and gasoline tax approximately this year we estimate at four million three hundred odd thousand dollars. So you would have to practically double your revenue in that regard, if you would complete and carry out that programme. That is the reason I am of the opinion that we have to complete some of these roads and increase some of these revenues before we attempt to do any more patchwork. The honourable members opposite know there are demands to complete every section. They know it is impossible for the Government to comply with the demands on the basis of provincial revenues. The "Red Book" of the Liberal party says that the policy while the present Leader of the Opposition was still in power was to finish this whole thing in four years, and that he was going to do it with only \$5,000,000 borrowed from capital moneys. I would say this, that if he could do that he is a superman. He could not do it on the basis of present revenues. We must concentrate on increasing the revenue, and while we may increase it in the province itself, the main increase in my opinion will come from the outside. We are situated

here between both Manitoba and Alberta and at the present time a large tourist traffic comes up from North Dakota, and the other provinces are making a bid for the traffic just now.

Now if you go into the figures on the gasoline tax receipts in the province of Alberta, a province where they have 300,000 less in population than we have, with a highway mileage of approximately half, you will find that their gasoline tax receipts were approximately the same as were the gas tax receipts in this province. There is a reason for this, and the reason is that they are getting the tourist trade which we are missing. Our gasoline tax, considering that we are the central province and that we have a National Park, should be double that of the province of Alberta, if we build up the present system. It is not the intention of this Government to go on increasing capital expenditures. We intend to go into the whole matter carefully and take stock from year to year. The effect, in my opinion, will not be an increase of the public debt of Saskatchewan and it will not be evident to the people of Saskatchewan until the fiscal year of 1931-32. I believe the results of this system, if it is advertised south and on both sides, will be evident to the people of this province as well as outside. I would point out that Alberta with only 3,700 miles of highways is spending over \$5,000,000. They apparently, appreciate the need for the expenditures and feel the full need. We have in this province 128,000 cars and motor trucks and the difference in the amount of mileage which a car will cover as a result of having good or bad roads is very pronounced. I have figures here compiled by authorities in the United States, which would show when applied in this case to our 128,000 motor vehicles in this province that, the result of building gravelled roads to standard would mean a saving of \$10,000,000 a year in car depreciation alone. These figures are from professors in the United States who have given this problem a thorough study. That is to say the amount this Government is asking to be spent is equal to the saving on motor trucks and vehicles in this province.

Mr. Spence: I do not want to interrupt my honourable friend, but I do not grasp the fact so readily that gravelling is so much easier on trucks or motor vehicles than is an earth road. My opinion is that the earth road is the most economic road in the world. My opinion is that the earth road is the easiest riding and everything else from the standpoint of economy that there is in the world.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to refer my honourable friend from Maple Creek to Professor T. I. Agg, of Minnesota University. Professor Agg figures costs in depreciation from an earth road greater than gravel by 1.7 cents a mile.

Mr. Gardiner: Would this not be true that you would have to take into consideration, in considering the difference between an earth and a gravelled road, the difference in the amount of rainfall? You would have to consider the difference in the amount of rainfall in the State of Minnesota and the amount of rainfall in the province of Saskatchewan, which is an entirely different thing. An earth road might serve in Saskatchewan where you might have to have a gravelled road in Minnesota.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My honourable friend is trying to argue now. The difference between an earth road and a gravel road in Minnesota might not be as distinct as the difference between an earth and a gravel road in Saskatchewan. I think the depreciation will be much greater and anybody who has driven over No. 1 Highway will agree that the depreciation on the average car is tremendous and if Professor Agg had been over that road and had it in mind his figures would have been much more in favour of the gravelled road.

Mr. Gardiner: I have travelled over both the roads of Minnesota and Iowa and my honourable friend will find just as bad roads in those States as he could find anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You must have been in all the back lanes of Iowa. I found better roads clean through the State of Minnesota.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, they have not as good roads in Iowa.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course, you cannot judge them by using as a criterion the province of Saskatchewan. Now, I would like to draw attention to that journal which is always correct and, of course, very fair to the present Administration, *The Moose Jaw Times Herald!* They say:

"Practically from the day he assumed office, Hon. A. C. Stewart, Minister of Highways, has been telling the people of Saskatchewan of the enormous savings he had already made, and would continue to make, in the cost of highways administration. He has stressed the number of highway officials under the Gardiner Government he has dispensed with, officials who would not be replaced, and the huge savings thereby effected.

But the estimates for 1930-31, tabled in the Legislature on Tuesday, do not bear out Mr. Stewart's statements and predictions. Here are the comparative figures:

| | Liberals 1929-30 | Conservatives 1930-31 |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Highways Administration | \$36,670.00 | \$43,180.00 |
| Improvements (chargeable to revenue) salaries.... | 22,380.00 | 39,480.00 |
| Improvements (chargeable to capital) salaries..... | 38,000.00 | 57,460.00 |
| Totals..... | \$97,050.00 | \$140,120.00 |

Further comment is unnecessary."

I think the Editor of the *Moose Jaw Times* needs not only an education in fairness but also in finance and he should be educated in the matter of Public Accounts before he starts to quote them. I would tell him this, that the figures did not include the engineers, they did not include the superintendents and inspectors, they never included any of the supervisors. These men were all dismissed. They were shown in the old Public Accounts and under the old system but were never shown in detail, either under administrative cost or anything else, and if the *Moose Jaw Times* will look that up they will find that we have effected a saving of \$165,000 in these particular salaries and in this particular expenditure and if they want the exact figures I will be pleased to furnish them at any time. I might tell the *Moose Jaw Times* further that this department is not hiring any additional engineers, with one exception, and he formerly was with the department. The engineers that are employed now are men that were in the employ of the previous Administration and they are being put out in the different divisions. No inspectors have been appointed, no supervisors have been appointed and these men have not been substituted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this year's highway programme, we, on this side of the House, stated that before the members of the Legislature were to be required to vote on the highway estimates that they would be given the location of the roads that the Government intended to build. We do not intend to follow the principle followed by the previous Administration of asking this Legislature to vote \$4,000,000 on highways and then refuse to tell the people where it was going to be spent. I would tell honourable members as follows — this is the proposed highway expenditure for this year:

PROPOSED GRADING PROGRAMME — FISCAL YEAR 1930-31

| | | TRUNK HIGHWAYS | |
|-----------|---|----------------|-----------------------|
| Route No. | Location | Mileage | Estimated Cost |
| 1 | Manitoba boundary to Maple Creek..... | 82.8 | \$331,200.00 |
| 10 & 14 | Manitoba boundary to Saskatoon..... | 125.3 | 497,200.00 |
| 5 | Warman to North Battleford..... | 44.0 | 176,000.00 |
| 5 | North Battleford to Lloydminster..... | 31.5 | 126,000.00 |
| 4 | Swift Current to Biggar..... | 105.3 | 421,200.00 |
| 7 | Rosetown to Alsask..... | 73.0 | 200,000.00 |
| 2 | Moose Jaw to Chamberlain..... | 9.0 | 36,000.00 |
| 12 & 2 | Saskatoon to National Park..... | 31.0 | 100,000.00 |
| 39 | North Portal to Corinne..... | 72.3 | 289,200.00 |
| 6 | Corinne to Regina..... | 12 | 36,000.00 |
| 9 | Northgate to Carlyle Lake..... | 55 | 220,000.00 |
| 11 | Chamberlain to Saskatoon..... | 71.0 | 284,000.00 |
| 6 | Regina to Raymore..... | 28.2 | 112,800.00 |
| 2 | Watrous to Wentz..... | 13.5 | 54,000.00 |
| | | 753.9 | \$2,883,600.00 |
| | Cost of completion 1929 Grading not included in above.... | | 79,985.29 |
| | | | <u>\$2,963,585.29</u> |

SUNDRY GRADING WORK

| | | | |
|----|--|------------|---------------------|
| 9 | Canora to Preeceville East (20' roadbed) | 22 | \$88,000.00 |
| 5 | Clair to Quill Lake | 11 | 33,000.00 |
| 6 | Lac Vert to Pleasantdale | 8 | 16,000.00 |
| 33 | Nora to Sylvania | 29 | 58,000.00 |
| 13 | Arcola to Kisbey | 6 | 18,000.00 |
| 40 | Battleford W. through Reserve | 12 | 12,000.00 |
| 4 | Glaslyn North | 6 | 18,000.00 |
| 4 | Val Marie North | 11 | 11,000.00 |
| 6 | Ceylon North | 12 | 12,000.00 |
| 15 | Semans West | 12 | 36,000.00 |
| 15 | Jasmin to Kelliher | 6 | 18,000.00 |
| 31 | Millerdale West | 12 | 36,000.00 |
| 14 | Grandora to Asquith (Recon.) | 13 | 39,000.00 |
| | | <u>160</u> | <u>\$395,000.00</u> |

COLONIZATION ROADS

| | Mileage | Estimated Cost |
|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Turtleford | | \$10,000.00 |
| Jackfish Lake | | 10,000.00 |
| Shellbrook | | 10,000.00 |
| Melfort | | 10,000.00 |
| Tisdale | | 10,000.00 |
| Canora | | 10,000.00 |
| Kinistino | | 10,000.00 |
| Wadena | | 10,000.00 |
| Elrose | | 10,000.00 |
| Stoughton — Fillmore | | 30,000.00 |
| | | <u>\$120,000.00</u> |
| Total..... | | <u>\$3,451,465.00</u> |

SUNDRY GRADING WORK IN CONTEMPLATION
IF FINANCES PERMIT

Verwood to Assiniboia on No. 13 Highway
 Saltcoats to Bredenbury on No. 14 Highway
 Battrum to Cabri on No. 32 Highway
 Notre Dame to Cadillac on No. 13 Highway
 Lipton South on No. 35 to No. 10 Highway
 Marchwell to Manitoba Border
 Bruno to Dana on No. 5 Highway
 Clarkborn to No. 14 Highway on No. 27 Highway.

PROPOSED PROGRAMME — GRAVEL SURFACING
FISCAL YEAR 1930-31

| Route No. | Location | Mileage | Estimated Cost |
|-----------|---|---------|-------------------|
| 35 | Qu'Appelle North | 9.5 | \$28,500.00 |
| 1 | Manitoba Boundary to Maple Creek..... | 239.9 | 719,700.00 |
| 5 | N. Battleford to Lloydminster (part)..... | | 150,000.00 |
| 5 | Battleford to Warman (part)..... | | 100,000.00 |
| 14 | Yorkton to Saskatoon (part)..... | | 300,000.00 |
| 4 | Swift Current to Biggar (part)..... | | 200,000.00 |
| 2 | Moose Jaw to Chamberlain..... | 25 | 75,000.00 |
| 12 & 2 | Saskatoon to National Park..... | 114.3 | 342,900.00 |

| | | | |
|----|--|-------|-----------------------|
| 39 | North Portal to Corinne..... | 119.5 | 358,650.00 |
| 6 | Corinne to Regina..... | 12 | 36,000.00 |
| 11 | Chamberlain to Saskatoon..... | 112.2 | 336,600.00 |
| 2 | Watrous to Wentz..... | 31.4 | 94,200.00 |
| 6 | Regina to Raymore..... | 58.5 | 175,500.00 |
| 9 | Northgate to Carlyle Lake..... | 55.0 | 165,000.00 |
| 10 | Manitoba Boundary to Yorkton..... | 36.0 | 108,000.00 |
| | Cost of further treatments on oiled roads in Regina district (65 miles)..... | | 110,800.00 |
| 14 | Asquith to Grandora..... | 13 | 39,000.00 |
| | | 826.3 | \$3,339,850.00 |
| | Cost of completion 1929 Graveling not included in above | | 33,950.91 |
| | | | <u>\$3,373,800.91</u> |

SUMMARY

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Trunk Highways | \$2,963,585.29 |
| Sundry Grading Work..... | 395,000.00 |
| Colonization Roads | 120,000.00 |
| Gravel Surfacing | 3,373,800.91 |
| | <u>\$6,852,386.20</u> |

In the matter of the proposed grading programme, No. 1 from the Manitoba Boundary to Maple Creek: It would be finished clear through to Maple Creek now but there had been a big diversion made north, and, in my opinion, there is twelve miles of wasted construction. That is west of Maple Creek, where it takes a jump up to the German vote north of Maple Creek. Then it is a fact also that the Alberta road is not quite ready to join there with it. Now that is from the Manitoba boundary on No. 1. Then there is the route on No. 10 and No. 14, Manitoba boundary to Saskatoon, No. 5 from Warman to North Battleford, and No. 5 from North Battleford to Lloydminster. That gives you a complete road across the middle-north of the province, with No. 1 in the south. Later on it is proposed to include a third east and west, No. 3, when the situation warrants it.

Mr. Spence: Where is No. 3?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Tisdale to Melfort and on through Prince Albert. No. 2, No. 3, No. 14 and No. 1 are equal distances apart; Swift Current to Biggar on No. 4, which will be a north and south highway; No. 7, Rosetown to Alsask; No. 2, Moose Jaw to Chamberlain; Nos. 12 and 2, Saskatoon to the National Park at Prince Albert; No. 39, North Portal to Corinne — that is the Soo line highway; No. 6, Corinne to Regina; No. 9, Northgate to Carlyle; No. 11, Chamberlain to Saskatoon; No. 2, Watrous to Wentz. Sundry grading work is included in this programme.

Mr. Davis: That is for completion this year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is all on this year's programme from the money to be voted. Then No. 9, Canora to Preeceville east; No. 5, Clair to Quill Lake; No. 6, Lac Vert to Pleasantdale — all these items are to complete gaps that will give the people service clear through on these roads; No. 33, Nora to Sylvania, 29 miles there; No. 3, Arcola to Kisbey; No. 40, Battleford west — there are 12 miles here not finished; No. 4, Glaslyn north, six miles there; and also on No. 4, Val Marie north, 11 miles there; No. 6, Ceylon north, 12 miles; No. 15, Semans west, 12 miles; No. 13, Jasmin to Kelliher, 6 miles; No. 31, Millerdale west, 12 miles, and No. 14, Grandora to Asquith — that is reconstruction, 13 miles. If there is sufficient left over after completing the work which I have outlined there, if we can keep the expenditures lower than the amount which we estimate it will cost, we propose to carry out sundry grading work as follows: Verwood to Assiniboia, on No. 13; Saltcoats to Bredenbury, on No. 14; Battrum to Cabri, on No. 32; Notre Dame to Cadillac, on No. 13; Lipton south, on No. 13 to No. 10; Marchwell to Manitoba boundary; Bruno to Dana on No. 5; and Clarkburn to No. 14 highway, on No. 27.

The Government is also setting aside the sum of \$120,000 to cover colonisation roads which will be in addition to the municipal grants already provided. We feel that there is a need for these roads and for a secondary or intermediary class of highway. We believe that the old Government was in error in setting only two standards of construction for roads in the province — standard earth construction at \$3,000 a mile, approximately, and the other, main market roads, at around \$500 a mile. We feel that you cannot meet the needs of a province like Saskatchewan with two hard-and-fast standards set and we feel that there should be an intermediary or secondary class of highway, somewhere between the two. We find the need for this particularly in that new lines of railway have been opened up and new municipalities formed and there are roads passing from village to village for which they have had no assistance. The municipalities concerned are demanding assistance. In this connection we are providing for colonisation roads in the north country in Turtleford, Jack Fish Lake, Shellbrook, Melfort, Tisdale, Canora, Kinistino, Cypress and Wadena. Even in Elrose there are certain roads passing through Local Improvement Districts, parts of which cannot be handled by the rural municipalities — inter-village and inter-town roads — which the municipalities are not bound to build. We intend to link these up with the roads already built. Roads built at approximately \$1,000 a mile would amply fill the requirements of the people in those particular sections until traffic conditions warrant a heavier expenditure. For that we have set aside \$120,000, as I have already stated.

Mr. Spence: Is that work to be done under the engineers' supervision?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. I might explain that the engineers will be placed in divisional centres and operate from them. They will go out and look over proposed projects; they will outline the work and make their report, and their report will in every case be acted on to the hilt, without political interference, I hope, from anybody. If there is any dispute, we can send the Chief Engineer out to straighten the matter out.

There is one other item I might mention. There has been some criticism of the Government in connection with the Highway Commission. I would say that that was not the platform of every member on this side of the House, and perhaps it furnishes the best answer to the argument of members opposite that this is not a Co-operative Government. I might say that it is the intention to have the Chief Engineer, the Deputy Minister and the Divisional Engineers consulted in every instance, and to consider what they deem to be best. We believe that is a better plan than appointing some commission behind which the Government might hide themselves when any dispute arises. If you review the condition that prevailed with the commission that was in existence at one time in this province, if you review the condition prevailing in other provinces where commissions have been set up, you will find that the tendency has been for the Government to "pass the buck" on to the Commission. We believe it best in the interests of all concerned, to pass the problem on to the engineers and leave it to them to recommend the programme which is best, the Government taking full responsibility for the programme ultimately decided upon and not seeking to cloak itself behind the skirts of some commission.

I would point out to the gentlemen opposite that it is the intention of the Government to take a "yea" and "nay" vote on the Budget motion now before the House, and it will be particularly interesting to note the attitude taken by members opposite, as the main criticism of the Budget has been on the highway expenditures, for the matter of Power has not been criticised. When the time comes to say what attitude they will take, their constituents will be interested to know whether their representatives are going to continue to follow the dictates of party leadership and political considerations, and vote against the interests of their constituents, or whether they will back a highway programme which will not only benefit the constituencies but the whole of the province. It will be interesting to note how the member for Notukeu (*Mr. Grant*) will vote, in connection with the work on No. 4 highway through his seat. And it will be interesting to watch the action of the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*), and how he will vote on the completion of the Soo Line Highway. It will also be interesting to note the vote of the member for South Qu'Appelle (*Mr. Huck*) and whether he places political considerations above all others, when he comes to declare himself with No. 1 running through his seat. It will be interesting to watch his vote on this Budget motion. It will be interesting to note the vote of the honourable member for Maple Creek because his constituency is going to benefit largely under this programme, and we will be glad to know whether he places the interests of his constituents higher than those of his party. And it will be equally interesting to note how the member for Lloydminster (*Mr. Gordon*) votes, for or against work on No. 5.

It will be interesting, too, to note the vote of the honourable member for Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*) and whether he favours the work to be done on No. 2 and No. 14, or not. And the member for Saltcoats (*Mr. Lopston*)—No. 10 runs through his seat; it will be interesting, therefore, to watch his vote. And it will be most interesting to note the vote of the honourable member for Canora (*Mr. Morken*) for the road to Preeceville runs through his seat. And as the programme calls for much work on No. 5, which runs through Redberry constituency, it will be particularly interesting to note how the honourable member for that seat (*Mr. Cockburn*) will vote at the close of this Budget debate. And also the member for Prince Albert (*Mr. Davis*). He talks of the need for a road to Prince Albert National Park and he is getting that road, so it will be interesting to see if he is going to vote against that. And the member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*), too; we would naturally expect, in view of this programme, affecting his seat so advantageously, he will vote in the interests of his constituents, and support this motion. We also expect the member for Saskatoon County (*Mr. Agar*) to vote with us on the Budget, in view of what is going to be done in his seat.

Mr. Davis: What decision did you arrive at in connection with the road from St. Louis? Who cancelled the contract?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I instructed the contractor in that particular case to move onto No. 12.

Mr. Spence: For this year only?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. I will go over that highway personally. There is one point I omitted that I intended to mention. The honourable member for Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*) raised the question as to the amount which had been spent under the Highways Department in his constituency during the past year. In checking up, I find that in 1928-29, he received for highways and bridges, \$119,059.68.

Mr. McGregor: This programme for this year — does it cover grading and construction only or gravelling as well?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Did I not deal with gravelling?

Mr. Gardiner: No! No figures at all.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I will give you the gravelling figures if you want them. The gravelling programme is: Qu'Appelle north, on No. 35; No. 1, Manitoba boundary to Maple Creek; No. 5, part, North Battleford to Lloydminster; and another part of No. 5, Battleford to Warman; No. 14, part of Yorkton to Saskatoon; No. 4, part between Swift Current and Biggar; No. 2, Moose Jaw to Chamberlain; Nos. 12 and 2, Saskatoon to National Park; No. 39, North Portal to Corinne; No. 6, Corinne to Regina; No. 11, Chamberlain to Saskatoon; No. 2, Watrous to Wentz; No. 6, Regina to Raymore; No. 9, Northgate to Carlyle Lake; No. 10, Manitoba boundary to Yorkton; No. 14, Asquith to Grandora.

Mr. Strath: You have not mentioned Happyland at all!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I might point out to honourable members that there are four or five seats on the west side of the province that will not be receiving anything this year under this programme of highway construction; and some of these are represented on this side of the House. They are being asked to forego their claims for this year in the matter of highway appropriations in the interests of the system as a whole. But we are completing No. 4 and doing as much work on the main heavy traffic trunk line construction as possible this year, so it will simply be a matter of building some feeder roads to couple up with the general system which they would never have received under the old programme. This will place these constituencies in the position where they can link up, and my honourable friend from Happyland will be in a position to join up with the programme next year.

Mr. Hogan: In referring to those highways, No. 2 from Moose Jaw to Chamberlain and No. 12 to the National Park, you will have to include some other road to get to the National Park.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. You did not get it all. It is No. 2 until it strikes No. 11 at Chamberlain.

Mr. Hogan: But you are not using No. 11.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. Nos. 11, 12 and 2. You will find that when this year's programme is completed we shall have in the province of Saskatchewan an all-weather highway completed across the province from boundary to boundary — No. 1; and another practically completed in the middle-south part of the province and another across the north-central portion from the Manitoba boundary through Yorkton, Saskatoon, Battleford and on to Lloydminster. Then there will be in the system four lateral highways, running north and south. No. 2, from Moose Jaw south and north to Chamberlain, No. 11 from Chamberlain to Saskatoon and No. 12 to the National Park. You see all three are in it. Then there is No. 6 which goes to Raymore and it also links up with No. 11. Then there is No. 9 on the east running north and south, and No. 4 on the west. The main revenue producers we expect will be the two east and west, inter-provincial roads, the Soo Line highway, No. 9 and No. 4. Later on, another transversal highway east and west, namely No. 3, will have to be taken into consideration . . .

Mr. Hogan: Will the honourable gentleman tell

Mr. Speaker: Order! This continued questioning after the honourable gentleman is through, is entirely out of order.

MR. D. A. HALL, M.L.A.

(Cumberland)

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—It is always an ordeal for us who live in our great northern hinterland, to express ourselves when standing on our feet, and, consequently, I do not intend to take up very much of the time of the House.

At the outset, and on behalf of the people of the constituency of Cumberland, whom I have the honour to represent here, I wish to take this opportunity of thanking the Honourable Premier and the Honourable Minister of Highways, for the visit they paid us during the election of last summer. I am sure I speak for all of our people up there when I say that we will welcome another visit from them at an early date. I understand they were on a fishing tour, and, if they are really serious, I would invite them to come at any time they wish.

As I did not speak during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would like, at this time, to refer to a few newspaper clippings relative to the election in Cumberland, last year. In the *Regina Star* of August 10, there was a statement to the effect that Dominion Government aeroplanes were used on my behalf. I am going to state that that statement is an absolute falsehood. There was not a Dominion Government plane used during the last election. If there is any complaint in that connection, I may say that I have it, because on the eve of the election a number of the pilots took away and I know that a number of those pilots would have voted for me.

There is another statement made in this paper: "Here," (referring to the constituency of Cumberland) "can be found Hon. Dr. Uhrich and others." I might say, in that respect, that the honourable member for Rosthern would not have come to Cumberland on that occasion at all, had it not been for the fact that the present Leader of the Government, with his Minister of Highways, had come there. I may say, also, that it was through my insistency that he came to the constituency. I would say, further, that in all my elections this was the first occasion in which we had outside workers. I do not think the result in any way was changed by that, as the people of Cumberland always seem to have approved my efforts on their behalf. This paper also says that the former Attorney General (*Mr. Davis*) was there. That is not true. The member for Prince Albert was not there.

Just one more remark I would like to make in connection with the election and that is with regard to a statement which appeared in the Prince Albert paper that I had been responsible for the disfranchisement of a hundred voters in the Cumberland Constituency. I saw at a later date where the number was set at two hundred by the *Regina Star*—they did not seem to be very certain about it. I might explain, however, that I am really responsible for where the polls are held. There is no one who could know the country so well as I do, and it was only natural that I should advise the returning officer where to place the polls—which I did. It is true there were a few voters in the Paddockwood country who were overlooked. I did not know they were there; but we did try to suit everybody in the constituency. That is all I have to say about the election, which was satisfactory as far as I was concerned.

I just wish to pass a remark or two on the estimates. While I think they are large, I am not going to criticise them all. There is one branch of the service, however, on which I do not think we are spending enough. I refer to the Game Branch. It is generally conceded by all those who know something of the situation that, if we are going to conserve our game, we will have to spend more money on game protection. In regard to the Budget: I think we are going through a period of some depression. I do not wish you to infer from that that I am talking "Blue Ruin." I have great faith in Saskatchewan, and I think we could quite well enlarge some of the expenditures on

some lines rather than curtail them at the present time. It is true that it is for the Government to read the pulse of the people and to respond to it, and I have some suggestions to make in regard to the Game Branch. I see that the vote for Game and Fur Conservation has been cut \$10,000. I should not have made any objection had that vote been increased by that amount. Statistics have shown that some of the very important fur-bearing animals are almost extinct, and two of the most important of these are the marten and the fisher.

Regarding the marten and fisher, they are almost extinct at the present time and there is only one solution if they are to be saved. The one way of saving these animals is by the formation of game sanctuaries. Both these animals are very easily trapped and for that reason sanctuaries are necessary for their preservation, and I think that if we put the sanctuaries in the proper places it would be the solution. I may say that I am quite prepared to work with the Minister in that regard. I know something about the northern country, and I am quite prepared to pass on to him my ideas as to where they should be established. This matter is absolutely apart from, and should be out of, politics altogether. A lot can be done, I believe, by means of such sanctuaries.

I wish also to refer briefly to the condition of Montreal Lake. It was a trading post of some importance during years gone by under the Hudson's Bay and Revillion Companies, but a few years ago they were considering very seriously closing it up altogether. Since that time, however, the National Park has been established and in a few years Montreal Lake has again become one of the most important fur centres of the north; and the reason why it is of importance is just on account of its proximity to Prince Albert National Park.

One of the greatest game exterminators we have to contend with in that northern country is the forest fires. It is a well known fact that annually great sections of the country with valuable stands of timber, where all game is plentiful, are being burned up. We have, I think, a fairly good fire patrol in the north but once a fire starts in any section and gets beyond control, nothing can be done. The country which is burned over cannot be replenished as far as the feed for the wild life is concerned for some time and it takes years for the wild life to come back.

I have mentioned on several occasions in this House, and the fact has been given some publicity, that, in the case of trappers, every man should be enabled to lease his own trapping grounds. I say that for this reason that very frequently, too many trappers are working in the one area due to the fact that they do not want to go too far afield. The result is that many of the areas are over-trapped. Now, if we had some system such as they have in British Columbia, where the trapping grounds are all mapped out, the situation would be much improved. Now that we have our aerial maps of the northern area, every man could have his own ground and he would take a greater personal interest in it which would manifest itself in many ways. The grounds could be improved by the planting of wild rice as feed, old beaver dams could be dammed up and the muskrats would not be frozen out in the winter time. All these things would tend to improve conditions, and be of benefit to the industry.

I just wish to say one word with regard to the trapping of foxes. In this connection some changes in the regulations should be made. I might say I have done considerable trapping while in the north country and I know something of the natural habits of the wild life we have up there, and I would say that there should be some change in the season. I am suggesting that the season open on the 20th of October and close a month earlier in the year. My reason for that is that every trapper, to be successful, has to get his traps out in the fall, before freeze up. We generally start to get our traps out about the twentieth of October and it is against the law to do that at the present time. But you have to set your traps about that time if you expect to do anything at all.

Regarding the closing of the season earlier: On the whole a fox caught in October, after the twentieth, is better than one caught after the fifteenth of January. The reason for this is that foxes start to rub in January, caused, according to some people, from their lying in the snow and the fur freezing to it and, naturally, pulling out every time they get up. I think, therefore, that, in the interests of the trappers too, the season should be closed a month earlier in the year.

Another thing I would like to bring up is the setting of traps in certain parts of the north country for the purpose of trapping coyotes and weasels. A person can set a trap for these animals at any time and catch fox or other animals out of season. North of township 55 no traps should be allowed to be set until the season opens. The reason for this is that some indiscriminate trappers come in from the outside and they set

their traps and, if you protest against it and take action, they simply say they are trapping for weasels or coyotes.

I also think we might increase the tax or license for non-residents. We have many people come in on a two-dollar license and they interfere with trapping rights. This, I maintain, is very unfair to the man on the ground who has been in the country for many years. The two-dollar license is too low for these people in my opinion.

Now, in connection with our natural resources, there are one or two items I will discuss when the matter is before the House later on. I do not think there is anyone in the north country who will not be gratified with the return to the province of our natural resources. I will naturally await with interest to hear what steps will be taken by the Government in their development. I am very much of the opinion, held by many other people, that we are in a far better position to administer the resources of the Province, and they will be far better administered from Regina than they are from Ottawa. I think that Regina or Saskatchewan people should absolutely have the handling of our resources. I trust, however, that they will be kept out of politics for I do not think that anything will hamper or hinder the development of the vast resources of the north country more than making them a political football.

I might just mention briefly a few of the important resources in the Cumberland constituency. We have timber and pulpwood, furs and fisheries, minerals and water powers. But while we have those resources, they are absolutely or almost absolutely, useless to us if we do not add good transportation facilities. We have our winter roads which are used commercially at the present time and they have almost all been built, not by the Government, but privately; that is by the people who live there. I would suggest at this time, if we are anxious to get our resources working, that we should take steps to provide the proper transportation facilities. I notice that some \$25,000 has been spent on the Regina-Moose Jaw road. It is rather a small amount but I would suggest to this Government at this time that it should subsidise to the same extent the aerial companies that operate to our far north country so that people will be able to travel into it at a much lower rate than at present. Aerial transportation will be for many years to come the chief means of transportation in the north land, but at the present time, it is a rich man's proposition travelling there by 'plane. The Government would do well to consider subsidising these companies, so that the costs would be cut down and so get more people used to it, for there is no doubt that many more people would travel that way. I would suggest that \$25 a head be allowed, for the first year, to the aeroplane companies. The average rate now runs about \$70 and the return trip than if with one passenger, and if a reduction of \$25 is made it will bring the rate down price would depend on how much of a load there is. If the 'plane is full, they go cheaper to somewhere around \$45 one way with perhaps \$30 additional for return. This would not make it an expensive trip for our people. I believe we could make it cheaper even than that because if we get more people to travel the companies would probably make more trips a week. The more business the lower the cost. They only make one or two trips a week now, and they have to charge the highest price they can get out of the public, to pay expenses.

I want to say a word regarding the tourist traffic. If the Government were to cut down the rates as I have suggested, it would increase the tourist traffic considerably. In addition, the Government could advertise in the well-known tourist papers about the beauties of the north country and its sporting features. We could, in that way, get many wealthy people from the United States and from other parts of Canada, notably the East, who want a touch of the wilds and to get away from everybody during the holiday seasons, to come into our north country where they will find everything to their hearts' desire. We have a country there we do not have to be ashamed to show anyone. I have travelled in a great many parts of Canada and as far as beauty is concerned, it takes second place to none. Regarding sportsmen's grounds and streams and lakes for fishing, we have fishing that would compare favourably with that of Ontario or any other place. In some of our rivers and lakes there are many fish which we could place with great advantage to the province. I am referring particularly to river trout and bass. Any waters that a lake trout lives in a river trout will live in and there is no reason why we cannot get our rivers stocked with trout. The exchange between our hatcheries and those in the United States should be arranged again whereby we made the exchanges in pickerel and received bass in return.

I noticed while I was in California last winter a rather unique programme in a "talkie" show. I saw a film in which Alberta advertised their fishing in Northern Alberta. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that would be a good plan for Saskatchewan to follow. The taking of the pictures would be very simple and the advertising of our

Province in that way would not have to be "pushed" because the public like that sort of thing.

Regarding highways I would say this: All the country up there north of Prince Albert to Montreal Lake is covered by the National Park and I would like to suggest the building of a road from Paddockwood to Montreal Lake, which is the start of our water transportation. Before the road was completed north of Prince Albert this land went into the Park and consequently we have no say in the expenditures of money there. I believe it would help considerably to have the eleven miles completed, and if the Government would get in touch with Ottawa with a view to completing that eleven miles of roadway, it would be a good thing.

Premier Anderson: Is it bush country there?

Mr. Hall: It is bush country everywhere up there. I am going to ask the Minister of Highways (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) if he will consider the building of a road from Lac la Ronge to Montreal Lake. That road is necessary if we are going to do anything to make it possible to travel up there; and if you are not going to do that you might as well leave the resources at Ottawa because, if you want to get up there and bring anything out, you have a highway or a road to travel over. I am sure that, on the whole, the road would not be an expensive proposition.

I would just say a word about power and that is that we all know of the development at Island Falls and that we have something over one million horsepower in our northern rivers which it will no doubt be possible to develop at some stage in our development. It will be a big factor some day in the life of our people.

As to timber, as you all know, great sections of valuable timber land have been destroyed annually. We have a very adequate patrol force, but many of the newcomers into the country appear to be careless and do not take the proper precautions against fire. But all fires are not caused by carelessness. I have seen many instances of lightning starting fires, and we can do nothing to prevent that, but something can be done to prevent the enormous waste in that way caused by people being careless with their fires.

The House will expect me, and I would like to devote a little time, to say a few words about minerals. I may say that, unlike the Minister (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*) I am not at all disappointed at the way mining development is coming along at the Rottenstone and Lac la Ronge. The Consolidated people have proven many million dollars of valuable commercial ore there, but I must admit it is a disappointment that they did not prove up to the 20,000,000 tons required before they will contemplate building a road into that district. But they have by no means abandoned their interest in the country. In a year or two, with the progressive mineral development of the North, and the acquiring of additional properties, there will be enough to warrant the construction of the railroad which they desire for the development of their holdings. It has not been an average year for many of the companies and if it had not been for the slump in mining and many other stocks, I am positive that the Consolidated people would be drilling there now. No company is being harder hit than the Consolidated at the present time. But they are not giving up the country. There are healthy indications at Pike Portage where the Nipissing people have some holdings and Ventures Limited have just recently paid money on a property just west of us at Lac la Ronge. We are going to operate in a larger way and there are many other interests desirous of coming into the country and I look for general activity on a larger scale this season. Under the circumstances I do not think the Honourable, the Provincial Treasurer, need feel as disappointed as he told us he was. Personally, I am as optimistic as ever regarding our north country and I have just as much faith in it now as I ever had. I hope I shall see the day when our resources in the north country will rival our agriculture to the south in productive value. When that comes about, I do not think Saskatchewan will take second place to any province in the Dominion.

MR. GEORGE SPENCE, M.L.A.

(*Maple Creek*)

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—I propose to make a few observations on the resolution before the House "that you do now leave the Chair," commonly known as the Budget motion. I am going to confine myself to two departments of Government over which it was my privilege and honour to preside for two years. I refer to the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries, and the Department of Highways. I propose first to deal with the Department of Railways.

We listened, in a previous sitting, to the present Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries making his "maiden" speech in this House, and I want at this time to compliment him on the impression he made and upon the very thorough and methodical way he went about the job. It is true he followed his notes very carefully — which, I think, is one of the privileges extended to new members which we older members have not got. I have observed also that the honourable minister is a mild-mannered man, is not militant and does not walk around with a chip on his shoulder as some of his honourable colleagues do. I have also observed that he has been relieved of a great many of the responsibilities that formerly attached to the job and I think that is due in some measure to the fact that he is mild-mannered and good-tempered. In any case, Mr. Speaker, he has allowed other members of the Government to take his thunder. I do not think that is a policy that always pays even although we are told in the Good Book that "the meek shall inherit the earth."

There are a few matters in connection with the departmental business which the honourable minister covered very thoroughly in his speech the other day, and I was very interested indeed in what he had to say in connection with the administration of The Game Act. But throughout that entire speech, I listened in vain for a new note; I listened in vain for pronouncement of a new policy, and I failed to see where he indicated a single one during the time he was on his feet. It is true he did indicate something was to be done in connection with the protection of game, and anything he does that will increase that protection we are heartily in accord with on this side of the House. But, let me repeat, there was nothing new forecast, no new policy indicated. He apparently is following very closely in the footsteps of former ministers and the policy now is what it has been, namely the conservation of game for our own people — that's what we were interested in.

There are some interesting facts in connection with our hunting grounds that have come to my attention. In reading over the last annual report of the department (by the way, it was my own report) I find some interesting facts in connection with our game birds. There is something very interesting in the account given there of the Hungarian partridge. This bird has had a most interesting career on this side. It was introduced from Hungary sometime toward the close of the eighteenth century when some were distributed along the Atlantic seaboard, but for some reason or other, it did not multiply to the degree expected. A small covey located and can be found today in the state of Maine. Around 1905, some 200 of these birds were introduced into British Columbia and they apparently thrived but not to the extent they did when they were introduced to Saskatchewan in 1921. Since that date, they have been reported in rapidly increasing numbers in the province, until now they pretty well cover the prairie section and the park section of Saskatchewan. I am told, also, by game guardians that they are penetrating the bush section as well. They are penetrating the Prince Albert district (my honourable friend from Prince Albert will bear me out in this) and in Tisdale and Melfort, too, these birds are multiplying and thriving. It is a new sport bird, and apparently it has established itself in Saskatchewan and we hope it is here to stay. It is at present the only upland game bird that can be shot at during the season. Another, the prairie chicken, has been closed for some seasons, and we hope that they are doing pretty well now with the protection they

have had and, from reports I have received, it would seem that the prairie chicken season could also be open in the near future. The Hungarian partridge runs the show, as I have said, in the upland shooting, but we have also ducks and geese in great numbers, and big game in the north — deer, moose and caribou — and I do not believe there is a country in North America where the sportsman can find a better hunting paradise than here in Saskatchewan.

I was particularly interested in the remarks of the honourable member for Cumberland (*Mr. Hall*) in this connection, and I believe there is no better authority on the game of our northland than the honourable member. He has lived there for a great many years. He knows the conditions which affect the wild life of the province. He complains of the fires in the north country which work to the disadvantage of our fur-bearing animals, and in this regard I am going to have something to say later on, with regard to the forestry fire and air patrols in the north.

I may say that, in connection with all these matters, we had under consideration before I left the department the extension of the game bird sanctuaries in the province of Saskatchewan, and we would have had one more in the north for the protection of game, in the area around the Waterhen river. As regards fur-bearing animals, I think something can be done in a practical way (and we were considering it) by establishing experimental fur farms, perhaps in the Beaver Hills or Moose Mountain districts, or both. I have thought sometimes, that it could be done in my own constituency of Maple Creek. By establishing with such farms a trained biologist, valuable information might be obtained in connection with the preservation of those fur-bearing animals in captivity which at the present time do not respond to such treatment. I have here in my hand the annual report presented to the House by the minister but which I signed myself, and it says, on Page 41 (the minister no doubt is familiar with this):

"Fox farming has been proven beyond the experimental stage and experienced breeders are having very satisfactory success. Practically all fox breeders who have developed farms beyond the 'backyard' stage had a successful season and secured fair returns for pelts marketed."

So, Mr. Speaker, we can say with a good deal of confidence that fox farming which in Canada was once confined to Prince Edward Island, now can be conducted with a fair degree of success in Saskatchewan:

"Mink farming, though not developed to the same extent as fox farming, has developed nevertheless beyond the purely experimental stages. Experienced breeders are securing fair results and the number of animals and value of improvements on mink farms may be expected to increase rapidly."

And I think the same can be said about mink farming which, if not such a success as fox farming, is at least a success and we can look forward with confidence to a great deal of expansion in this branch of the industry. Then with regard to muskrats:

"Muskrat farming is still in the experimental stages. Because of the relatively low value of the muskrat pelt, the same intensive effort that can be successfully applied to the silver black fox and the mink does not appear to be profitable with muskrats at this time. The result has been an attempt to breed muskrats under conditions approaching their natural wild state. Last season there were no muskrat farmers reporting that they had developed their ranches to a pelt-producing basis. Some licensees are experimenting with what might be termed intensive methods such as breeding the animals in dry pens and with only sufficient water for drinking purposes. While this method appears to be possible as a breeding method, it has not yet been demonstrated that muskrat pelts can be profitably produced under this system. The chief value of such an experiment would appear to be the opportunity it offers of studying the effect of various foods and securing new information regarding breeding and life history of these animals."

No one disputes that muskrats can be grown in captivity, but the fact is that the fur under the circumstances is not worth very much and does not compensate the breeder for the financial investment he has made or the time and attention he has to give them — and so on. However, a great deal of work is being done with regard to muskrat breeding in dry pens, and rearing in solitary confinement, with snug buildings and sufficient supplies of water for drinking purposes only; and I am told that many interesting things have been discovered about the life history and habits of muskrats which will be of great value as the industry develops. I think something along that line can be done by the Government to give a real start to this great industry, and a great deal of valuable data can be secured from such experimental fur farms, I am sure. I would recommend this to the attention of the minister, and suggest that he give it some consideration.

I would like, at this time, to say a word in connection with the air survey. I asked the minister, when he was speaking in this debate, if he had done anything in connection with the air survey, and he said that he had not, he had had no communication with Ottawa nor had he discussed the matter nor written to Ottawa in connection with it. I think it is very important that this work should continue. Last year, I made a trip to Ottawa and pressed to have this work undertaken in Saskatchewan. The great work now is in determining the mineral areas of Saskatchewan. To all intents and purposes we can say that the old days of the prospector going out with his birch-bark canoe in summer and his dog-team in winter time are gone, and the prospector of the future will be the representative of great amalgamations of capital, going out in aeroplanes, which are used also to establish caches here and there, and thus keeping the prospector in touch with the supplies. Great advances have been made in geo-physical surveying, too, and it is now possible with the very sensitive instruments that have been evolved, to tell not only where minerals are situated but also to tell what these minerals are. We had two blocks of the north country surveyed from the air, last year, by the Dominion surveyors, and the sections as they are completed are shown on the map of Saskatchewan hatched in in different colors. The request I made last year was to have Lac la Ronge area mapped from the air and then the country around the Rottenstone and a small piece of territory in between the two. I had a talk with one of the engineers, named McDonald, who has done a tremendous amount of work in that part of the country, perhaps more than any one else in Canada today, and he also has done much in connection with the water powers, and he said that much could be done from the air by way of getting the location of lakes, getting the extent of water and land areas, and so on. For instance, Reindeer Lake is shown on the map as a great body of water. In reality, it is nothing of the kind. They boast in Ontario of their "Thousand Islands" — why, Reindeer Lake is a lake of 10,000 islands!

Much more remains to be done in the north country, and thus it is very important that this work be carried on, more particularly if the natural resources are going to be returned to the province in the near future. So I would suggest that the Government should prepare to continue this work. It costs a lot of money, it is true, but in the great saving of time it would mean, the cost is more than balanced, in my humble opinion. If this is done, it will be possible for northern Saskatchewan to make more progress in the next five years than northern Ontario has made in the last eighteen years. That is all I wish to say on this subject for the present.

Reverting to the minister's speech, I do not recall that the minister was doing anything different from what we already have done in connection with our northern areas. We interested ourselves in the clearing of the water courses leading into the north country. We took the matter up with the Dominion Government, pressed it upon their attention and were successful in persuading them to remove the rocks from the bed of the Montreal river and the Bigstone so that now canoes with outboard motors, carrying considerable loads, can make the trip in. I was much interested, too, in the remarks of the honourable member for Cumberland (*Mr. Hall*) in regard to transportation by road. While there is a good water course when you get to Montreal river, there are certain seasons of the year when you have to fly into the country to get there at all, and if this country is to be developed, a great deal can be done if you build a road. Here again, nothing new was intimated in the speech of the honourable Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries, and I might say that all eyes are directed at our north country — and by that I do not mean the eyes of Saskatchewan alone, but of the financial houses of Montreal, New York and Chicago, and generally all over the east.

There is another branch of this department, I would like to speak on, shortly, and that is the Freight Rates Branch.

I read an important announcement in the press this morning which means a great deal to Saskatchewan and more particularly to the section of Saskatchewan from which many of my friends opposite come — particularly the members for Yorkton and Regina. It has reference to "Sturgis Cut-off" branch line. I am going to take time to read this in full:

"Winnipeg, Man., March 26. — Construction work on the Sturgis-Hudson Bay Junction branch line of the Canadian National will be finished about May 18 and the line will be turned over to the operating department on that date. An announcement to this effect was made today by A. E. Warren, western vice-president of the Canadian National.

"A very considerable saving in time and distance between southern Saskatchewan and the Hudson Bay Railway will result with the completion of this line and

the opening of it for regular freight and passenger service. Between Regina, Moose Jaw and other southern points in Saskatchewan there will be a lessening of 94.6 miles over the existing route from those centres to The Pas.

"Intermediate points such as Melville and Yorkton will also be brought considerably nearer to The Pas and the Hudson Bay Railway.

"Until the Sturgis-Hudson Bay Junction line goes into operation, the route from Regina to Hudson Bay Junction is via Swan River, a distance of 429.6 miles. The distance by way of the new route which lies through Melville, Yorkton and Canora, will be 335 miles.

"Passenger and freight train services are now under consideration by the departments concerned and it is not expected that an announcement on train service will be made for a few weeks.

"The Sturgis-Hudson Bay Junction line was one of those included in the three-year branch line programme which was passed by Parliament in 1927. Although it is practically the last item of that programme to be completed, the date upon which it is to be turned over for operation is more than six months ahead of that set by the Bill."

I am quite sure we were all glad to read that in the press this morning. It is very important news, and it brings to our minds certain things in connection with the freight rates on that line. I undertook, while in office, to get ready for the freight rates that would be put into operation on this line when it was put into service and the mere fact that this line brings us nearer to the Hudson Bay means that it will bring about a complete reorganisation of the whole freight rate structure at all tributary points, and we were working at that when we went out. I would like to have had a statement from the minister as to how that work was progressing and I would like also to know if these particulars as to freight rates over this line are ready. I pause for the minister's answer now.

Hon. Mr. Merkle: I wrote Mr. Warren ten days ago asking for any information he might have as to the time when the Sturgis line would be connected up on the short way to The Pas, and I was very pleased to see the notice in the press today. It is indeed a great pleasure to me. So far as the freight rates are concerned the Chief Clerk in charge of that department is working on it now preparing data and a statement on the freight rates.

Mr. Spence: Well, that is hardly satisfactory. I would like to know that those rates are ready to submit.

Hon. Mr. Merkle: On a point of order: I did not say they were ready to submit. I said the Chief Clerk was working on that point at the present time.

Mr. Spence: Well, there is no need for argument. There is no need for the point of order. The point is that this is very important to the people of central, northern and southern Saskatchewan, and they will be very interested in connection with the whole matter. I would like to feel that this work is being carried on in the same way we were proceeding.

Premier Anderson: Only with more speed.

Mr. Spence: Well, we were going just as fast as it was possible for that office to carry it on and I would like to know whether these rates would be ready to submit on the date this line is ready for traffic, because it will mean the grading down of all freight rates from points tributary. Not only that, but the opening of Churchill brings to our front door a great ocean port which we think will be a great asset to Saskatchewan but its success will depend on what the rates over the new railroad are going to be, together with ocean rates and marine insurance across the Atlantic to European ports. We were in conversation with Ottawa on the matter and I was informed by the honourable Minister for Railways (*Hon. C. A. Dunning*) that the matter was being taken up with Lloyds'. Consequently I was disappointed when the minister spoke the other day that he gave us no information in this respect, because, as I have said, it does not mean a few paltry thousand dollars but millions — and yet the minister sits in his seat as dumb as a clam on this very important subject!

There is another thing in connection with this on which I would like a little more information from the minister and that is what progress — and I am not saying this in partisan mood — has been made with the joint application submitted by the Saskatchewan Liberal Government with the province . . .

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Mr. Speaker, might I interrupt the honourable gentleman: This comes in my department as well as that of the honourable the Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries (*Mr. Merkley*) and I had intended speaking on this earlier but was barred by the fact that the application was on the way to the Privy Council.

Mr. Spence: But the Board of Railway Commissioners is not a court.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Oh, yes, but it is a court! The Court or Board of Railway Commissioners!

Mr. Spence: Well, I do not want to take an undue advantage of my honourable friend. He has taken so many things from the Minister of Railways that there is nothing left. They have shown some co-operation when he was doing some of the Attorney General's work when he took the Doukhobors out of gaol. I just want to make this observation: I have never been able to see why the application was withdrawn. Now, we submitted a joint application. Let me enumerate: The Terminal rate case, then there was the Mountain differential, the constructive mileage between Calgary and Vancouver, then the export rate on grain, and last but not least. —

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to settle the point of order. The point is that there was a decision by the Board of Railway Commissioners and the proceedings to which my honourable friend now refers were by way of appeal to the Privy Council; the Privy Council of Canada is the only tribunal to which there is an appeal and no decision has been given by the tribunal. I had intended to speak on this matter and the reason I did not was that it was before the court. That is the reason I refrained from discussing it.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is well taken!

Mr. Gardiner: The Privy Council of Canada is not a court and I submit, Mr. Speaker —

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: It is the Executive Council, the Dominion Executive Council. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that it is an appellate tribunal and they have this matter before them and they have not given any decision yet. It is a court, I submit.

Mr. Gardiner: Then, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to prevent a discussion of it in this House. If we were to be guided by that, that it is a body for further consideration on matters of this nature, then we are not in a position to discuss the natural resources. It is not a "court" in that sense of the word.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: My honourable friend misses the point I am endeavouring to make altogether. The Board of Railway Commissioners is a body set up by the Dominion. That body rendered a decision. Now, there is no appeal from that Board except to the Governor General in Council, which is the Cabinet. And that appeal has been taken to the Privy Council of Canada, which acts there in the nature of an appellate tribunal and it is the only tribunal to which an appeal can be taken.

Mr. Spence: Might I proceed: The point of order is immaterial. I further repeat that I expected the Minister to deal with this matter. I hoped that he had this information in his possession. The whole thing is under the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries and if it is not, then it is a matter of what has become of it. The honourable gentleman has been down to Ottawa since and should have brought back to this House some information, which has been an issue to the Saskatchewan Boards of Trade for ten years. The fact is that the application was altered and I would like to have an explanation on that point. And we have not had it. Perhaps the Attorney General will give —

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Mr. Speaker, I would have given any information in this House before but for the reason I have just now given, that is, that it was before the Courts and because there was an appeal pending, so far as publicity being given as to why the change was made. And my honourable friend knows that and there was a very full and complete statement in the press at the time.

Mr. Spence: Well, I am still not satisfied.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: And you never will be!

Mr. Spence: But I think something should have been heard about it.

Premier Anderson: You will hear lots about it!

Mr. Spence: — And I am impelled to the conclusion that the honourable Minister of Railways does not wish to discuss it.

My closing word with regard to the Department of Railways, Labour and Industries is that I see no change of policy. The present minister is following closely in the footsteps of the former Administration and where he has departed from it at all it is not satisfactory to members on this side of the House.

Now, with regard to the matter of highways, I have never had an opportunity, or never availed myself of it, of speaking or making a set speech on the Department of Highways in this House, although I did have the honour to administer the department for several years. In the last election I discussed the Department of Highways and the policy of the Liberal Government and I had a good deal of success in discussing it with the taxpayers. I found in checking over the results that wherever I had the opportunity to propound the whole policy that there were good majorities in that poll.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: You should have covered more territory!

Mr. Spence: If I had had the opportunity I could have carried the gospel of good roads to a greater number of electors.

Premier Anderson: The gospel but not the roads!

Mr. Spence: I was going to tell my honourable friends something about roads, if they will let us discuss them. I am sorry for anyone who sits in the position of the Minister of Highways, for he has a job on his hands, and I will give you the reason for it. I feel rather sympathetic towards my honourable friend sitting there today, and the men who have occupied that position ever since it became one of the departments presided over by a minister with a portfolio. It is one of those departments that no matter what you do or what way you do it or do not do it you are damned and if anyone doubted that statement he got the proof of it while the honourable member for Moose Jaw (*Mr. Smith*) was speaking. There are three important criticisms levelled at the former Administration by the present minister. I am not regarding too seriously some of the criticisms by the Leader of the Government. It is with due regard to his general ability that I say I do not think the honourable minister knows much about roads and I do not think he knows much about the state of opinion with regard to the the road policy of the previous Administration either.

Premier Anderson: By experience on the roads!

Mr. Spence: Oh, we have all had that. But I do think that he has not anticipated that the present minister would understand his job, and I may say that you cannot learn it all in six months. I doubt whether it can be learned in six years, even with the most intensive study. However, as I said, the honourable minister is doing his very best and I am not going in this debate to lay any charge or any statement which I may make against the present policy as directly due to the minister himself, but rather to the fact that there are some underlying, fundamental principles that must be observed.

Now of the criticism of the minister let me say his present policy is an ambitious policy. I want to say it is too ambitious. I think he is justified in so far as the actual spending of the ten millions is concerned; that is, so far as the amount is concerned — I am not going to find very serious fault with that. It has been said in this debate that the roads which we have spent money in building have depreciated to about half their construction value from approximately \$20,000,000 to about \$10,000,000. Now, that is hardly a criticism, for anyone who understands the basic principles of highway engineering will not make a statement like that. Every highway in America and in the world has depreciated and that goes on from the day it is built. No doubt about that! So I will dispose of criticism number one by simply saying that the degree of depreciation is taken care of in the highest type of road by the nature of its construction and the earth road is the cheapest. You can have roads all the way to \$35,000 a mile, after that, and if you want to get the limit there is a road two and a half miles in London, England, that cost \$13,000,000. So that you can go to any expense with those high types of road.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: What was the matter with that London road? What is the reason for its cost of \$13,000,000? What was it paved with? Gold?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: London Bridge, he is talking about.

Mr. Spence: You can estimate cost to maintain just in proportion to the first costs on your road. Whatever the type of construction, it will cost proportionately to maintain. The principle is very, very simple. Simple as A.B.C. The earth road is maintained with earth and that costs you something — dragging repairs, etc. In the gravel road you use more gravel, and gravel costs money, and so on up to the bituminous road, the concrete road and in some of the higher types of road plenty of flint stone. But the repair cost is in proportion to the total cost. I give this principle in answer to the minister's criticism that that very day you allow traffic to go on it, a road begins to deteriorate and wear away. It is estimated that a car travelling about 700 miles will take off a gravel road in that distance, its own weight. It is estimated also that four inches will blow away every year, based on round traffic figures of around 600 vehicles a day. That is a practical condition that cannot be avoided, and it is taken care of by maintenance and repairs and that sort of thing.

It is said by some eminent scientist that if one played a violin long enough in a building you would create a vibration strong enough so that the building would finally be shattered and brought down. Take the great bridges we have across the Saskatchewan river! I do not think there is an engineer today who would estimate what the depreciation on the bridges are because they do not know. There is the crystallisation of the steel besides that of wear and tear. The same is true of concrete. So much for number one.

For number two, Mr. Speaker, we were accused of demanding and taking a "blank cheque" from this Legislature while we were in office; that we submitted the vote to the House, passed the vote and nothing further was known about it, where we were going to spend it; or in other words, that we got a "blank cheque" to spend road money. Now, I am going to discuss that in some detail as I go along.

It was said that there was a "patch-work" system and that roads began nowhere and ended nowhere. I am putting these two together. Then it was said that there was a wrong system followed where you carried a road down here to get votes down there. And then, of course, there was the common criticism, that the roads were very bad. There is nothing new in that. There are bad roads all over Canada and in every state in the Union. It is not a question of bad roads or good roads. The question is this: Does the highway policy of any state or any province fit in and naturally give transportation facilities to the people who are paying 99.999 per cent. of the cost of those roads? Any road is a good road that will move the traffic that offers at a minimum of cost, whether bituminous, or gravel or a concrete road. Highway building or highway construction is now a very practical engineering matter. It is by all odds the largest enterprise on this continent. We no longer guess at anything. A highway engineer knows exactly what he wants to do and how he will do it. It is the largest enterprise. It will surprise you, Sir, to hear that motor vehicles on this continent, or that the amount of money invested in them is three times the amount, three times as great as that invested in the steam rolling stock. There has been spent approximately \$1,750,000,000 on road construction on this American continent. More money invested, more men employed than in any other single enterprise, so it is no longer a guess, "catch-as-catch-can" proposition. Road building is as much a science as any other business. The old path master has given place to the road engineer; the old wheelbarrow and the scraper have given place to the great caterpillar and the road elevator-grader. The road drag has given place to a combination of tractor and grader, and you might say that mass production is the thing that dominates the whole thing. Let me repeat that no country in the world has kept pace with the times on highways. A thing in common use today is out-of-date tomorrow. All the world is on rubber wheels.

Now, Sir, in the *Free Press* of August 25, is a despatch signed by Miss E. Cora Hind, who is agricultural editor for the *Manitoba Free Press* and as such travels in all the provinces and I think probably she knows more about the subject than any other individual I know of. Writing to her paper she says:

"North Battleford, Aug. 24. — My last report was from Sibbald and concluded the Alberta inspection. It was good to get back into Saskatchewan with its larger percentage of graded roads and well-marked trails and highways."

And so on and so forth.

Then, in addition I have as an authority the Mayor of this city of Regina, who used part of the policy for his election to the honourable position he now holds, and I have here his paid advertisement as it appeared in *The Regina Post*:

"No one realises the importance of the road question more than Mayor McAra. He is watching with the greatest interest the splendid experiments at present being carried on by Hon. George Spence and the Provincial Government. If these experiments prove the success hoped of them when spring comes around, Mayor McAra advocates the same method being employed on certain of the city thoroughfares that in the natural order of things will not be in line for pavement for some time to come."

Then referring to the other point made, that no country in the world was keeping pace with demands in the matter of highways, I find on December 6, 1928, a statement from Hon. Mr. MacPherson, who is Minister of Highways in Alberta, and the heading says:

"Alberta Having Road Troubles."

"Minister of Public Works indignant at the Editorial Criticism,"

and the same minister went before the farmers of Alberta and apologised to them for the bad roads, and he made this statement that from now on they were going to develop their secondary system of highways, and I understand in this year's programme the greater bulk of the money will be spent on the secondary roads.

Then I have another one to give you. I assure you it is absolutely authentic. When the Good Roads Convention was held in this city a year ago, I had occasion to have a discussion with some of the Road Commissioners from across the line, but I shall deal later with this secondary road system.

Now, I want to discuss the laying out of our system and in order to discuss it more intelligently, I am going to show members of this House some maps. I sat in the House when the honourable member for Saskatoon (*Hon. Mr. McConnell*) exhibited a brick. Now a map is not nearly as dangerous as a brick, and I am going to beg your permission to place the maps so that the members will see them, or so that honourable members on the Government side, at least, will see them. I do not ask them to agree with me on this, but it is their duty to understand it. Some have eyes and cannot see—and some have ears, and I ask, that seeing they may believe and hearing they may understand.

The first map is a map which was placed before honourable members, on the table of this House, in 1920; we started work in 1921. It is a location map, Mr. Speaker. This location map is a map of the highway system of the province of Saskatchewan. No fair-minded man can look at that map. Mr. Speaker, and say that politics entered into its compilation. Now the first thing an engineer does is to prepare a map, to get his roads on paper first—and I would say it was done better in the province of Saskatchewan than in any other province of Canada, and I have checked them all with the exception of British Columbia. It was done with the assistance of gentlemen on both sides of the House with their consent and with the consent and assistance of the rural municipalities, and sufficient time—I think nearly one and a half years—was occupied in the compilation of this map. I know I was consulted, and while I was being consulted there were three or four other members standing by, and it was passed upon in rural municipal gatherings and the different organisations of one kind and another were consulted, and it was accepted. During the two years I was Minister of Highways, there were no more than half a dozen changes made on that location map, and none of these were important, and notwithstanding what the honourable member for Bengough (*Mr. Warren*) said the other day . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Might I ask the honourable member a question? The old map showed the road to run through Maple Creek straight west; was there not a diversion then of six miles at Maple Creek?

Mr. Spence: I was not Minister of Highways then, but I will deal with the map in detail as I come to it.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Was that where the great mud hole was?

Mr. Spence: Why does not the honourable minister raise his comments to a higher plane and discuss this thing intelligently instead of sitting there and prating like a parrot? The minister is spending \$10,000,000. Surely that is worth some

attention! I am prepared to discuss this thing, through and through, if it takes a week. As regards the Maple Creek diversion, I am not prepared to say it was right or wrong. There is perhaps room for engineers to differ.

This map, Mr. Speaker, took a year and a half to two years in compilation after consulting with the rural councils and with members of the House. It was adopted by the rural councils, and I have attended many conventions and I have heard no complaint yet condemning the locations, not one condemning the location of the 7,300 miles in this tremendous road system. It was submitted to the Legislature and placed upon the table, and, as I have said, has been accepted by councils all over the province of Saskatchewan.

Will honourable gentlemen take a look at this location map and tell me that there is anything there unfair, or indicating political machinations of any kind or undue influences of any kind? I will tell the honourable minister that he is human, just as I am, and that the rain will fall on his roads just as it did on mine, and most of the trouble I experienced during the time I was minister was due to that very factor, and until conditions are different from what they are now, it will remain the most troublesome factor.

Well, Sir, this tremendous system of 7,300 miles brings 75 per cent. of our people within six miles of the main highway system of the province — within easy reach of that system. In addition to giving the province this fine system of trunk roads, we have this other map, which is a still more interesting map, which shows the great secondary system of highways, the 25,000 miles of secondary roads which we have in addition to the 7,300 miles of provincial highway. This secondary system brings our system of good roads from the four points of the compass, north, south, east and west to 450 marketing points in the province of Saskatchewan. How was it built? It is built out of revenue account with the assistance of the rural municipalities, by contractors and with the road foremen. I can speak with absolute conviction of the period during which I was minister, and I will say that in every single mile upon it, there was first consultation with the rural councils. How could politics enter into it under those conditions? I repeat, that during the time I was Minister of Highways, we did not put a single foot to that system without a resolution from the rural municipal councils.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is it not a fact that a great number of grants for roads were made which roads were not on the main market system at all?

Mr. Spence: There may have been some such cases — but very few. I appreciate the interruption, because I want to discuss this thing with the minister and perhaps we will get along better when we understand each other. But I will repeat that statement, there was not a foot of road put to that system without a resolution from the rural council concerned: and that is the "feeder" system into the trunk highway system, and we developed it by giving grants to municipalities. The only string we had on the municipalities was that those grants were to be spent on main market roads, otherwise there would be no grants, and the money was to be spent under the supervision of our highway inspectors. And to that we had an added 180,000 miles of farm roads correlated to the secondary system and through it with the trunk system — all co-ordinating to form the road system of this province.

I would state here, that railways are not built on sentiment. Nor are they built because of the clamors of the Boards of Trade or other organisations. They are built for business reasons, and highways should be built on the same principle. I am going to say this, were it not for the branch lines that feed the main lines of railway, the grass would grow green on the streets of this fair city — well, not exactly today, I'm afraid; the grass would be frozen! You know what I mean. I would say this also, that the system we have is more adapted to the development of our basic industry, agriculture, and you cannot go to Alberta, to Manitoba, or wherever you like, and compare the system with what we have here, nor can you go to the states of the American Union, because the conditions do not fit in with ours. So it cannot be done to satisfy the clamors of the organisations — and it has not been done that way, but to develop the basic industry, agriculture. We have on this map 70,000,000 acres of farm lands on which people live and move and have their being; more and more the farmer is becoming a power farmer; and more and more machinery is entering into the farming operations in Saskatchewan, so the farm truck and the farm car rapidly are becoming the major section of the business for which roads are used. Roads are not built for tourists; nor for pleasure either. They are built primarily for the development of

the country. So we decided that it would not serve the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan to have a system of trunk roads costing \$30,000 a mile, so we did the next best thing, and we have a trunk system larger than any other province, larger than Manitoba or Alberta, and we have in addition to that the secondary system to help develop the province from an agricultural standpoint. No matter where you go, the smallest little town or village, you will not find running into it a hard-surfaced road but you will find a good road leading into it from two directions, and these roads were built from grants from the Government. These roads are all correlated with and lead into the main system. I sometimes think when honourable gentleman opposite are discussing this question that they are under the impression that Rome was built in a day. Take this system of farm roads, 180,000 miles of roads in agricultural communities and 32,000 miles of main market roads and highways. We have not been going for many years (about ten years) and yet in that time, about half our road building programme, almost half our system, has been completed and, surely, that is good progress for a population of 800,000. Last year, our appropriation for road purposes was higher even than that of the province of Ontario calculated on a per capita basis. That will surprise you, Mr. Speaker, but I have the actual figures here: Ontario spent approximately \$17,000,000; we spent \$5,000,000. Ontario has approximately three and a half times the population of Saskatchewan. Now divide the two sets of figures, and you will find that we were spending more per capita of population than Ontario — and we did not build pavement. I will tell you why in a short time.

I have here a map of the State of Utah and, in passing, I would advise the present minister to get hold of the road maps of the States to the south of us and look at them. Let him look at the maps of some years ago, and then skip a few years (they do not change enough each year to mark the point); let him skip and look at the map as it is today. If he does that he would find that those large centres in the United States with tremendous populations started out to build earth roads, then they gravelled them, and then they paved them. Then the country between the large centres was joined up. They did not start with building right across the state from east to west and so on. They simply did not do it that way. In Illinois, they started off by linking up Chicago and Milwaukee — they built out from the large centres; they did not build cross-country roads first. Then as to surfaces, I have told you of the pavement out of London, England, costing \$13,000,000 though it is only two and a half miles long. But even there, they are starting from the centre of population, and that is the way it was done in this province. That is the way the present map will show it has been done and the result shows that in those sections of the province, regardless of politics or anything else, where agriculture is most developed, there you will find the most improvement in the matter of highways — that is, construction was based on the density of traffic principle.

I have another map to illustrate what has been done up to now, but, as I understand it has been agreed that I adjourn the debate at this stage, I will move to that effect, Mr. Speaker.

Resuming on Friday, March 28, Mr. Spence said:

Mr. Speaker,—When the debate was adjourned, yesterday, I was attempting to discuss with the House the proposition of roads from two angles. In the first place, in answer to the criticism which has been made of the former Government's roads policy, I had already dealt with and disposed of that question. I devoted some attention to the remaining criticisms in regard to our roads and bridges, and I was discussing the criticism of the "blank cheque" voted by the Legislature to show that such criticism did not stand. I also dealt with the criticism that the roads were a zig-zag, patchwork proposition, that they did not follow the contours, and that they must have been "political" because of that — that, in short, the policy of the previous Government was a "catch-as-catch-can" proposition, with no starting point and no finishing point.

I had discussed road building from the provincial and national standpoint to show that road building is a very serious, scientific business, requiring great engineering skill, and that scientists and engineers were engaged in determining what the basic principle is. I had striven to show also that very large questions of economics are involved and still further economics having at their background the well-being of a province, state or country.

Now there are several classifications of roads in the province of Saskatchewan just as there are in every other province or state and Saskatchewan has divided its

roads into four classifications. Perhaps I got the impression erroneously when the minister spoke the other day in this debate, that there was a new policy as to road classification in the province. I may have got the wrong impression from his remarks, for I cannot believe the honourable gentleman, with his legal mind, would do such a thing if he has read *The Highways Act* even with the amendment brought down today. I am going to read the section which has to do with the classification of roads, from the Act as amended in 1923:

"8.—(1) For the better administration of this Act and of more effectively carrying out its provisions, all public highways in the province shall be classified by the minister under the following headings:

- (a) provincial highways;
- (b) main market roads;
- (c) colonisation roads;
- (d) local roads.

"(2) 'Provincial Highway' means a public highway upon the improvement of which provincial money has been expended under the provisions of The Canada Highways Act, or any amendment thereto, and includes any other public highway designated as a provincial highway by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

Then there follows definitions of "main market road," "colonisation road" and "local road" in the same way.

That is the classification of our roads under which we were working. I have endeavoured to show as best as I can with the aid of maps, that our policy was the wisest and best policy in that the roads were built where they were most needed. I propose to put up these maps again, Mr. Speaker, with your permission — being a map-smith by profession I like to do it this way — a very interesting hobby, I assure you.

I shall hold up for your observation, Mr. Speaker, and for that of honourable gentlemen opposite, the location map of the province of Saskatchewan highway system which was designed first, foremost and entirely, in order to give service to the greatest number of people in Saskatchewan. That was why the map was drafted. That is what we did do. No one can contradict that, and I am assured by the previous minister who had the job on hand, that many drafts were made before the map was finally approved and assented to. As I stated before, after compilation, the map was taken around to various conventions, such as the municipal conventions, and was placed in the Legislature, and it was approved and after being assented to, it became the location map of the province of Saskatchewan and has been accepted as such without question from that day to this.

Premier Anderson: When was it assented to?

Mr. Spence: In 1921. That was the trunk system of the province, but, as I pointed out, yesterday, that trunk system would not give full service to a great province like Saskatchewan unless it were supplemented by a secondary system — shown on a secondary map. The same system was used in connection with a third location map, the local roads mainly municipal and, so far as the minister is concerned, he had nothing to do with it; and politics could not enter into it while the first and second maps were being prepared because of the very manner they were prepared and approved.

The map exists today almost without alteration from the original. It was so when I became minister and during the time I was minister, and the map was left in that condition for the present minister, and doubtless it will continue to be the basis for the activities of future ministers. I doubt if it ever will be altered in any material way. I have looked at a great number of highway maps of the provinces of Canada and states of the Union, and I have never seen a more comprehensive location map than we have in this province. I am of the opinion that there is no more comprehensive system anywhere than that in this province when you take all factors into consideration.

What is it designed to do? It is designed to meet the conditions in Saskatchewan, and I am going to repeat, you cannot go to Ontario and take the system there and apply it in Saskatchewan and get away with it. It won't do. The Toronto to Hamilton highway will not do in Saskatchewan. You cannot take the Manitoba system and place it in Saskatchewan and get away with it. The Manitoba system is laid out in

a triangle, the population being largely centred in one city. In Manitoba it might be all right to build a highway at \$20,000 a mile from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie and on through to Brandon and thence to the Saskatchewan boundary. A road like that serves a very large section of the population of Manitoba. Half their population is in one city.

The same thing is true, though not perhaps to the same degree, in the province of Alberta. There they have a "herring-bone" system, and if you take a trunk road from Calgary to Edmonton it will serve a large portion of the population of Alberta. I have not had the same opportunity of studying the location maps of British Columbia, but I am informed that a road up the Fraser River Valley fairly well meets the situation in British Columbia — they can't very well go up and over the mountains. We can conclude that a system that would work well in Manitoba, Alberta or British Columbia will not be of much use in Saskatchewan. Therefore, we have studied our own needs in the system we have here, and we have placed before the people a location map which meets their particular needs. I again repeat, the condition in Saskatchewan with its rural population scattered over 70,000,000 acres of agricultural land, with its population of 800,000 almost evenly scattered over that whole area, except where it is collected into such centres as Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Yorkton, Weyburn, Swift Current, and so on, demanded such a system as we have evolved, and the problem here is not one of dense traffic at all between one centre and another; if you except the small stretch of 42 miles between Regina and Moose Jaw, the somewhat larger stretch in the north between Saskatoon and Prince Albert and the smaller stretch between the two Battlefords. You have almost a quite even traffic as a traffic census will show. Therefore I repeat again, a system will not work to the advantage of agriculture unless you build on a policy of which the guiding principle is the giving of service to the places where it is most needed, and we have, up to now, built on that system as a construction map will show; we have built up such sections as traffic conditions would warrant. For instance, the stretch between Regina and Moose Jaw carries very heavy traffic for Saskatchewan, approximately 1,000 vehicles a day. However, it was not thought necessary to gravel that road until we had made some study of methods whereby the gravel could be kept on the road, and there was a reason for that. This gumbo surface, as you very well know, Mr. Speaker, is very soluble and when it becomes wet the gravel goes right down almost as if it were dropped into a bucket of water. So it was thought wise not to spend too much money, despite the heavy nature of the traffic on the road, until we had found out some method of treating the surface and so holding the gravel. We have been experimenting, as they have been in the states to the south of us for two or three years, with the oiling process and so far the experiment has been a success as far as we can now see.

We had another thing in mind. We did not intend to spend very much on the highway system for gravelling, until fifty per cent. of the roads had been brought up to standard. That was the policy we announced, and we did not spend much on gravel until a year or two ago, when the 50 per cent. had been reached. Then we did start to gravel on those roads where traffic was and is heavy, and where gravel was comparatively easy to get.

Before starting to deal with construction matters, Mr. Speaker, I want to recapitulate a little (not much) of what I have already said as to the highways. After that I shall deal with construction and after that I shall give a summary to show how both on capital and revenue accounts we have followed in the main a "pay-as-you-go" policy.

I have said that roads should be built to help develop the natural resources of the province, and it is true in this province that agriculture is the basic resource. The people on the land it is who will, directly and indirectly, pay through taxation, 99.999 per cent. of the cost of those roads and consequently, in building our roads, the first consideration should be whether or not the construction is going to benefit agriculture. Our objective in Saskatchewan should be, as in other similar states, to lower the cost of production, to lower the cost of transportation so that the decreased cost of production may have its reflex in the remuneration to the farmer and increase in that way the price or value of land. There is only one way by which that can be accomplished, and that is by consulting the people directly as to their needs, and that has been done in the past. There is a certain stage in road construction perhaps hard to understand because our country is a young country and it is hard to compare it with states much larger and much farther advanced along the lines of highway development.

In setting up a road, it is necessary first of all to understand conditions and in order to accomplish that we did not have on our staff a large number of high-priced

men. We had only such men on our staff as could take care, not of this type of highway, but of secondary roads. They were not engineers; and it was the object of those men to see that the secondary system was thoroughly correlated to the main system, and to see that all the money we gave to the municipalities by way of grants was spent, as it must be, on main market roads, with the idea (let me repeat) of co-ordinating the whole system and seeing the roads were properly built. We worked in very close consultation with the municipalities. We had conversations with members of the Opposition, although there are members on the other side, Sir, who never darkened my doors though I was at great pains to represent to them that I was prepared at all times to hear from them. I am quite prepared now, as a member of the Opposition in this House, to work out with the Minister this secondary road system. With these problems in mind, we set out and we had to work out a system which, with the money available for the purpose, would place a good serviceable type of road in front of every man's farm. Not a pavement, Mr. Speaker, nothing like that; but a good serviceable dirt road, and the very fact that we have profited by the mistakes of other provinces, has made it possible for us to give as good a dirt road standard as can be found anywhere, which costs less per mile to construct. So we can conclude in answer to the criticism of the "blank cheque," that there was no blank cheque at all. We had the map location, and the consent of all people concerned.

We have discussed location, and now we have to start on the building. We had a very simple programme of construction, recognised by the best engineers to be sound. You cannot build them all today and tomorrow — that goes without saying; but we followed the principle that we should build up the worst places first, a system known as the "stage construction" system. This work was only started in 1921 and did not get well under way until 1922 — that is seven years ago, Mr. Speaker, and in that time, under this stage construction system, we have built or assisted to build 14,000 miles of good roads that you can travel forty miles an hour on. Is that progress or is it not? If it is not, I would like to know what is! And it was all done following out this map, the more intensive work being done around the large centres of population following out that good road principle of the "density of traffic."

I am going to say something more on construction — particularly surfacing. A good deal has been said about mudholes. Of course, there are mudholes and there will be mudholes for many years to come. Some of our critics seem to think that all a Minister of Highways has to do is to wave a magic wand and perfect roads will spring up all over. I would tell them that we won't find much difficulty in getting stuck even after the present Minister has been in power for four years — if he lasts that long. I have travelled a good deal, many thousands of miles in fact, over the roads of this province, and I have yet to be pulled out of a mudhole. But, of course, there are mudholes. Take my honourable friend's mudhole, Wascana Lake — I see people crossing it these days, but when the frost goes out of the ground if you try to cross you'll get stuck. No doubt about it! And I have been stuck right here in Regina, and I am not finding fault with the city on that account. All I want to stress at the present time is that the resources of the people are not sufficient, and the material is not here yet, to pave those roads.

Now what have we been doing in those past years? I see the new Minister has changed to twenty-four foot width in the present programme. Of course, that will cost him more money. If I were he, I would go a little slower on that; as a matter of fact what happens when the road has been built for a year or two is that it soon becomes a twenty-four foot road and usually with a little smoothing affords a good surface for gravel. The earth road standard here is just as high as you will find almost anywhere you go. I would say more than that — that it has cost less per yard than the earth roads in any other province in western Canada. I am going to say even more than that: I am going to say that it has cost less than any other road in all Canada per mile, and a good deal less than in many of the states of the Union and costs less in maintenance per mile, too. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because we adopted the same logical and safe principle of building as I have already indicated to you, of the stage construction method. Instead of letting 100 miles to one contractor, which entices only the man of large means, we let contracts in small lots so that the individual road contractors could gradually work up to a point where they could take on a big job. That explains why the work was done cheaper than it was done by either of the great transportation companies. I feel proud that I am able to stand up and tell the people that there has been so much efficiency up to now in the Department of Highways. Up to now, our standard of construction has been based on the principle that the first investment of \$2,500 or \$3,000 a mile is the foundation for a safe future. Once you have laid your road bed the next stage is what is called the subgrade, for gravel. And afterwards, when you have gravelled it, after many years

of use, you gradually build up from one stage to another until you can wind up with one of those very expensive types of road known as pavement. I am not recommending we should. I say the foundation of our roads is one stage in the development of any kind of road you may develop afterwards, and in that way you preserve every dollar you put into the roads. I am not saying the surface does not blow away, the essentials are there, drainage, etc., and everything is so planned that every dollar invested in the present road programme is protected and preserved and I hope will be continued to be preserved.

Now, I have already said there is a limit to what 800,000 people can do in the matter of highway construction. There is a limit, too, Mr. Speaker, as to how fast they can go. I am amused at the light criticism that has been indulged in of the previous Administration's policy by the present Minister of Highways. You would think the Minister of Highways could have grasped it that his job is one which is subject to all sorts of criticism all the way down from spending money to road measurements. Highways development takes money and equipment, and I would tell the Minister of Highways now that he is going to have quite a little job on his hands organising his department to spend the money after he has it voted.

Now Dr. Gordon McKay of Cleveland says: "Roads are built more for use than they are for pleasure," and so on. I have already referred to the Minister's programme, as brought down, as an ambitious programme, and I am not going to criticise it from that angle. I am not going to say that this sum should not be spent on the highways. I imagine that it has been said of the old Government that we were a little conservative, perhaps not going as fast as people desired. But I want to tell you this, that it was a mighty good policy, and the man who can deliver the goods, get full value for the money and meet reasonably well all difficulties, that man is doing very well. I think the time is coming now to "stop, look and listen." Irvin Cobb has said he had two wonderful sensations in his lifetime, one when he went up into the air for the first time and the other — and his first was as nothing to that — the one coming down. They came down from the clouds and the sensation was reached when he got below the clouds and observed the bonded indebtedness of the United States. It may be observed that 45 per cent. of the debt in some states is due to the highway policy and many of the states in the Union are bonded to the extent of fifty, sixty, ninety and even one hundred per cent. I will give you the basis for that statement from the engineering books. In the great agricultural states of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota and Montana, tremendous road expenditure has not increased land values. Let us discuss that, as something was said in the previous debate on this subject. Now I know something about the State of Montana and I am going to make a bargain with the Minister of Highways. He is going to make a trip, I am informed, along the No. 4 Highway to the United States boundary and around and back again and I am going to extend this invitation to him. My farm home is just exactly about 100 miles south of the city of Swift Current and when he gets there he will want to visit with his Minister at Swift Current. He will have a nice little visit and then he will take this trip. It will be a nice trip with lunch on the boundary, and I am going to invite the honourable Minister to stay at my farm.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Who will pay for it?

Mr. Spence: I would like to show him the roads for I want to co-operate with him, and then I would impose myself on his company down to a school house that is boarded up—what is known as the Whitewater School, twenty-five miles from my farm. I think he can see the school —

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to ask the honourable member a question: Would he say, in view of the statement of Montana's highway commission that there is not one dollar of bonded debt due to highway expenditure in the State of Montana, that that is not correct?

Mr. Spence: We have not got to that yet! The State of Montana has a rather peculiar system of highways. By the way, before I forget it, I met a visitor from Montana and I asked him about this and he said, "Yes, the Whitewater School was still there." I do not wish to criticise any state or province with respect to their policy. They have possibly good reasons for it. But I have discussed this with people often from the State of Montana and they have said, "If we only had the system of roads in Montana that you have, we would not mind the taxes. We have got roads, it is true, but when you get off the State roads there are no roads at all." I once asked a leading farmer not more than ten miles away why it was they were always grouching

about hard times. I said, "Surely you have grain to haul to market and all those wonderful things and have all the advantages which are so desirable to agriculturists in this country and there is not that much difference between the soil of Saskatchewan and Montana and yet all these farms have been deserted." Now, he might have been right or he might have been wrong, but this is the answer he gave: "It is those . . . taxes," and he had an adjective to describe it. Now that is the situation. There are two courses to be followed in connection with the building of highways. One course is to build them on the plan where you preserve the money invested and the next thing is division of the money. I am going to discuss for a moment or two the principles that cover these things.

There are two principles of financing highways. There is one, the installment plan which we have been following here, the "stage construction" method, and there is the other of voting a great bonded indebtedness, which catches you up and undermines the whole structure and the first thing you get is people moving off the land under the strain of taxation. Now, I have set it out because it is an important principle and I say we have no moral or legal right to take money out of the pockets of future taxpayers for things we of this generation have enjoyed and worn out. We have only the right to mortgage the future for those things which are left and built of steel and stone. Obviously it is equal fallacy on the other side to tax this generation for things which future generations will enjoy. The principle is as plain as ABC. I have put in a form such as this. We are here as legislators and are responsible for an equalisation of the taxes as between the men who occupy these halls today and those who will occupy these halls in the future. Now as proof of that, I am going to quote one or two authorities on the subject. I have in my hand the Kiwanis Magazine, November, 1928, in which Oliver O. Haga, past Governor of the Utah and Idaho districts, says this:

"In view of the large amount of money that is being spent upon these two classes of highways, and in view also of the depressed condition of our agriculture . . .

There you have it again!

" . . . the question may well be asked: Do such roads increase or tend to increase the price of farm products, or do they render any substantial relief to the farmer? Obviously they do not. The price of agricultural products is not determined by the local market, or the local demand.

"In the important field of road construction our members can do much to bring into closer co-operation the business men of the cities and those engaged in the various lines of agriculture. We are in closer touch with the making of the laws and the policies and plans in highway construction, and I suggest as an activity in practical idealism that we keep a watchful eye on the interest of the farmer who is generally absent from the conference table when roads are selected and approved for construction."

Exactly! There is the kernel and the meat of the whole argument:

"I suggest as an activity in practical idealism that we keep a watchful eye on the interest of the farmer who is generally absent from the conference table when roads are selected and approved for construction."

That has not been the case in Saskatchewan. They have not only been consulted, but even carried down to the municipal councils and they have had every opportunity to have a say in where and how the money should be spent. Mr. Haga makes another interesting statement:

"Statistics for 1926 on the indebtedness of the several states of the Union show that fully 45 per cent. of the total bonded indebtedness of all the states had been incurred for highway construction. In my own state, Idaho, about 55 per cent. of our state indebtedness consists of highway bonds, and in Utah, I believe, it stands at 75 per cent. In some states it runs much higher, in Wyoming and Pennsylvania practically 100 per cent. of the total state indebtedness was incurred for highway purposes, in New Jersey and West Virginia about 80 per cent., and in California and Missouri 68 per cent. and 69 per cent. respectively.

"Recent reports show that the expenditures on highways for the year 1927 were over \$1,250,000,000. Obviously the old system for overseeing, supervising and constructing highways has been expanded beyond recognition and has been almost wholly abandoned. No longer can it be said that in highway construction, 'our memories of the past are the guide posts of the future.'"

And in discussing the whole thing, as to whether or not the change is beneficial to rural districts, he says:

"Clearly, too little thought has been given in late years to the construction of market roads for our agricultural communities. I speak particularly for the man on the back forty who pays his full share of the taxes for the building of roads for the other fellow. In the building of highways, we may well take a leaf from the experience in railroad construction."

Then he goes on to discuss that — how roads are built for traffic and doing business and at the same time and incidentally, making a profit for themselves.

Now I have in my hand another interesting paper. It is more interesting because of the fact that its writer is interested in this high type of bituminous surface road. The writer is Mr. W. E. Rosengarten, Traffic Engineer, The Asphalt Association, New York City. He says this:

"There is a rising tide of public demand that we supplement our great paved road programme with a secondary or farm service road improvement programme of such magnitude as to afford quick and substantial relief from the mud burden."

Then he goes on to analyse in the table here, how this can be brought about. He takes a budget of \$500,000 and a road programme of 1,000 miles, and he makes this comparison as for every 1,000 miles, in accordance with traffic density:

| Group | Traffic in vehicle miles | | Miles in each group as determined by Survey Miles | Vehicles | Per cent. | Subdivision of Funds |
|---------------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|-----------|----------------------|
| | Limits | Average | | | | |
| Dense I | Over 1,200 | 1,500 | 25 | 37,500 | 14 | \$ 68,000 |
| Medium II | 800 to 1,200 | 1,000 | 25 | 25,000 | 9 | 45,000 |
| Light III | 300 to 800 | 500 | 200 | 100,000 | 36 | 182,000 |
| Very light IV | | 150 | 750 | 112,500 | 41 | 205,000 |
| | Under 300 | Total... | 1,000 | 275,000 | 100 | \$500,000 |

Now, these are very illuminating figures prepared by a statistician and engineer. Then he says in the last paragraph of the statement:

"It must not be considered that the improvement of the secondary roads is 'temporary' and soon to be totally lost. Grading and drainage structures should be laid out and built as a lasting improvement. The base and surfacing should be laid carefully to grade with the idea that eventually they will serve as foundations for more improved surfaces, as traffic develops and the particular road moves up to a higher group. It is earnestly recommended that a survey be made of our highway systems, so that we can give due consideration to all classes of highways and thereby not over-develop one at the expense of another."

That is the opinion of an eminent engineer highly versed in the technique of highway construction and it endorses the policy which we have been following in the province of Saskatchewan since the highway policy was inaugurated. I have another rather interesting extract here. This is from Tom King's pamphlet submitted to rural councillors. He has this to say:

"At the present time, our province, and I might say, all Western Canada, is looked upon as a very fertile field for the organised engineer, contractor and manufacturer of road equipment. They come under the guise of Good Road Associations. Publicity agents are used to fill the press of the country with the tremendous importance of the highways, and the millions to be made out of tourist travel..."

And let me say here, that I have never been able, — while I, like others, believe we should encourage tourists — never have I been able to see what percentage of the tourist money got into the pockets of the farmers of the province. He says:

"They are here, a great many of them, seeking new pastures, from across the line from the country to the south of us, where they have left a trail of desolation among the rural population in impossible taxes and bonded indebtedness."

That is what Tom King has to say.

I was not going to read any newspaper clippings to the House because they are wearisome, but I picked up a cartoon which I carried with me in the last election and I might perhaps be able to get some expressions here as to what it was all about. The "joke" is supposed to be on myself. I have no objection to the likeness, but I do object to what it makes me do. It says here:

"The Minister of Highways, Hon. George Spence, is compelled to adopt the Conservative Road Policy."

Now, I object to that — and I am sorry the Leader of the Government is not in his seat because I am now going to read some of his "professions of faith" during the last election campaign. On May 6, 1929, he was speaking at Moosomin, and he had this to say in outlining the highway policy of the Conservative party:

"What of the Conservative policy? We plan to institute a real road building programme under a good roads commission of experts. Good gravel roads will be provided for our people. Two main highways east and west and one north and south will be started and completed with all possible speed.

A substantial sum of money will be borrowed over a period of years and interest and sinking fund charges looked after from current revenues from the gas and motor license taxes."

Then, he was all for a policy of making future generations pay for the fine roads he was going to build. A fine chance posterity will have to pay for gravelled roads which will wear out in five years! The Minister is a young man and the best engineers will not recommend a bonded debt for roads longer than twenty-five years at the most. So a fine opportunity future generations will have of paying for the road! Then we have this clipping from *The Regina Star*, Saskatchewan's great "Independent newspaper," of August 22. This is not an extract from a speech. This is an interview, and it must have been given with a great deal of care. It is not too much to say that the notes prepared had been looked over very carefully by the Leader of the Government before he handed it to the press. It says this:

"Over fifteen and one-half millions of dollars in eight years! And what have we to show for it? What is the result after twenty-three years of Liberal road-making? The worst roads of any province in Canada! Some of the worst roads in North America!"

I am surprised! It has improved! He does not say it is the worst in the world!

What about this Highway Commission? Well, there is nothing in the estimates providing for the Highway Commission. I have almost come to the conclusion that the honourable member for Yorkton (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) is doing the thing; that "the tail is wagging the dog" and that he is telling them all where to get off at; that he is running the highways and apparently the Leader of the Government has agreed upon the programme of roads. The present minister, being acquainted with present conditions, has advised his Leader what should be done in this regard and I am pleased to see there is nothing in the programme as brought out providing for any very expensive type of road. He has rather indicated to his Leader, (I think wisely so) that the money invested in the highways system must be preserved and that such roads as we have built should be built in stages, doing the worst places first. I will illustrate that by way of a story: A delegation came to my office while I was Minister and I casually asked one of them how long it had taken them to make the trip. Well, he gave me the time and I said, "You made very good time," and he told me that the road was just excellent. I said, "That's fine." Another of the delegation added that they had seen one hole in the road. I said, "It would be remarkable if you hadn't." And he said, "Yes, but that hole is five miles long," and no doubt that is the case. In building the worst places first you always get to the point where traffic becomes dense. But all that is required under such a system is to have a pretty careful survey of the conditions and to see those sections are placed in the programme for the year and in that way you progressively advance stage by stage, making expenditure from revenue and keeping the capital in capital structures such as steel and concrete bridges, and at no time do you get into difficulties. That is the system I would like to see the Minister follow: For an indeterminate number of years, to gravel over such sections of highway as traffic conditions justify, and so on as

the money is available, the first road costing \$3,000, and, when you have gravelled the system, your difficulties are not over. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and as doubtless every member knows, your difficulties are just beginning and it is as hard to maintain a good gravel road as it is to maintain a good earth road and much more expensive. Then there is the dust nuisance — and it is an important nuisance. It is found now in the provinces where they have gone further than we have, if reports are to be believed. The next thing is the sprinkling of the gravelled road with oil. That will cost more money.

Now I am going to show you another map of our system and again let me repeat that, judging from the Minister's programme, it does not vary in one iota from our highway map, though it is true he has made his own selection as to where the work is to be done. I am going to attempt to show from the blueprint the "feeder" roads and so on, and the trunk highways east and west and north and south which, as I have said, are so laid out that 75 per cent. of our people who live on the land and who pay 99.999 per cent. directly to the Government are somewhere within easy distance of that main system. This blueprint shows five roads north and south and five east and west. It is true one of those east and west ones is a very short road and is not projected across the province and the reason for that is that the settlement in and through the area through which it would have to go is not sufficient to justify it at the present time. Looking at this map, I note a very interesting thing and it is this: that we had been projecting colonisation roads. There is a stretch of road 100 miles long in the north country to which the Minister made reference. The road is there now. The highway goes up into Meadow Lake now. Why? Because there are two townships and a half of just as fine agricultural land there as you will find in all Canada and there are people there, living there, moving there, having their being there, and it was built to serve them. And the former Government was able to do that, Mr. Speaker, because it did not waste the public money in building roads where the traffic does not justify it. This map, which you see here, is our map. This was the system we were developing, and we were developing this system progressively, and principally on a "pay-as-you-go" plan.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Does my honourable friend contend this road is built already?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes. It is blocked out as built on this map.

Mr. Spence: More has been done than appears on this map. Our policy was to regulate the construction of roads to meet the development of the districts requiring the service, and, by the system we followed, we were able to keep pace with that development and assist it. All the way through we aimed to serve the basic industry, to help the development of agriculture. There has been some talk of a scenic highway — and I am sorry the honourable the Minister of Public Works has been pressing for a scenic highway down the Qu'Appelle Valley.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I want to tell the honourable member that the Minister of Public Works has not pressed it.

Mr. Spence: He said it publicly.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I may tell the honourable member that the Leader of the Opposition has written me a letter wanting three.

Mr. Gardiner: But not this one.

Mr. Spence: I do not think it a wise thing to spend large sums of public money in roads of that kind without due consideration of the engineering features and with not enough consideration of the public funds. Too much attention has been given altogether to catering to the tourist traffic. There should be no rushing forward in trunk highway development, involving heavy expenditures of the public moneys only to leave, as one writer has said, a trail of desolation behind. These scenic highways are luxuries. When our highway system is completed, we will have in Saskatchewan the best tourist roads of any province of this country. Why do I say that? Because, Mr. Speaker, I have observed that, as Minister of Railways, 80 per cent. of the people who come to visit here in Saskatchewan, know that there is no great mountain range and so on. The great majority of the people who come here to visit come to see these great wide plains of ours and they cannot see it simply by going to the National Park. They can see it best by driving all over the province and it is in proportion to the extent they see it that they go away with a good impression of Saskatchewan. The

United States may be a good place to go, occasionally, to see how things should be done. But it is also true that the United States is a good place to go to, to see how things ought not to be done, and I would advise the Minister of Highways, who has surrounded himself with engineers, and good engineers, too, to go down there and see how not to lay out his highway programme.

Much of the preliminary work towards the completion of the system has been done by previous Ministers of Highways, and I do not include myself in the number for the simple reason that most of it was done before I went in there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would inform the honourable gentleman that engineers he mentions are the same that were in the Department when he was there. I have not surrounded myself with them. I might have surrounded myself with McCallums and McKays — but I did not.

Mr. Spence: That's beside the point. I am simply outlining some of the things he will have to resolve, if he is not going to plunge this province into heavy debt. The question is, do these speed highways help the province? The answer is, certainly not! Do they help the farmers whom we in Saskatchewan want most to help? Again the answer is, certainly not! It was for these reasons that the late Government did not rush into great trunk highway schemes of construction. In every case, we tried, (and we have succeeded in it) to keep the Budget for capital and revenue pretty well balanced, and if at any time there has been any leeway at all, it has been on revenue account and not on capital. In that way, we kept down the public debt, and I would like to see the present Budget more evenly balanced than it is between revenue and capital. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the capital vote cut in two and the greater proportion allotted to secondary or market roads because these are hard times, and the men who build these highways are large contractors with large bank balances and it is they who profit by such construction. The farmers will get nothing out of it. There is no need to rush into this. Balance your present Budget, keep on in the way we have been going, and all you need have to do is to wait a few years longer and you will have one of the finest tourist systems on the continent. You have given too much consideration to the cities in this programme, but just look what has happened in the cities just because of the slump in agriculture! I say, therefore, that your construction should be on a balanced scale and that you should give much more consideration to the farmers than to the tourist traffic and your trunk roads and main market roads should be on at least a fifty-fifty basis.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is it not a fact that we are spending \$270,000 more on main market roads this year than last year?

Mr. Spence: That's good. I am not criticising that at all. But you are not spending enough in proportion to what you are expending on the trunk road system. I maintain the prosperity of the farming community is the index of the prosperity of the cities and it is entitled to equal consideration at least in deciding upon where the money is to be spent. No mistake has been made in that way in the past, Mr. Speaker, and those road maps prove it. They prove that the man on the land, upon whom the prosperity of the province depends, has got his share, and has not been overlooked.

Now I am going to examine the proposals of the Minister of Highways, and I am going to display another map. This is a map showing the Minister's proposals. I was not able to follow the Minister when he spoke. He talked too fast for me. But I am told that *The Regina Star* is the official organ of his party, and I think that is correct, and I am taking their report of what the Minister said. No. 1 Highway — this is his main programme — Manitoba boundary to Maple Creek, all built. He has put it on his highway programme to be built. It is all built to standard and some of it is gravelled. Then No. 10 and No. 14, Manitoba boundary to Saskatoon

Hon. Mr. McConnell: What is that fork down there? (*pointing*).

Mr. Spence: That is where No. 10 meets No. 14. I have not drafted those true to detail, but the Minister from Saskatoon thinks it is. I have drafted on the map, Moose Jaw, not as Moose Jaw actually is, but as the member from Moose Jaw thinks the Minister of Highways thinks it is. I have drafted, of course, Yorkton, too, showing the two roads leading to the Manitoba boundary.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why has the honourable gentleman not joined Biggar to Saskatoon? It will be joined this year, you know.

Mr. Spence: I know. No. 10 from the Manitoba boundary to No. 14. No. 5, Warman on to North Battleford. No change there. Forty miles built and forty to be built. No. 5, North Battleford to Lloydminster, six miles there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: 31.5 miles, excuse me! 31.5 miles to be built there.

Mr. Spence: The Minister must have changed the location of the road then. No. 4, Swift Current to Biggar, 154 miles built, 26 to be built.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My engineer's report on that one is 105.3 miles to be built.

Mr. Spence: The Minister apparently has procured figures not available to me. It is impossible for me to scale it off the way I am doing from the map and not be a few miles out one way or the other. But the figures I use are approximately correct. No. 2, Moose Jaw to Chamberlain, not built eight miles.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me advise the honourable member he has been wrong in every figure yet.

Mr. Spence: How much am I wrong there?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One mile. It should be nine instead of eight.

Mr. Spence: Then No. 7, Alsask to Rosetown, 75 miles to be built. How many am I off there?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is 73 miles, instead of 75.

Mr. Spence: Well, I am two too much there.

Mr. McIntosh: I would like to know how much of No. 1 is built.

Mr. Spence: It is all built but a little piece west of

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me ask the honourable member if it is not a fact that 82.8 miles have to be rebuilt?

Mr. Spence: The minister may have the engineer's report. I have not. But all of it has been built with one small exception west of Caron — just a few miles. Nos. 12 and 2, Saskatoon to the National Park — No. 12, a total of 84 miles all built; No. 2, 228 miles built. No. 39, North Portal to Corinne, the Soo Line Highway up to Corinne, about fifty-fifty, 30 miles built, 35 to be built

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me correct the honourable gentleman again. There are 72.3 miles to be built on that road.

Mr. Spence: Yes. Pardon me, I am wrong there. I see the honourable gentleman has been varying from the principle of service roads to scenic highway.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why did you put it on the map?

Mr. Spence: Why spend money on prairie trails. It is all right to put it on the map so long as you don't spend money on it. There are a few changes (not very many) shown on the programme and in every case the mileage of the road affected has been increased. No. 6, Regina to Raymore, 24 miles to be built.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Twenty-eight miles not built on that road — if you go north on Albert Street.

Mr. Spence: That piece of road, so far as I know, was brought up to standard construction. However, I do not mind the correction. Then No. 2, Watrous to Wentz, a total of 29 miles built. No. 11, Chamberlain to Saskatoon, approximately 42 miles to build. This gives as a total, 558 miles. Some figures, of course, will be wrong, those for instance that the Minister has corrected from the engineer's reports. Allowing about \$5,000 a mile he

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The total mileage is 753.9 and it would not run that price per mile at all. Then there is reconditioning so many miles which I shall give when the estimates come down.

Mr. Spence: The point is this, the minister's map is based on our map. The minister, however, has made his own selection on which he will concentrate. Our programme was the whole thing; not a part, but all of it, and we went at it as we had the money to pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What about the \$20,000,000 of a capital debt?

Mr. Spence: We borrowed \$20,000,000 of capital and lost that — that is the minister's contention. It is not lost! It is in concrete and steel bridges, and in capital works generally in connection with highways.

My contention is, Mr. Speaker, that highways should be built not on sentiment, or the enthusiasm of a few individual good road associations and similar organisations. They should be built to serve the people who are here and to promote the development of our resources, and more particularly our greatest industry, agriculture. Highways should not be built on sentiment and enthusiasm, no and not even to temporarily glorify a Minister of Highways is it necessary or right to pour out money from the public purse on a programme like this.

As to gravelling, I want to deal more exhaustively with the former highway policy because I may not have a chance again. These gravelling contracts were awarded with some consideration of the density of traffic on the roads and we have gravelled the roads from Regina east and west, and Moose Jaw east and west, so we did not overlook my honourable friend from Moose Jaw. Apparently, too, we did pretty well for Yorkton — quite a bit of gravelling was done around there. At Saskatoon, we gravelled west, south and north. At Battleford, north and west, and No. 15 at Melville, west and east. These were the centres where traffic was comparatively heavy, and we gravelled in these places. Then there were a few places where gravel is easily accessible — down in Gravelbourg, for instance, and we did some gravelling in such neighbourhoods as there were gravel pits. In connection with this matter, I hope the minister will follow in that policy on the advice of his engineers, because I have observed he is being guided by them largely; but I would advise him not to pay too much attention to the engineers in regard to the snowfences, if it is they who are urging him on to it. In regard to these fences, if I wanted to be brutal I would say "In Heaven's name what does he want to be experimenting in snowfences along the Moose Jaw road for?" Now, I have a section in my part of the country where there are vrey deep cuts in the hills and when there is a snowfall the road in the cut gets quite full, and the minister would be quite justified in putting in a snowfence there. But the idea of putting a snowfence on these baldheaded prairies is too ridiculous for words! I am all for keeping down capital expenditures, and in my opinion, there are ways and means of keeping the roads open; and it is axiomatic, a good summer road is a good winter road. If the minister wants to know anything about winter clearance, he should take into consultation the honourable member for Cypress who has travelled all through, this winter, on one road in his district.

It seems to me that something should be done to get a wider gauge for our sleighs, and I cannot for the life of me see why North Dakota and other states can get this without any trouble while we still have to keep on with the sleighs on the old narrow gauge. If you get the sleigh of the same gauge as the wagon, then you can get an attachment to the car for little cost, and you can put your attachment on your car. That I think will solve the problem of winter travel over our roads. I have travelled over snow three feet deep down in the Shaunavon district, and I think that is the solution. My personal opinion is that merely pushing the snow aside on the bituminous surfaced roads will ruin those roads, in no time. There is very little trouble in maintaining a good earth road on this clayey soil, all it needs is dragging after a rain. The problem here with any road is not to get the foundation — the clay is good enough, it is the surfacing. The Romans did that with blocks of stone, but here we have to surface with gravel and, before I forget it, there is not enough gravel of the right kind in the province of Saskatchewan for a too ambitious programme, and I believe the minister will find, in carrying out this programme, that good gravel is a pretty scarce proposition in the province of Saskatchewan. Gravel that might suit the railway companies for ballast will not do for roads. And a lot of the gravel we have will not do at all unless it is crushed to the proper size to be of service.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, while the minister has given us an inkling of what he is going to do, he has not budgeted it at all, as he claims to have done. He has not departed in any material way from the system which we laid out and in every departure, as I have outlined and explained, the result has been an increase of the mileage. He will have to do a lot more explaining in connection with his programme to satisfy me. The proper way, as I have said, is to bring in the blueprints and specify the yardage. This is just a pretence at budgeting and I regret that I have to say this but I think it is my duty — the minister, for the first time that I know of, has brought politics into the highway problems in a way I never thought possible. The member for Yorkton, as Minister of Highways, comes into the House and he cajoles and bullies and threatens individual members over here and says: "If you do not vote for this and that patch of road, something is going to be done about it . . . !"

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I made no such statement. The statement to honourable members opposite was quite clear and distinct, namely, that their constituents would be very interested to see how they voted on this Budget involving, of course, a vote on the road programme as presented to the House. That is not threatening the members, and I object to the honourable member's statement. I say that their constituents will be very interested to note they way they vote and it will be presented to them so that they may decide as to whether it is a good programme or otherwise.

Mr. Spence: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, my point is this: The members over here who choose to criticise the Budget and, in particular, the road programme, should not have their lips sealed by any such statement as that, and I want to offer the minister this felicitation: I am prepared to co-operate with him in his highway policy and in doing that I say that the department has never been in politics and I hope it never will be, and I say that he will not seal the members' lips on this side with any threats. So far as I am concerned, if the minister promised to pave every road in my constituency I would still refuse to vote for his Budget because I do not believe it is in the interests of the people of this province nor in the best interests of the constituency of Maple Creek.

There is also a power policy before the House, and I regret to see the Government has not entered into the question in a whole-hearted fashion and on a larger scale, but perhaps the finances do not justify it. I am not going to criticise them severely, for they have not departed from the former Government's policy one iota in the legislation before the House. I would say this: We realise that the Minister in charge of this department has a big job ahead of him and there is no reason in the world, that I can see, why the question should be made a political question and I, for one, do not intend to inject anything of a political nature into it. But I do resent being continually challenged on the policy of the former Administration.

Mr. Speaker, because of the matters I have mentioned, I do not propose to support the motion.

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

(Kindersley)

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—I am going to be somewhat brief, for, as has been said, we farmer members are getting anxious to get back to our farms. I have listened to the former Minister of Highways (*Mr. Spence*) this afternoon while he was preaching his gospel of good roads. I should say rather a "sermon" on good roads. However, I acquired rather a dislike for long sermons when I was a boy and I have not yet got over the habit.

I will at this time try to answer a few points brought up by the last speaker. In attempting to defend his administration of his department he said the policy was rather conservative and while I do not think I am going to agree with him, on many matters they were very conservative, in my opinion, conservative almost to a point where we did not have any good roads at all.

Mr. Spence: No. I have driven over them.

Mr. Whatley: Yes. The honourable member was in my constituency shortly after he became Minister and right here I will say I saw him at that time and he admitted that we did not have our share of provincial highway construction.

Mr. Spence: You certainly got it afterwards.

Mr. Whatley: We got a little bit, it is true. However, I will come to that. I will mention the trip he was making. He gave us a nice speech there and he took a ride over the roads but he did not invite me to go along.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I went to Kindersley and I got there late at night and it was raining heavily. I looked all over for a familiar face. I was a complete stranger and my honourable friend was nowhere to be found there.

Premier Anderson: No crowd there!

Mr. Whatley: Yes, there was quite a few crowds. They kept track of my honourable friend and after a while he was driven over a road they were constructing there and they told me they picked out a car that would give him plenty of jolts and they drove him over the worst part of the highway. It reminded me of the story of the minister who said that the old Ford was a great help to him. When he was asked why, he said it bumped the devil out of him. I think this ride helped the ex-Minister because, after that, he did open up his heart and gave us some money that year.

Now, another point my honourable friend dealt with was when he said that the Prime Minister, when he was in opposition, went around and said he would give the country bituminous and concrete roads. I never heard that myself. I did not know he had said these things, and all I knew was that he had promised good roads and gravelled highways.

Now, my honourable friend says he would cut the budget in half.

Mr. Spence: I did not say that!

Mr. Whatley: We have heard a lot of "blue ruin" talk. I will agree that we are passing through a period of depression but I think now is the time to put a little money into circulation. The medium of exchange is rather short in the province just now and I think it is a good time to put on a programme of road building and money-spending that will help out the situation. I think, also, that we can get work done a little cheaper and get more value for the money. But, in any case, I would not shorten the purse-

strings. I state this, that the present Budget will not add one cent more to taxation. There is no new taxation and there is no justification for the cries of "over-burdening with taxation" that are being spread around by our honourable friends opposite.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I would correct the honourable gentleman: I did not say I would cut the Budget in half. All I said was that I would have divided it half and half, capital and revenue.

Mr. Whatley: I will accept the correction. That may be all right. That was said when I was out of the Chamber. I was given to understand he had said, "cut the Budget in half."

Now, if my honourable friends are sincere in their statements, why did they raise the Deputy Ministers' salary after June 6th, when we were in the throes of a dry season and when it was already seen we were going to have only half a crop? With regard to the policy of "building in the worst places first," it was a poor policy because it encouraged the municipalities to neglect the Provincial Highway within their boundaries, and in my constituency for years we had a road that was impassable because it was on the highway. As regards the all-weather grades I will agree with him and he knows I advocated those roads and got no support.

Mr. Spence: Bring in a Bill!

Mr. Whatley: To turn to the Budget, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the able way he dealt with the finances and the Budget of the province, and I want to say this too, that the Budget is one that I can heartily approve. We can spend this money economically, and it will do more good than at any time during the last four or five years.

To come back to highways, and I want to say that this is the first time in the history of this Legislature that the Minister of Highways has come out with a straight programme and taken the House into his confidence and told us where the money would be spent. For years we have been voting huge amounts and never were informed where it would be spent. I think it was one year ago we questioned the Government and could not get one word as to how the highway appropriations were to be allotted. We were asked to vote a year ago a large item; they spent the money, and on top of that, \$2,500,000 more was spent. There was a tremendous increase in expenditure covered by supplementary estimates, which added to last year's main estimate, increased the latter by between four and five million dollars. When you consider the increased amount we are voting to carry on the power proposition and the road vote, which I am going to deal with, I think we can congratulate the Government and support the Budget.

Now, in dealing with the spending of Capital sums of money on our roads and the bonded indebtedness which our friends deprecate I would quote from a speech made by the honourable the junior member for Moose Jaw City (*Mr. W. G. Ross*) two years ago, the speech which was mentioned by my honourable friend from Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*). That speech, by the way, was heralded as being of great significance in its way, and everyone who got up afterwards complimented the member and, therefore, I am going to mention what his plan was. We considered it a good plan, and since it was given in the speech made by the mover of the reply to the Speech from the Throne, we regarded it as that Government's policy. It outlined a little scheme whereby we would capitalise the Gas Tax, estimating the possible amount to be derived from a three cent Gas Tax. Mr. Ross says this:

"But, to be conservative, let us take the figure of \$750,000."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we did get a little over a million, but to proceed with my quotation:

"This amount would provide interest at 5 per cent per annum and an adequate sinking fund for a debenture issue, running 20 years, of \$9,350,000. It is safe to say that the return from the tax would always be safe and sure, and that the annual return would tend to increase from year to year. Debentures could be issued annually for an amount fixed on the basis of the increased return from the tax due to the increased consumption of gas, or on an increased gallonage tax if that should be found advisable."

Now, the scheme was to capitalise the Gas Tax for the construction and graveling of two highways east and west and one north and south so we would have a road by which we could go somewhere and get back on, rain or shine (which we have not got yet), using that amount of \$750,000.00 to take care of both interest and sinking fund

for a capital expenditure of over nine million. We are spending seven and three-quarter millions this year out of Capital on roads. Do you not see, we can take care of that expenditure by capitalising a portion of the Gas Tax and still have a goodly portion left. Last year the Gas Tax was \$1,450,000. Now, we are increasing the Gas Tax by adding two cents, making it five, and, therefore, getting an increased amount from that source so that the setting aside of \$642,000, which is the amount required for interest and sinking fund for a debenture issue of seven and three quarter million dollars spread over a term of twenty years, is a very good scheme to my way of thinking, and we don't need to be scared by the talk of "blue ruin."

Now, coming back to my honourable friend and his gospel of good roads. I am going to tell him about the gospel of my constituency. Kindersley is about twice the size of a good many other constituencies and, furthermore, we have 256 miles of that 7,300 provincial highway mileage which my honourable friend has been talking so much about. Now, about eighty miles of that is No. 7 Highway, passing through the most famous wheat country in this Province. After leaving the boundary of Saskatchewan it passes through the wheat lands of Alberta, to Calgary and from there west to Banff and the mountain resorts and joins up with the Windermere Trail. In fact, it will logically become part of the Trans-Canada Highway. A good many tourists pass over it. What have we constructed of that highway? Twenty-five miles. After coming year after year with hat in hand to the late Government! For a long time we had only 20 miles built. Furthermore it did not connect up any two points, starting one mile from one town and stopped three miles from the next; out on the bald prairie and not touching any town at all. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a good policy, but is just a "patchwork" system.

Now, you would think if we did not get any more than that in provincial highways built we would have got more in provincial grants. The average provincial grant to municipalities last year was \$2,000, and this year we are going to get an average of \$2,200 per municipality. Well, Kindersley constituency has never yet got \$1,000 per municipality. \$10,000 has been the largest amount for the constituency to be divided between eleven municipalities. So you see, we have been pretty short on expenditures on highways up there. What has been the reason for this? I contend, and it has been contended many times all over the constituency, mainly, of course, by Liberal supporters of the late Government, Liberal "heelers" and others, that the reason was that we were represented by an opposition member. That was the whole song and dance in the last election, so much so that it behooved us to defend the Government sometimes against its own friends. It was propaganda to elect a Government supporter but it did not have the desired effect. That kind of propaganda did not "go over" because the people there said they were not going to be bought with their own money. One man said to me that he would drive in mud up to the neck before he would be bought in that way. Now I think I have dealt very fully with the Gospel of Good Roads as preached in my constituency. The honourable member who has just taken his seat (*Mr. Spence*) said something about spending the money where the development of agriculture is greatest and I say, Mr. Speaker, that my constituency has been badly treated even if you apply that principle, because agricultural development there cannot be beaten in any other constituency in the province. It was not a good gospel for us. I have always tried to keep an open mind on matters regarding legislation for the good of the province and never allowed bitterness, as a result of our treatment, to interfere with my decisions in this House. When I took up the matter of our constituency with the new Minister (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) after the change of Government, I attempted to arrange a meeting with the Minister for the members of a delegation. After taking over the Department, however, he was not in his office very much for awhile, so I got him on the 'phone one day and told him I wanted to come down with a delegation and see him about roads. He asked me what it was we wanted. I might say I had written to him and he recalled the letter as he said, "Is it that Flaxcombe road?" and I said "Yes." Then the Minister said: "You won't need to come down. You are very short of roads in that constituency and that road should have been built long ago." And, he added "We will attend to that." Well, Sir, I nearly dropped down with shock. It was a shock to me because it was the first time I had ever got any consideration at all from any official source. The honourable member who has just spoken (*Mr. Spence*) did admit too, we were short on provincial highways. Well, I always thought we had not done very well, but no doubt, now we are going to get some roads.

Mr. Parker (Touchwood): Other parts need them as well as Kindersley.

Mr. Whatley: Now, my honourable friend says we had a highway system of 7,000 miles in some stage of construction. How much has been built in my constituency? 35

miles all told. And, as I say, we have the heavy traffic between Saskatoon and Calgary. It amounts to 12 per cent of our highway built to dirt standard but not a mile of gravel, yet I understand there is about 1,000 miles in the province of highway gravelled.

Mr. Strath: We have none in Happyland either!

Mr. Whatley: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to quit on highways and pass on to deal for a few moments with Power. I think I was the first member of the Legislature to get up and say that I was in favor of Government ownership of power. That was two years ago, and the Government of the day did not appear to know at the time whether their policy was to be a private or a public ownership one. I may say I am still in favour of public ownership, and I am not prepared to change my opinion yet, in spite of what the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*) told us the other day. I believe he is absolutely sincere. I give him credit for that. He gave us some very useful information and I agree with him to this extent that the farmers are not going to get much advantage from power on the farms at least in our lifetime.

Mr. Spence: Why do you say that?

Mr. Whatley: Because it is too costly.

Mr. Spence: How do you know it is always going to be too costly?

Mr. Whatley: I grant you that, in the matter of research there may come about a cheapening of power costs especially in the matter of transmission lines, and there may be a time coming when we will be able to do without lines, and there may be a time coming when we will be able to do without lines altogether, if invention maintains its present rate of progress. So I agree with my honourable friend, it is a strong statement but, at least at the present time, it is too costly for the farmers to benefit much.

Mr. Spence: A few are getting it now.

Mr. Whatley: Oh, yes. A few are getting it now, I admit, but even in Manitoba where they have had a Provincial Power Commission for some years and in Alberta also where they have the hydro only a few farmers have power service as my honourable friend stated. I think he said only one or two hundred farms were served.

We are on the eve of a great industrial expansion today and we know that power, today, takes its place with capital as the life-blood of industry and development, and that explains the fact that private power interests are trying to get a foothold in this province today. We often wonder why they are trying to purchase these local plants at so much more than their value, but it is because they want to gain complete control for the future, and they do not mind losing a million or two now in order to get control of power in this country as they have across the line. We talk of the economic penetration of Canada by the interests of the United States and we know that power companies in this country are linked up with those across the line.

In this connection I would like to read something that Senator B. Norris, of Nebraska, said in regard to certain things brought out before the Inter-State Commerce Commission:

"The most important question for solution now before the American people is the preservation of our God-given natural resources, and this brings us at once to the consideration of the power question. Recent developments in this country have clearly shown that the Power Trust is the greatest monopolistic organization that has ever been put together by human ingenuity.

"The property controlled by this great combination is greater than the total value of all the railroads in the United States.

"With its slimy fingers it reaches into every community and levies its tribute upon every fireside. There is no avenue of human activity that it has not undertaken to control. It has invaded the Commercial Clubs, Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs. It has undertaken to poison the minds of our boys in the Boy Scout organization. It has sent its secret emissaries to influence and control women's clubs and organizations. It has undertaken to bribe the minister in the pulpit, and, with its sinister, stealthy tread, it has entered our public schools and tried to poison the minds of our children. It has secretly controlled college professors and high school teachers, and has systematically and deliberately undertaken to build up sentiment in its favor by the control of the press.

"The working of this Trust has been secret and underhanded. And where did it get the money to carry on this wonderful campaign of deception? The Power Trust has but one source of income, and that is the contributions made from one end of the country to the other by those who use electricity.

"The Electric Trust is in politics clean up to its neck. Moreover, in dirty politics, unfair politics, wicked politics, contaminated with corruption and deceit. This Trust is in politics from the White House down to the school district. It forgets nothing. It overlooks nothing.

"Our Public School System is dear and sacred to the heart of every patriotic citizen, and the man or woman who undertakes to undermine that system of public education by secret and false propaganda and misrepresentation is an enemy to our country. He is striking at the very foundation stone of democratic government, and such conduct cannot be upheld or overlooked by any real patriot.

"I have given you thus only a few samples of the work of this gigantic octopus which is secretly undermining our society, our civilization and our Government because if the activities thus disclosed are carried to their logical conclusion it seems that this Trust is greater than the Government and that it will eventually control the Government. I, myself, cannot understand how any man who loves human liberty, who loves his country, can stand idly by and remain silent while this attempt to overthrow our Government and destroy our liberties is going on."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what they think of the situation over there and I say that the time has come when we have to say whether or not the same thing is going to take place in this Province.

I would like to give you a few comparisons with regard to the cost of power. We have in this City (Regina) the most up-to-date plant, the most efficient service and the cheapest rate of anywhere in the North American continent.

Mr. Spence: Steam plant, yes.

Mr. Whatley: Yes, for steam plants. They are putting in a new plant.

Mr. Spence: A new unit, Mr. Speaker. Our friends from Saskatoon have a more up-to-date plant in their city. It is new entirely.

Mr. Whatley: Yes. The Commission's plant. Going back to the Regina plant—this is what they have done (and I do not want to take up too much time, Mr. Speaker), their rate, if not the lowest, is moving in that direction anyway. Last year, with those low rates, the plant made a clear profit of \$100,000 after adding \$15,000 to a fund to instal a new unit which will double the capacity of their plant and that, by the way, is already half paid for out of revenue. Since the Regina plant has been in operation it has made \$2,115,130 of profits, of which no less than \$1,000,000 has been used to reduce taxation. In addition, it has met its charges on capital, and paid off its debenture charges, and further it has over three-quarters of a million dollars in a sinking fund to meet future debentures when they fall due. The profits last year were made on the old plant; their new unit will increase the efficiency and capacity of the plant and so make higher profits possible, even with the low rates which they have now. Now Saskatchewan is at the parting of the ways . . .

Mr. Garner: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question: Do I understand my honourable friend to say that they have the lowest rates on the American continent in this city?

Mr. Whatley: There may be some lower, but I think that, for a steam plant, they are just as low as anywhere.

Mr. Spence: May I give the honourable member some information? For plants of similar size to the Regina plant, what my friend says is true; but not for plants of a larger size.

Mr. Whatley: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just about through with that anyway. I think the present power situation in the Province is a very difficult one and the Government has my sympathy in dealing with the problem.

Mr. Spence: They do not appreciate that.

Mr. Whatley: That is a matter of conjecture. Anyhow, the farmers of this province are pledged to the public ownership idea. I have frankly told them in my constituency that they cannot benefit much from it at the present time, as it is not practicable, and I think all the members should tell their farmers that, as it is a foolish policy to let them carry on in the belief that they are going to get cheap power on their farms right away. As to private ownership, I think the time will come when we shall have to make a definite decision to expropriate all the private plants. I think the stand will have to be made next year, and I am of the opinion the Government will have the backing of the people of Saskatchewan if they take that stand. However, so far as the Power Commission is concerned, the scheme must run itself. The farmers of this province should not have to pay for it, if they are not going to benefit from it. This is a reasonable attitude. It must be a self-sustaining proposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something concerning our courts of justice. I may say, at the outset, that for a long time I have not been satisfied with our system of Justices of the Peace—our J. P. system.

I discussed this whole question some years ago with the late Judge Baldwin, who was a good friend of mine, and he agreed it was not as it should be. He suggested the division of the province into districts, with travelling magistrates to replace the J. P.'s. Many of our J. P.'s are not qualified to carry out the duties for which they are appointed. Too often that has been the case in the past. Too often they have been appointed because of political affiliations and not because of their fitness for the position. Again there may be times when they sit on cases in which their own fellow citizens are involved and they cannot deal justly with a case of that kind because they do not wish to get themselves in wrong by incurring the displeasure of these same fellow-citizens. That enters into the picture.

I believe there are better systems in the world than our system of appointing J. P.'s and their way of functioning in this province, and I am going to refer to a scheme, which has been put before the citizens of this province by a lawyer, a citizen of Regina, Mr. John Feinstein. He has given this matter considerable study. I may say I had a conversation with him last year in the course of which he outlined his plan and I do not think it would be a bad idea to give the House a brief summary of his suggestions, which I have here. I do not think it will take very long to give the House the benefit of these suggestions. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that I support this plan, but I think it is, at least, worthy of consideration.

First of all, he recommends the cancellation of the commissions of all Justices of the Peace. He thinks the time is now opportune, if it ever was, for such a step, because so many of the appointments were made by the last Government which, naturally, could not take the step that can be taken now that the new Government has taken over.

Then he suggests the appointment of a number of judicial officers as "Judges of the Peace." I may say I do not like the title he suggests because it might conflict with our other judges. These "Judges of the Peace" are to be chosen from members of the Bar of the Province of Saskatchewan who have practised in the province for five, seven or ten years, with one "judge" for each judicial district, or otherwise, as may be found advisable. I think the point is well taken that men who have been in the practice of law would be better qualified to administer the law than any ordinary Tom, Dick, or Harry in our towns or villages who may be appointed as a J. P. Mr. Feinstein recommends one "judge" in each judicial district—that is, one "Judge of the Peace."

Next he suggests that Police Magistrates in the cities should only be chosen from members of the Bar. In that he is trying to get away from the political appointments that have taken place in the past. Mr. Feinstein suggests that these "Judges of the Peace" be appointed on the recommendation of a commission composed as follows: The Premier of the Province, the Attorney General, the Leader of the Opposition, the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench and the President of the Law Society. I shall read his next suggestion:

"The 'Judges of the Peace' shall not be removed except for cause and only after investigation by and upon the report of a Judge of the Court of King's Bench. They shall devote their whole time to the office."

He next suggests "liberal remuneration; graduation after a number of years on the Bench, and pension." I do not know if the pension idea would suit my honourable friend, the member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*). He is rather strong against pensions. He says everybody is getting pensions but the farmers.

Mr. Feinstein's next suggestion is:

"All fees collected by the 'Judges of the Peace' to go to the Provincial Treasurer.

"A number of 'key locations' to be established in each district and local men to be appointed Clerks of the Peace to

and these are their duties, Mr. Speaker,

"Receive information and complaints; grant summonses, and attend to adjournments and remands."

They would not have anything to do with making decisions as between individual and individual.

"All papers in connection with any matter within the cognisance of the Judge of the Peace shall be transmitted by the Clerk to the Judge.

"Depending on the circumstances, the Judge of the Peace may hear a case at the judicial centre or at the place where the offence was committed.

"Application to be made to the Minister of Justice to have extended jurisdiction referred to in section 774, subsection (1) of the Criminal Code of Canada, conferred on all Judges of the Peace, as above."

Then Mr. Fenstein proposes a change in connection with the Civil Law. He suggests the amendment of The Small Debts Act to give jurisdiction to the "Judge of the Peace" in cases involving up to \$300 with, possibly, no appeal below \$100.

He has also some suggestions in connection with conciliation, and here, to my mind, he has a very good idea—this idea of conciliation, introducing a new principle. These are his suggestions:

- "1. The "Judge of the Peace" may be appointed 'Official Conciliator' of the district.
- "2. No civil action shall be brought except upon a certificate granted by the Official Conciliator that conciliation is impossible or the matter is not subject to conciliation. Probable exceptions: When constitutional questions are involved; the Crown is a party; matrimonial actions; bankruptcy matters, etc.
- "3. Before action, proposed Plaintiff shall summon proposed Defendant before the official Conciliator who will hear both parties, in person, not under oath, separately and in camera. No record will be kept and there will be no disclosure of what transpired there.

The Official Conciliator will give no advice as to the merits or otherwise of the proposed litigation or conciliation between the parties.

- (a) If conciliation is impossible or the matter is not subject to conciliation, the Official Conciliator will grant his certificate to that effect.
- (b) If a settlement is arrived at, and the facts warrant it, the same shall be reduced to writing, signed by both parties and the Official Conciliator, and shall have the same force as a consent judgment. No appeal."

There are some other suggestion here, Mr. Speaker, but I shall not deal with them now.

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

Resuming at 8 o'clock p.m., March 28, 1930, Mr. Whatley said:

Mr. Speaker: When you left your chair, I was dealing with the matter of the administration of justice by way of the J. P. system and I had outlined a scheme suggested by Mr. Fenstein, a well-known Regina lawyer, and was dealing with the matter of conciliation wherein he suggested that all parties to a suit, the accuser and the offender, before going into court, appear before the Official Conciliator and there try to settle their case without going into court. I had stated that the suggestion was that parties must have the certificate of the Official Conciliator to the effect that the case cannot be settled in that way before they can go into court.

I have here a clipping from the *Regina Leader* in which they have this to say in connection with this matter:

"Mr. Fenstein draws a dividing line between justice and law and points out that there are many cases that could, to great advantage all round, be handled by a

public conciliator rather than form the subject of court action. He points out that in France there is in each canton a Judge de Paix, whose function is to act as a conciliator, bringing the opposing parties together and, if possible, arranging a settlement. He has no judicial powers and can act as a conciliator only. Mr. Feinstein advocates the appointment of 20 or 25 Judges of the Peace to take the place of the present Justices of the Peace and to act as official conciliators in cases of civil dispute.

The Western Retailer, published at Saskatoon, a city in which Mr. Feinstein has also offered the suggestion he made in his address to the Regina Rotarians, deals sympathetically with his proposals and points out that in Great Britain some steps have been taken in this direction. There, it points out, Chambers of Commerce are frequently called upon to settle commercial disputes of great importance that, in the ordinary way, would be settled in court. They have arbitration boards and the parties to any dispute can elect to have their case settled by such a body. 'Whatever the law may be in such matters, it is safe to say that justice is done,' comments the Western Retailer.

The courts are an indispensable part of the equipment of the State but their existence does not mean that they should be resorted to at every opportunity. It is more creditable to adjust disputes without resort to them, and Mr. Feinstein's proposal appears to be of value in this connection."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just about through, and would have been finished inside five minutes had you allowed me to proceed before leaving the Chair. There is, however, a matter that might be of interest to this Assembly. In the course of my remarks during the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne, I made reference to a loaning scheme in New Zealand which is accredited and acclaimed on every hand there. They loan at the rate of $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, but reducable to $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent if the loan interest is paid up within 15 days of the due date. Since making that speech, there has come to my hand the annual report of this State Advances scheme and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read a few items which may be of interest in view of the fact that our Farm Loan Board is the cause of so much controversy at the present time.

In New Zealand, their net profit for the year, according to this report was £30,000—that is \$150,000 was their total net profits. Now I find that the cost of administration and of making these loans—they call it "management expenses"—works out at two shillings and eleven pence for every £100 loaned, or 70 cents for every \$500; also that the amount outstanding worked out to 1.016 per cent—that is the total of accounts outstanding at the end of the year.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: May I ask a question? Does the honourable gentleman know how much the Government pays for its money to put into this scheme?

Mr. Whatley: No, I do not know. Perhaps you will find it in this report. I shall hand it over to the Honourable Minister when I get through. I am just dealing, Mr. Speaker, with a few of the items here that I thought would be of interest to the House. Under this scheme, they make advances to workers and they have also a Rural Advances Branch. With reference to advances to settlers, I find that, since the inception of the scheme in 1894, roughly, over \$190,000,000 have been loaned out during the period, and losses were written off to the extent of \$758,000, but I presume the profits in reserve far more than cover all that because it records net profits for the year at \$30,000.

Now, in regard to the advances made to workers for the building of houses and so forth, I find that the net profit for the year amounted to \$54,435, showing that they make a profit on this scheme also. Now the cost of management in this connection is given at .062 or one shilling and three pence per £100, which works out at 30 cents per \$500, and I find, too, that the amount outstanding in arrears is .69 per cent, that is, Mr. Speaker, less than one per cent outstanding in arrears.

Since the commencement of this advance to workers scheme in 1896, a total of over \$80,000,000 has been advanced to workers and the losses taken during the period amount to just one shilling in every £100, or 24 cents to every \$500. That is all.

Speaking on the Farm Loan Board, I think that what is needed in this matter is that those who have been given loans should be let know that they have to deal with the Board in a business-like way, just as they would deal with a private loan company. They must understand that they must come through with their payments and arrears when due and they cannot expect the Board to be more lenient than the private companies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one word on the Hospital situation. As I have stated, we have a number of Union Hospitals in my constituency, but I believe that if this whole province were mapped out into hospital districts, each around a logical centre, a big difficulty in this connection would be eliminated. The trouble in these local areas at the present time is that there are petty local jealousies that interfere with the establishing of hospital areas. The matter has been taken up in my constituency, and it was thoroughly discussed at a meeting at Eston recently with the result that the people there passed a resolution asking for a solution of this problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I will draw my remarks to a close. I would like, again, to remind the Honourable Minister of Highways of our road situation in my constituency. Since we only have had built to date approximately 15 per cent of our Provincial Highway mileage, whereas all over the province it has been built up to 50 per cent, we shall look for a great deal more in my constituency than we have had; and since, in the matter of grants to municipalities—the municipalities in my constituency have averaged just about half what has been the general average these past five years—we shall expect double the amount of grants in the next five years to come.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall resume my seat but before doing so, let me say that I shall, most certainly, support the motion.

MR. J. G. GARDINER, B.A., LL.D., M.L.A.

(North Qu'Appelle)

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—The occasion upon which we discuss the Budget Speech is one that gives us as members of this House, the opportunity of discussing all public questions before the people of the province and that not merely from the financial point of view. That practice, as all members know, dates back to very ancient times in the development of our institutions of government and makes it possible for members to discuss many questions of public interest when money is being voted and to voice what criticisms they may have.

I think full advantage has been taken on this occasion, as it has been taken in the past, of the opportunity of discussing any grievance anybody may have and to enumerate the grievances they may have which may have been long standing in their minds: to bring up old difficulties and to recite something of the accomplishments which have been met with since the opportunity was last presented.

This is the first time in the history of the province that we have had a Government other than a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, and this is the first time that we have had a Provincial Treasurer bringing down a Budget who was not a Liberal Provincial Treasurer. No doubt, looking back over that record of twenty-four years of Liberal administration, things were done which should not have been done and, also, some things were not done which should have been done. For that reason, we could expect that members on the Government side of the House would, on this occasion, go back over the record of the previous Government, pointing out sins, as they thought, of omission or commission.

I may say, however, that I was a little surprised and somewhat disappointed, too, in being called upon during this debate to listen once more to the story as told by the Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) with regard to all the grievances he has stored up during the last twenty-four years. During the discussions which have taken place since the Address, I have been rather interested in the remarks of members of the Government side of the House with regard to the length of speeches delivered from this side. I think I must hold the record for length of time on this side of the House, but I am sure that I must have well over two hours to go in order to catch up to the Minister of Public Works. His remarks on this occasion seem to me to have been delivered for the purpose of arriving at one grand anti-climax which had to do with a certain man now in the public life of the Dominion of Canada but who, at one time, sat in this House as Prime Minister of the Province — the Honourable Charles A. Dunning. It seemed to me that the minister took two hours in this debate, to discuss the activities of one department for the sole purpose of telling the House that \$500 was spent in order to bring in twenty-two men, during the last Federal election, to vote in Regina. Even if that were true, Mr. Speaker (and I am not saying it is true!), I venture to state that every commercial traveller who came back to the city of Regina and voted on polling day or at an advance poll, came back at the expense of the company for which he was working. I venture to state, too, that the great majority of the banking and railway institutions and other concerns of any kind who send their men out on the road to do the work of those institutions or organisations in the province, see to it that their men get back to vote and that the expense of their getting back is largely paid by the institutions for which they are working. I venture to state that the honourable minister could have gone into any department of the Government and there found certain individuals who came back to vote in every election in the province of Saskatchewan, and I venture to state that, no matter what Government is in power, those same individuals in the future, if they are still in the employ of the province, will come back on election day to vote and that they again will have their expenses paid.

I do not believe that to be the strongest reason for criticism; the strongest reason is to be found in the actions of the minister himself. I was quite surprised to note that the honourable gentleman did not take part in those banquets, which his colleagues have been having since they came into office, all over the country; and it was hard to find a reason why he was not there, making speeches as he did in the election campaign. Now, I have found the reason. Since taking office, he has been too busily engaged with those gentlemen he has brought in to conduct his investigations. He has been too busy working with them, interrogating the young men picked up on the streets who might have worked at some time for the Government, or stenographers who might have taken dictation in the department at some time or another, gathering material for the speech he intended to deliver in the House. Then he states that the cost of getting the advice on which the address was made was \$3,200; and I make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker: When a speech is made up at a cost of \$3,200 chargeable to the Department of Telephones, for the sole purpose of making an attack upon a Minister of the Crown now at Ottawa, about twenty-two men who came in to vote, that expenditure is a political expenditure made for purposes having to do with the next Federal election in Saskatchewan.

That is all I have to say in connection with that type of criticism.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The statements made are entirely incorrect. I have not interviewed any young men on the streets. I have not seen, nor was anyone sent to interview, any stenographer who took dictation in the department.

Mr. Gardiner: I can produce a few affidavits myself when the time comes, to indicate that what I have said is correct.

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: When any honourable member gets up and says what another says is wrong, he is entirely out of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister has denied his statements, and he must accept that denial.

Mr. Gardiner: I have not accepted it, Mr. Speaker. I say that, at some future time, I shall, if given the chance, produce affidavits to prove that my statements are correct.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: We shall give you the chance!

Mr. Gardiner: It is my opinion, that the address delivered in this House the other day by the honourable minister was made largely to discredit the Hon. Mr. Dunning and I do not think anyone who read the speech can come to any other conclusion than that it was made for political purposes.

With regard to the Budget Speech itself, I would say this: The minister, in delivering his speech at the beginning of this debate, built it up in the way other Budget Speeches have been built up. That is to say, he dwelt at considerable length on the general conditions throughout the province, reviewing the conditions of the province in relation to the financial circumstances of the province. Members on Government benches, including the Provincial Treasurer, criticised the former Government for alleged over-expenditures of the current year, but they did not say a single word on the increased expenditure for the coming year in spite of what was said by the Provincial Treasurer. What did he say?

In the first place, he indicated to us that the farming population of this province has a purchasing power as the result of last year's operations of approximately \$100,000,000 less than the previous year. I think that was the figure he used. Now, Sir, that should surely draw to the attention of this House that if the farming population of this province (and, after all it is the farming population which makes business go in this province) — if they have \$100,000,000 less to spend than in the previous year, and if we had difficulties in the preceding year, then we can look for even greater difficulties during the coming year. With that thought in mind, I propose to discuss the speech of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

It was a complete surprise to me to hear him state that the deficit he was reporting was only \$400,000. I have a vivid recollection of the headlines and stories in the *Regina Daily Star* a week or two after he took office, in which it was indicated that we were going to have a deficit — or had a deficit — of some \$2,400,000.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I do not think the word "deficit" was used by me at that time. I think the figures I used were right, and represented the financial condition at that time.

Mr. Gardiner: I think I am right in stating that in the press, which supports this Government, it was stated there was a deficit. Two members of the preceding Government denied the story at the time and said it was wrong, but the honourable minister went to Saskatoon shortly afterwards and said it was correct.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The statement I made was correct. I did not use the word "deficit."

Mr. Gardiner: Well, you had better take it up with the newspaper concerned. The minister apparently was so torn with love for the Liberal Government, last fall, and for the Liberal party, that he made the deficit then as big as he could and then proceeded to tear it down from \$2,400,000 to \$400,000 out of consideration, as he says, for the old Government. He shows now a deficit of only \$400,000 for the province since the first day of May, 1929, to the 30th day of April, 1930!

Now, Sir, a \$400,000 deficit is not an unheard of thing in any province of Canada. In Ontario, the Government of Hon. Mr. Ferguson reported a deficit of \$15,000,000 following the Drury regime. In Alberta, according to the *Winnipeg Tribune*, they had a deficit in 1921 of \$2,118,000; in 1922, a deficit of \$1,910,000; in 1923, of \$571,680 and in 1924 of \$620,000 and they have had deficits since that time. So a deficit of even \$2,000,000 is not an unheard of thing even in these western provinces.

Nor is a deficit in Saskatchewan an unheard of thing, Mr. Speaker. I have in my hand a list of surpluses and deficits recorded in this province, and there is a considerable number of the figures shown in red which signifies that they are deficits, Mr. Speaker, brought down by a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan — nine of them to be exact, all deficits reported during the 24 years of Liberal administration in this province.

In 1907-08, there was a deficit reported of \$247,000; in 1908-09, another of \$454,000; in 1911-12, another of \$148,000; in 1914-15, another of \$291,000; in 1915-16, another of \$489,000, almost \$500,000; then in 1920-21, a deficit of \$402,000 was reported; in 1921-22, a deficit of \$1,584,000 and in 1922-23 a deficit of \$360,000. In the next year, 1923-24, which as we have already been told in the investigation on the Farm Loan Board was a good year for collections, we had a considerable surplus and that surplus was used entirely to wipe off some of the accumulated deficits of former years. But the next year we went back into the deficit column again, so that, Mr. Speaker, in the 24 years of Liberal administration, there have been nine occasions in which deficits have been reported ranging from \$148,000 up to as high as \$1,500,000. The year following 1925 was the first year I was Prime Minister of the province and the first in which any member of this side with the exception of the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) and myself, were personally involved. Since then, we have been able to report surpluses and in the meantime we have wiped off the accumulated deficits of former years until, coming down to the beginning of last year, as related by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer the other day, we had an accrued surplus of \$219,000. That is, Sir, we had an accumulated surplus from 1905 down to the beginning of the present fiscal year, a cash surplus of \$219,000 over all these years. But in addition to that, we had approximately \$1,610,000 of accumulated liquor profits in the bank to the credit of the Liquor Board at the beginning of this fiscal year. One-tenth of that was earmarked to provide for sinking funds, bringing the sum down to \$1,450,000, so that there was, all told, in addition to the money voted by the Legislature, \$219,000 plus \$1,450,000 or a total of \$1,669,000 in cash over amounts estimated available to the new Government when it took office, as a result of the administration of the former Government.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We used it all to pay your debts!

Mr. Gardiner: We shall get along to whose debts you were paying after a while. We'll see whose debts they were!

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, we do not need to answer the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer, the other day, in connection with the deficit. We can point to a record of twenty-four years of Liberal administration in this province and in all those twenty-four years, never at any time did a Provincial Treasurer find it necessary to capitalise revenue expenditures in order to show either a surplus or a deficit. At

I do not believe that to be the strongest reason for criticism; the strongest reason is to be found in the actions of the minister himself. I was quite surprised to note that the honourable gentleman did not take part in those banquets, which his colleagues have been having since they came into office, all over the country; and it was hard to find a reason why he was not there, making speeches as he did in the election campaign. Now, I have found the reason. Since taking office, he has been too busily engaged with those gentlemen he has brought in to conduct his investigations. He has been too busy working with them, interrogating the young men picked up on the streets who might have worked at some time for the Government, or stenographers who might have taken dictation in the department at some time or another, gathering material for the speech he intended to deliver in the House. Then he states that the cost of getting the advice on which the address was made was \$3,200; and I make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker: When a speech is made up at a cost of \$3,200 chargeable to the Department of Telephones, for the sole purpose of making an attack upon a Minister of the Crown now at Ottawa, about twenty-two men who came in to vote, that expenditure is a political expenditure made for purposes having to do with the next Federal election in Saskatchewan.

That is all I have to say in connection with that type of criticism.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The statements made are entirely incorrect. I have not interviewed any young men on the streets. I have not seen, nor was anyone sent to interview, any stenographer who took dictation in the department.

Mr. Gardiner: I can produce a few affidavits myself when the time comes, to indicate that what I have said is correct.

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: When any honourable member gets up and says what another says is wrong, he is entirely out of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister has denied his statements, and he must accept that denial.

Mr. Gardiner: I have not accepted it, Mr. Speaker. I say that, at some future time, I shall, if given the chance, produce affidavits to prove that my statements are correct.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: We shall give you the chance!

Mr. Gardiner: It is my opinion, that the address delivered in this House the other day by the honourable minister was made largely to discredit the Hon. Mr. Dunning and I do not think anyone who read the speech can come to any other conclusion than that it was made for political purposes.

With regard to the Budget Speech itself, I would say this: The minister, in delivering his speech at the beginning of this debate, built it up in the way other Budget Speeches have been built up. That is to say, he dwelt at considerable length on the general conditions throughout the province, reviewing the conditions of the province in relation to the financial circumstances of the province. Members on Government benches, including the Provincial Treasurer, criticised the former Government for alleged over-expenditures of the current year, but they did not say a single word on the increased expenditure for the coming year in spite of what was said by the Provincial Treasurer. What did he say?

In the first place, he indicated to us that the farming population of this province has a purchasing power as the result of last year's operations of approximately \$100,000,000 less than the previous year. I think that was the figure he used. Now, Sir, that should surely draw to the attention of this House that if the farming population of this province (and, after all it is the farming population which makes business go in this province) — if they have \$100,000,000 less to spend than in the previous year, and if we had difficulties in the preceding year, then we can look for even greater difficulties during the coming year. With that thought in mind, I propose to discuss the speech of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

It was a complete surprise to me to hear him state that the deficit he was reporting was only \$400,000. I have a vivid recollection of the headlines and stories in the *Regina Daily Star* a week or two after he took office, in which it was indicated that we were going to have a deficit — or had a deficit — of some \$2,400,000.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I do not think the word "deficit" was used by me at that time. I think the figures I used were right, and represented the financial condition at that time.

Mr. Gardiner: I think I am right in stating that in the press, which supports this Government, it was stated there was a deficit. Two members of the preceding Government denied the story at the time and said it was wrong, but the honourable minister went to Saskatoon shortly afterwards and said it was correct.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The statement I made was correct. I did not use the word "deficit."

Mr. Gardiner: Well, you had better take it up with the newspaper concerned. The minister apparently was so torn with love for the Liberal Government, last fall, and for the Liberal party, that he made the deficit then as big as he could and then proceeded to tear it down from \$2,400,000 to \$400,000 out of consideration, as he says, for the old Government. He shows now a deficit of only \$400,000 for the province since the first day of May, 1929, to the 30th day of April, 1930!

Now, Sir, a \$400,000 deficit is not an unheard of thing in any province of Canada. In Ontario, the Government of Hon. Mr. Ferguson reported a deficit of \$15,000,000 following the Drury regime. In Alberta, according to the *Winnipeg Tribune*, they had a deficit in 1921 of \$2,118,000; in 1922, a deficit of \$1,910,000; in 1923, of \$571,680 and in 1924 of \$620,000 and they have had deficits since that time. So a deficit of even \$2,000,000 is not an unheard of thing even in these western provinces.

Nor is a deficit in Saskatchewan an unheard of thing, Mr. Speaker. I have in my hand a list of surpluses and deficits recorded in this province, and there is a considerable number of the figures shown in red which signifies that they are deficits, Mr. Speaker, brought down by a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan — nine of them to be exact, all deficits reported during the 24 years of Liberal administration in this province.

In 1907-08, there was a deficit reported of \$247,000; in 1908-09, another of \$454,000; in 1911-12, another of \$148,000; in 1914-15, another of \$291,000; in 1915-16, another of \$489,000, almost \$500,000; then in 1920-21, a deficit of \$402,000 was reported; in 1921-22, a deficit of \$1,584,000 and in 1922-23 a deficit of \$360,000. In the next year, 1923-24, which as we have already been told in the investigation on the Farm Loan Board was a good year for collections, we had a considerable surplus and that surplus was used entirely to wipe off some of the accumulated deficits of former years. But the next year we went back into the deficit column again, so that, Mr. Speaker, in the 24 years of Liberal administration, there have been nine occasions in which deficits have been reported ranging from \$148,000 up to as high as \$1,500,000. The year following 1925 was the first year I was Prime Minister of the province and the first in which any member of this side with the exception of the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) and myself, were personally involved. Since then, we have been able to report surpluses and in the meantime we have wiped off the accumulated deficits of former years until, coming down to the beginning of last year, as related by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer the other day, we had an accrued surplus of \$219,000. That is, Sir, we had an accumulated surplus from 1905 down to the beginning of the present fiscal year, a cash surplus of \$219,000 over all these years. But in addition to that, we had approximately \$1,610,000 of accumulated liquor profits in the bank to the credit of the Liquor Board at the beginning of this fiscal year. One-tenth of that was earmarked to provide for sinking funds, bringing the sum down to \$1,450,000, so that there was, all told, in addition to the money voted by the Legislature, \$219,000 plus \$1,450,000 or a total of \$1,669,000 in cash over amounts estimated available to the new Government when it took office, as a result of the administration of the former Government.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We used it all to pay your debts!

Mr. Gardiner: We shall get along to whose debts you were paying after a while. We'll see whose debts they were!

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, we do not need to answer the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer, the other day, in connection with the deficit. We can point to a record of twenty-four years of Liberal administration in this province and in all those twenty-four years, never at any time did a Provincial Treasurer find it necessary to capitalise revenue expenditures in order to show either a surplus or a deficit. At

any time in those twenty-four years in which a minister brought down his budget, he said there was either a deficit or a surplus from revenue account in the light of current expenditures, and, if there was a deficit, he told the House in what way expenditures would be cut to take care of it. That is the policy that was followed, and so successfully, that we were able to balance the Budget during the whole term of years we were in office. No Provincial Treasurer needs to capitalise revenue expenditures unless he intends to adopt in the province a new policy of capitalising over-expenditures.

I am going to try to demonstrate to the House that the policy announced by the Provincial Treasurer in bringing down his Budget to the House is the wrong policy for Saskatchewan, involving as it does the capitalisation of over-expenditures.

When we left office, we had, let me repeat, \$219,000 in cash representing the accumulated surplus of previous years and in addition to that we had accumulated profits to the credit of the Liquor Board of \$1,430,000 (as it appeared in the published speech) instead of \$1,450,000 which is the proper figures. In addition to that there was available another \$300,000 from the liquor profits of the current year which we did not take in.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Yes you did! You took in \$2,000,000.

Mr. Gardiner: But we did not take in the \$300,000 of profits actually estimated by the present Provincial Treasurer and taken into account over and above the \$2,000,000 we had estimated a year ago. So, Mr. Speaker, when the present Government took office, there was a total of \$1,949,000 available to cover any extra expenditures made by either the outgoing Government or the incoming Government, or to meet any over-expenditure on revenue account for any of the departments of Government.

Revenues during the fiscal year now closing produced \$15,110,000. That was the amount of the revenues that came in as a result of the estimates of last year. These revenues together with the sums accumulated from past years, which I have just mentioned, namely \$1,949,000, makes an entire amount available for expenditure for the present twelve months, of \$17,050,000. Well, now, that was admitted by the Treasurer. Those are not my figures. They were admitted by the Provincial Treasurer in his own Budget speech, the other day. He had available \$17,050,000 with which to pay for all expenditures incurred either by the outgoing or incoming Government.

What about expenditures? The estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1929—30 were \$15,947,000 and the supplementaries (as stated by the honourable member for Pipestone (*Mr. W. J. Patterson*) the other day) amounted to \$2,300,000, about \$1,000,000 of which, according to what the minister said the other day, he intended to place in deferred account, and I would say he is doing that because it is perfectly proper to do so. That is to say it is not the proper thing, when you take into consideration a season such as last season, when it was necessary to give large sums for relief in a certain part of the province, such as highway relief and other similar undertakings which it was necessary to do, and which are extraordinary and cannot be estimated in advance by the Government; I say it is not the proper thing to drain the Treasury of the province for that purpose although the work has to be done. He is doing exactly what other Governments have done in the past in this province and what other Governments have done elsewhere. He is spreading it over a five-year term and, therefore, it would not appear in the amount which we would reduce this \$2,300,000 by. But let me submit this: I fail to find an amount equal to \$1,000,000 that he would be justified in taking into deferred charges. At least, if we were administering the affairs of the province, we could not find a sum equal to \$1,000,000. I think I can find this, in his figures: I can find a sum of approximately \$800,000 that, were we still in power, we would feel justified in putting into deferred charges. Well, \$800,000 taken away from \$2,300,000 leaves \$1,500,000 and if you add that \$1,500,000 to the \$15,947,000 estimated expenditure, you would get actual expenditures of \$17,447,000 for the current year. Well, that leaves just two or three thousand dollars short of the \$400,000 deficit the honourable minister brought down to the House. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the last Government, through its estimates, through its accumulated surplus and from other sources, handed on to this Government, handed on to the present Provincial Treasurer, a total of \$17,050,000; and the expenditures made through activities of the former Government during the four months of last year it was in office, and through the activities of the present Government which at the end of April will be responsible for eight months of these expenditures, is estimated to cost \$17,447,000 from revenue account, which leaves a deficit of \$400,000. And again, I repeat, that is not an unheard of deficit. It is not a deficit larger than we have had in the Province of Saskatchewan before. It is a deficit just a little more than a quarter of the largest deficit we have

had in Saskatchewan, and it is just one-fifth of the largest deficit they have had in the Province of Alberta in the last eight years. So, after all, even if we listen to all the stories of the Provincial Treasurer with regard to the terrible activities of the late Government during the last few months we were in power, the story, in reality, is not so bad as he would have it appear. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the old Government, if it had been continued in power, because of its more careful management of the financial affairs of the province, could have taken those same revenues (and I speak now not only of the Highways Department but of all departments) and shown a surplus rather than a deficit over the entire year because of careful administration during the last eight months of the year.

In order to prove that this is possible, let me call the attention of the House to the large expenditures during the last eight months of the year. There are certain unforeseen expenditures that occur from year to year, expenditures that cannot be estimated because they are not foreseen when the main estimates are brought down, and that is the reason why we always have supplementary estimates from year to year. I have gone back over all the supplementary estimates brought down by Liberal Governments in this province in the last twenty-four years — and we had election years at other times, just as well as last year — but in all that time there never has been a list of supplementaries brought down half as great as that brought down by the Provincial Treasurer in this Legislature, in this his first session as Provincial Treasurer in this province.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: They were all yours!

Mr. Gardiner: Oh, No! They were not all ours, as I shall proceed to show you in a moment. Surely they were all ours up to the time this Government took office, but when this Government took charge they became responsible for the expenditures of the last eight months.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: All yours except \$800,000!

Mr. Gardiner: But estimates which were not even anticipated by the last Government are included!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Add them up!

Mr. Gardiner: Take "Election Expenses", \$222,800.

Premier Anderson: You knew it was coming!

Mr. Gardiner: But we did not know how much it would cost. In any case, we did not need to hold the election in 1929.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: You should not have had it.

Mr. Gardiner: Perhaps if we had not had it, it would have been to the advantage of the province.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: A lot of this was for expenditures on matters which the old Government undertook and commenced in 1928.

Mr. Gardiner: The item estimated for the administration of the Gas Tax — that was in 1928, but the increase simply means that the revenues in connection with the Gas Tax were more than we estimated and that should have helped to balance the Budget. Then take "Criminal Investigations, \$67,500." I do not think we were responsible for all the criminal investigations since September 6, or all the trials which have taken place since September 6. I think that the new Government will have to take the responsibility for these.

Premier Anderson: You were afraid to do it!

Mr. Gardiner: When the honourable gentleman says we were afraid to do it, let me tell him that we had the courage to take the advice of all legal authorities in the matter and in doing so saved the people of this province a considerable sum of money. But the honourable gentleman went up and down the province threatening to prosecute certain individuals to get votes . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: And we did do it!

Mr. Gardiner: And at what cost to the people?

Mr. Davis: And with what results?

Premier Anderson: You were afraid to prosecute!

Mr. Gardiner: You prosecuted certain individuals at the cost of the province and what results did you obtain? Just the same results as in the case of Dr. Mitchell. In a previous debate when I raised the point my statement was challenged. What was the reply? The minister stood up in his place and denied my remarks and said, "I have the admission of the gentleman. We will show him!" And you took him to court and the jury took only ten minutes to say what they thought of it.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Twenty minutes.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, twenty minutes. I am advised it was ten.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: If you can take any satisfaction out of an acquittal on that evidence, you are welcome to it!

Mr. Gardiner: We have had a great deal of satisfaction down the centuries since 1215 in the British Empire, in trial by jury, and when a jury in this province gives its decision we are prepared to abide by it.

In addition to "Criminal investigations" we have "Prisoners" subsistence and discharge expenses, \$20,000.00 I understood from the minister that that had something to do with the groanings of the taxpayers but, of course, I am not blaming the Government for that — either the incoming or the outgoing Government. Then "Highways, relief work on roads, \$340,000." I am prepared to admit that had the old Government been in power we would have had an appropriation for certain relief work, such as highway relief. I am not prepared to admit, however, that we would have done it in the way the present Government did since coming into power. I want to say, too, that all the information the minister (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) got by holding meetings throughout the southern part of the province was in the possession of a department of the Government when the old Government went out; and so it was not necessary to have held those meetings . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: There was no information at all in the Department of Highways — none at all when I went on that trip. We acted on the information we secured on that trip.

Mr. Gardiner: I am not speaking of Highways. I said in a department of Government, possibly in two departments certain information had been secured and was in possession of the deputies . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In what departments?

Mr. Gardiner: In those departments which usually carried on the work of investigations of that kind — the Municipal Department for example and others which had men out in the field continuously gathering information regarding agricultural conditions.

Then there is the account of the Bureau of Child Protection which is not balanced either. A sum of \$132,250 was required in addition to the amount voted last year bringing the total which could not be forecast a year ago, and could not be prevented by either Government to \$807,000, and I understand from the remarks made the other day that there is likely to be an increased expenditure in connection with Old Age Pensions.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: That is a statutory obligation, and so is not voted.

Mr. Gardiner: I understand that. I did not find it in the statement and concluded that it was not to be voted.

In addition to the deferred charges of \$800,000 and unforeseen accounts of \$807,000 which I have mentioned, there is still \$700,000 of increased expenditure to be accounted for and that \$700,000 is spread through all departments of Government. But there is one department which exceeds all others, one department which seems to have more or less run wild, and that is the Department of Public Works. The total expenditure

for the administration and maintenance of public buildings in connection with the Public Works Department during the last ten years has never been much over \$1,300,000 in any one year. In the vote for last year there was one million three hundred and a few odd thousand dollars, which runs approximately the same amount as was required to run those buildings for many years, and which had not been exceeded in many years. The expenditure was somewhat greater in 1921 than in the years intervening, and the reason for that was, as I indicated a moment ago, we had a deficit in this province in that year. It was a very difficult year and we had not held up on expenditures in 1921. As was indicated by the honourable member for Kindersley (*Mr. Whatley*) a few moments ago, possibly it would not be the proper thing to keep down expenditures knowing that the year was going to be a hard year. But there were other opinions. Two of the first letters I received after June 6, came from the member for Bengough (*Mr. Warren*) and the member for Moose Jaw County (*Mr. Whittaker*). These two gentlemen both wrote me saying "In our opinion, all expenditure on highways and public buildings should be immediately stopped."

Mr. Warren: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I would ask the honourable member a question: Did I say highways or public buildings?

Mr. Gardiner: I am talking of public buildings, but between the two of you, reference was made to both and my reply was the same to both and it was this, that, in a year such as this when unemployment was staring us in the face in the larger towns and villages and on the farms, too, as indicated in the reference that was made by the honourable member for Kindersley, this was not the time, with the winter coming on, to cut down expenditures, but that the expenditures should be cut in succeeding years to meet any deficit rather than during this present somewhat difficult year. What did we do? In 1921, we spent money and in succeeding years we kept expenditures down to a point lower than they had been in 1921 in every year down to 1928. Expenditures in 1921 ran over \$13,000,000 and never until the year 1928 did they reach an amount equal to that expended in 1921. We did that by being careful in the administration of this particular department for one of the departments in which you have to be careful if you want to keep down expenditures is the Department of Public Works. The two largest spending departments in the Government of this province are the Department of Public Works and the Department of Highways, and you may add a third, the Department of Education. I think these are the three largest spending departments in the Government and it is in departments of this kind that savings have to be made, if you are going to have savings at all in a hard year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened this year in the Department of Public Works? We find that, in spite of the fact that \$1,300,000 was voted which is the amount, in round figures, that has been found necessary to carry on the maintenance and administration of public buildings in this province for a considerable number of years, the expenditures on public buildings this year call for an additional \$310,000 in the supplementary estimates to be spent in connection with these buildings. That \$310,000 is approximately 25 per cent. of the total amount spent for that purpose by Liberal Governments in any year in all the time those Liberal Governments were in power. Approximately 25 per cent.! And when my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer comes down with his Budget in the House and says it was out of consideration for the old Government that he has cut the deficit down to \$400,000, I am going to tell him now that the highest expenditure ever made by a Liberal Government was just a little in excess of \$100,000 (I think it was \$102,000 to be exact) in excess of the amount voted for maintenance of public buildings.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: By what amount was it increased by the present Administration? Was it not as a result of the increases in pay to a number of members of the Civil Service granted by the late Administration prior to June 6?

Mr. Gardiner: No, it was not!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Then by what amount?

Mr. Gardiner: The amounts are in the estimates. The honourable gentleman himself told us the other day, that it was for buying new supplies for Government institutions such as the mental hospitals. The sheets had worn out; pillow cases had

worn out; pillow slips had worn out; mattresses had worn out and the springs had got weak; and he said all this was necessary because the last Government had not authorised these purchases. The more likely explanation is that after capitalising \$2,100,000 that they would have been quite justified in retaining in revenue account, they saw the light and realised, unless they did run these expenditures up we were going to end the year with a substantial surplus. So he authorised those expenditures for new sheets, new pillow cases, new pillow slips, new mattresses and new springs . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: They were not bought by the present Government. This was a debt left by the previous Administration which we had to pay and the honourable gentleman cannot show it any other way.

Mr. Gardiner: When the honourable gentleman has been on the Treasury benches as long as we were, he will find that the staff in any department in this Government, in this building or in any other building that is carried on for governmental purposes, makes it their business to try to get all the money for their department that they can get the Government to approve and the Legislature to vote. When we were considering the amount of money that should be asked for the maintenance of these various departments, we have had submitted to us just as large amounts as the honourable gentleman has had submitted to him this year, but on each occasion we have cut those amounts down to the limit commensurate with efficient management, and by so doing we have made it possible to have balanced budgets from year to year. But the honourable gentleman says, "We can blame all this on the previous Government. They were in power for four months of the year, and we have told the people of the province that they spent outrageously in all directions and we have got to prove it!" So the honourable gentleman comes into the House and asks the Legislature to vote 25 per cent. more money for expenditure on public buildings, in administration and maintenance, which money has been squandered . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: You cannot prove that we squandered ten cents!

Mr. Davis: Yes. Twenty-one cents on Wascana Lake!

Mr. Gardiner: We will prove that next year! That, it seems to me, has been the proceedings in connection with this whole matter when the honourable gentlemen on the Government benches today have come into this House with a deficit of \$400,000.

It was not out of consideration for the old Government that the present Government capitalised \$2,100,000 that, possibly, should not have been capitalised; rather, I would say, it was out of consideration for the programme they had announced to the people of the province during the recent election. They said that, if they were returned to power, they would borrow \$20,000,000 to spend on roads and they found an opportunity to increase the expenditure, this year, because of the activities of the last Government in laying out works which were not authorised when the last Government was in power, and to spend on highways in the province a considerable sum which was capitalised to create a public debt of \$2,100,000 and thus carry out their own policy which called for the capitalisation of highway expenditures.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker:

Opposition Members: Sit down!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Try and make me! I would tell the honourable gentleman that the statement he has made is absolutely incorrect: that any contract that was let was let by his Administration with the exception of three that were transferred on to No. 1 Highway. In addition, three hundred of those contracts were not let by the present Administration. We did not increase highway expenditure by \$500,000.

Mr. Gardiner: I shall prove that long before we are through them, too. Now, the amount to be spent by the new Government immediately out of capital account on highways was \$20,000,000. We provided, out of capital account, last year, \$1,500,000 for expenditure. Then there was an amount of \$230,000 accepted by the House because of the agreement we entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the building of the Nipawin bridge and that was voted by way of warrant by the outgoing Government before September 8, last, making \$1,730,000 out of capital account. The present Government have added to that amount in their supplementaries for road building to implement their promises made during the election, a sum of \$1,900,000. Now, adding to the expenditures authorised by the House last year, that is, \$1,730,000

from capital account and the \$1,900,000 capitalised but not voted last year, for road purposes and the amount of \$7,500,000 asked for this year, you get a total of \$11,130,000, which is \$1,130,000 more than their own programme calls for during the first year they are in power. For I remember when these gentlemen were called on to explain their road policy, they said to the people that "immediately" meant "two years."

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is the honourable member saying that \$11,000,000 was spent in 1929 on highways?

Mr. Gardiner: No!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And are you trying to tell this House that your Government let no contracts?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, I could tell you that our Government let no contracts beyond the amount available, but I have not said so yet. What I am trying to tell the House is this: that this present Government came into power on September 9, last, and by the time they are in power one year that they will have spent approximately \$11,130,000 upon highways from capital account, the only deduction being the amount spent by the old Government during the preceding four months.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On your contracts!

Mr. Gardiner: Well, we shall see about the contracts, too! The application of their own policy of capitalising road expenditures to the finances which were turned over to them by the last Government would have produced a surplus, and a most imposing surplus — a surplus of approximately \$1,900,000. What did they do in order to get rid of that surplus?

The first thing they did was this: They struck \$500,000 off the automobile licenses, by making their schedule of rates go into effect on the 18th day of—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Might I correct the honourable gentleman in that statement? During the fiscal year 1929-30, \$500,000 was not struck off by this Administration, nor were revenues

Mr. Gardiner: Well, you will know quite a lot more about it than you apparently do. About half of the licenses are issued after the snow goes and what we depend on to balance a budget through auto licenses is really the passing of the winter (and I expect it will pass away early this year) and before the first of May, in all probability, the great bulk of the licenses will have been issued for the year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Might I tell the honourable gentleman that the statement that the great majority of the licenses will be issued between January 1 and May 1, 1930, is not correct.

Mr. Gardiner: They struck \$5 off the license fee and had they left that revenue as it was the license fees would have taken care of \$500,000. What did they do in addition? In order to make possible the enormous expenditure provided for next year, they did away with the whole benefit resulting to the public for the future from the taking of \$5 off the licenses by adding two cents to the gasoline tax bringing it up to five cents a gallon, and from this they hope to get, during the coming year, a revenue of \$1,500,000. Thus, while pretending they were cutting down the taxes, when they were striking off, at the very outside, \$500,000 during the present calendar year, they are estimating that they are going to add on \$1,500,000 to the same set of taxpayers during the year 1930-31. And they are also increasing the truck licenses as well.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: That does not apply to the farmers though.

Mr. Gardiner: That is the intention.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: It is actually as much as you over-spent.

Mr. Gardiner: The fact of the matter is that we have in addition to the enormously increased expenditures of the supplementaries made in addition to the estimates

for different departments a year ago, this cutting off of revenues from the earnings anticipated by the outgoing Government, in order to change what would have been an enormous surplus at the end of the present year into a deficit and, then they have capitalised to a considerable amount highway expenditures for the mere purpose of conforming with their own policy in connection with highways.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Who authorised it in Liberal seats?

Mr. Gardiner: We did not bring down a programme of highways that provided for the expenditure in the various constituencies dividing the number of seats on the Government side from those on the other.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You did not bring down a programme at all until the election.

Mr. Gardiner: The programme brought down this week made provision for expenditures on trunk highways in the seats of twenty-five members on that side of the House and in the seats of twelve members who sit on this side, and it would have been no disgrace

(Interruptions by Government members.)

I repeat again, it would have been no disgrace whether the Government of this province were Liberal or Conservative, in a year such as this to bring down a Budget showing a deficit of approximately \$2,000,000. It has been done before and in all probability it will be done again, particularly if this Government stays in power. It has been done in other provinces in Canada whether the affairs of those provinces were conducted by the Conservative party or any other party; but, more particularly, where Conservative Governments have conducted public affairs. In order to conform to their policy, this Government is capitalising expenditures which should be made from revenue account. This Government is prepared to capitalise these expenditures and, after doing so, to create a deficit against the old Government by increasing expenditures in every department and by cutting down the revenues anticipated a year ago.

What of the new Budget? The only thing new about the new Budget that is of any importance is that the Provincial Treasurer proposes to increase the allowance for Public Debt sufficiently, after allowing for increases that took place this year, by an amount running to \$842,000 more than ever was needed before.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: That is not correct!

Mr. Gardiner: There is not very much of a mistake about it.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Some of it is yours, too.

Mr. Gardiner: That's what I stated. It includes what was added to the debt this year. Because of all the expenditures incurred on capital account, this year, and for all those incurred in the coming year on capital account, there will have to be an increase of \$842,000 to take care of the charges on the Public Debt. The result of twenty months' operations of this Government in this province, eight months in the current year and twelve months in the next fiscal year, with the transfer of \$1,900,000 from revenue to capital, the increase in expenditures in all departments of \$700,000, a cut at least from estimated revenues of the current year of \$500,000 and a reduced estimate of liquor profits from \$3,000,000 to \$2,000,000. . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: That was because you cut down the price of liquor.

Mr. Gardiner: On the point which the Honourable Minister of Public Works has just made: There was a small cut made, as I understand, by the Liquor Board which published the list and when the Chairman of the Liquor Board appeared before the Public Service Enquiry Commission he was asked the question by the only political member of the Commission, the Honourable Minister, how this came to be done. He was told that the Board made the change, and the Chairman of the Liquor Board lost his position for telling the truth. He said that the Board was responsible for any change made, and only a few days afterwards, he lost his job.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Are you sure of that?

Mr. Gardiner: It was a very few days after that. And the result of these operations that I have enumerated was a deficit of \$400,000. I wish to repeat before linking

that matter up, that a careful Government could have held that capitalisation down to \$1,730,000 in highways, and finished with a respectable deficit — I do not say a deficit as low as \$400,000, but they could have cut down and with the revenues as provided, they could have finished with a respectable deficit. But, in following out their policy, the Government proceeded to do what I have indicated.

Next year, their current account calls for an expenditure of \$17,740,000 and a capital expenditure of \$13,670,000. I do not know what to make of it when he comes into the House now and says that the outgoing Government was responsible for all the expenditure during the past year and that we were a spendthrift Government because we incurred an expenditure of \$17,447,000 together with themselves, last year; and immediately after making that statement, the minister comes into the House and says that, apart from any supplementaries he may ask for, "we are going to provide out of these estimates for an expenditure of \$17,800,000," or \$350,000 more than we spent together this year! And yet they say we were spendthrift in the current year!

Their capital expenditures are more than double the amount that was provided by the old Government for the current year, making a total expenditure from these two sources of \$31,500,000.

The total amount expended by the last Government, even admitting that the contention of the minister is correct, that the old Government spent all they could in the first four months of the year, and after the honourable minister had added all the figures he could for the last eight months — and the new Government went the very limit in expending money provided by the old Government during these eight months — the best they could do was to spend some \$28,000,000! Now this new Government comes along and is going to show us how to economise and they ask for a vote of \$31,400,000 to spend next year on what cost \$28,000,000 this year.

I propose to make this suggestion to the House: That when a Government comes along in a difficult year such as this and proposes to increase the expenditures by some \$3,000,000 over and above all we can accuse the new Government of spending during the eight months of the current year they were in office and all they can accuse us of spending in the four months we were in office, there is something wrong with a minister and something wrong with a Government that will spend like that in a year like this!

Now, the Government found it necessary to find some department upon which they could throw a considerable portion of the blame for an alleged reckless expenditure and because they had said so much about them, they picked on the Highways Department and had investigations made into the Telephone Department and the Farm Loan Board. There was only one thing for them to do insofar as the Highways Department was concerned, and that was to throw the blame upon the highways in order that it might appear to substantiate the many ingenious arguments they had used and to prove to the people of this province that we had spent their money recklessly. But I happen to have anticipated something of the kind and, before we left office I got a statement prepared in the department showing the commitments of the outgoing Government. I have that statement in my hand and it shows this (and it is dated up to the end of July, 1929): It shows the amount that would have been necessary from revenue account to meet the expenditure incurred for highway construction on contracts, some of which had been authorised and contracts let, some of which had been authorised but no contracts let, and some of which had not been authorised. The total required to cover all work contemplated from revenue account was \$3,461,000. The vote of last session after the cost of administration is taken off, amounted to \$2,300,000, leaving \$1,160,000 or, to be exact, \$1,161,000, which would have been incurred but which was not voted in the last session of the House.

That possibly requires some explanation, and the explanation is this: The honourable minister in presenting his Budget referred to the policy announced by Hon. Mr. Dunning in regard to liquor profits when the Act first came into force in this province. At that time, Mr. Dunning announced that he proposed to apply the liquor profits to the keeping down of the public debt of the province; and the thing that weighed heavily with the Government at that time was that in years like 1921 we had added to the amounts of expenditure estimated from revenue account because, as I said, that was a difficult year and as a result we had a large deficit. In the years preceding and succeeding that, a considerable amount had been spent in fighting grasshoppers and other plagues on account of which large grants were being paid which had placed considerable amounts in deferred charges from year to year. The statement Mr. Dunning made was that these expenditures themselves were unforeseen expenditures and the liquor profits were unforeseen revenues, therefore, it would be

perfectly proper to apply unforeseen revenues to unforeseen expenditures. So we used them to liquidate the deferred charges account and gradually wiped off the back deficits until we finally wound up with a surplus at the end of the fiscal year 1928-29. In 1928, we had arrived at the point where all deferred charges were wiped out so far as we could wipe them out, and we came down in the session of 1928 and said that the practice insofar as liquor profits were concerned was going to be changed. We said we could, first of all, use them to take care of deferred charges and unforeseen expenditures and then apply the surplus (if there was any surplus) on highways. We proposed to spend the money in bringing part of the road allowances in the province to a better state of perfection. And why did we choose highways? Because, though there is a limited mileage of roads to be built up to standard in the province, any Government can spend an unlimited amount of money on the highways of the province; further, the principle as laid down by the minister the other day (that it is proper to capitalise certain road expenditures) was one which we did not want laid down. We did not want a service built up on the liquor profits in this province — a service upon which the people of the province counted and which they needed. The reason for that is that at any time in the future, the people of the province might want to make a decision with regard to the liquor traffic itself, and that decision would inevitably be affected by the fact that it was necessary to keep up the service so built up in this province. So we said that the right thing to do was to wipe out deferred charges and all unforeseen expenditures and then apply the rest upon the highways, after providing ten per cent. for the Sinking Fund. We have done that from that time and in 1928 we came down in the House and asked for \$1,000,000 to spend on highways on revenue account through the supplementary estimates. Had we been in power we would have come down and proposed this year to do the same and for the same amount, and we would have presented it in revenue account in the supplementaries; but our friends have seen fit to capitalise it. But the whole amount we were responsible for over and above the amount voted in the previous session of the Legislature was \$1,160,000; and again I want to call your attention to the fact that there was available, left by the old Government, over \$1,600,000 of accumulated Liquor Board profits and from this sum, following the principle laid down in previous years, it would have been quite in order to take care of that extra expenditure on the highways. And there was considerably more in sight on the first day of August, last.

What did we do in addition to that? We went over the figures and I may give you all of them, before I proceed. The next has to do with capital commitments. These commitments at the same date were \$1,730,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What date was that?

Mr. Gardiner: July 25.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: How many did you let later than that? Some contracts were let as late as September 4!

Mr. Gardiner: This includes that. We shall see about that. In the middle of August, 1929, what happened? We discussed the whole situation and came to this conclusion: that the House was going to meet on September 6, and there was every probability that the Government might be defeated and so we said that, in view of the circumstances, the outgoing Government would not be justified in incurring further expenditures in large amounts by way of letting contracts through the Highways Department. I am not saying no agreements were entered into with municipalities. Commitments were entered into with municipalities even before it was announced there was going to be an election. Commitments must be made in March, April and succeeding months, so that you can provide for expenditures on highways during the season. I presume the same practice will be carried out by the new Government. But any considerable expenditure incurred after the first day of August, last, would have to do with those large contracts, for municipal highways work is usually done before the harvest starts.

Now, what were the instructions (and I think they were lived up to) issued to the Highways Department? Their intention was that we should place any Government that succeeded us, if we were defeated, in the position that they could either proceed with the programme or stop it, as they wished, the minute they came into power.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: That statement is not correct. These contractors were on the ground and had actually started the work and in view of that you could not, in fairness, stop those men.

Mr. Gardiner: Just wait until I am through. Those were the commitments of the Government—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Before September 6.

Mr. Gardiner: These were the commitments of the Government up to the first of August. Over the whole season — they were committed to expend \$1,161,000 in excess of the estimates for the whole year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But you signed contracts on September 4th!

Mr. Gardiner: That is included. You mean August 4th.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No! I mean September 4th.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, there might have been one—or two.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: More than that . . .

Mr. Gardiner: Will the honourable member allow me to proceed? We will see about that when you bring on the estimates. Two contracts are not going to make \$1,100,000 . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The total is over \$5,000,000!

Mr. Gardiner: The amount incurred by the outgoing Government was the amount I have given. Then, in the month of August contracts were advertised, which, had we remained in power, would have been let. But those contracts were left advertised except the two which the honourable minister referred to, and which I had no information on — but I have these memos. These contracts were left advertised so that they could be acted upon by the incoming Government. If it saw fit, they could have been accepted or otherwise. The tenders had not been opened . . .

Hon. Mr. Bryant: And no one was allowed in.

Mr. Gardiner: Another statement was given the other day in a return brought down. What did the new Government do in the matter? The first return, which I am now giving to the House and which was tabled by the minister proves the point I made. That return is in the records of the House. It is a return showing the authorisations by the department in the different years from 1921 and the actual expenditures in the same years, and showing authorisations and expenditures for the last year between May 1 and September 1. It shows, Mr. Speaker, that in most years our authorisations exceeded our expenditures. This is out of necessity, in most years, in view of the experiences we have had. Certain of the authorisations we have made were not carried out either by the municipalities or by the contractors to whom contracts have been let. For that reason, though the authorisations show in one year, the actual expenditures were made in the following year. This accounts for the fact that the amount authorised in any one year may be more than the amount expended. In 1928, for example, the authorisations were around \$1,000,000 more than was expended either through the supplementaries or through the votes in the preceding estimates. That million dollars was not spent in the current year, but the larger part of it was carried over until the present season and if the honourable gentleman will check the files he will find that that has been the case since the programme of main roads was laid out . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But more so in election years!

Mr. Gardiner: In election years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. About a million dollars.

Mr. Gardiner: 1921 was an election year, and my honourable friend will find that they finished with a very small margin, if any.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What about last year?

Mr. Gardiner: 1925 was also an election year and the same thing is true. We finished up without any supplementary. Those are the facts anyway. In the year 1925, there was no supplementary. There was no over-expenditure, no authorisation

over and above the expenditure of the previous year. And there was no authorisation in 1929 for over-expenditure in connection with highways over and above the \$1,600,000 available out of liquor profits.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Would my honourable friend permit a question? Is he contending by his argument that we have carried over into next year around a million dollars authorised by his Administration and that it increases this year's expenditures to that extent?

Mr. Gardiner: No! I am simply stating what would have happened.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what would have happened?

Mr. Gardiner: But the honourable gentleman did not do that. He certainly did not do that. He cancelled contracts right and left, in different parts of the province and, without calling for any tenders, he gave the same gentlemen jobs in other parts. He was so anxious to get gravelling the 1,921 miles of road which we had made it possible to gravel by reconstructing them up to standard during the earlier part of the season that even after there was a foot of snow on them, he proceeded to run trucks over those roads, cutting them up in his anxiety to pour gravel on them . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: That statement is not correct. I was over the roads myself and they were not cut up. I was over them after the snow came. It is like his statement about Montana.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, the average person in this province does not need to go over the roads to know pretty well what happens when you put heavy trucks on a road after the snow.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was over the road and I say that did not happen.

Mr. Gardiner: And you started pouring the gravel on on top of the snow and we do not need . . .

Dr. Arthur: Might I ask the honourable gentleman why it was that his Government put trucks on the road during the gravelling down in Cannington last spring until he had to withdraw them on account of the earliness of the season?

Mr. Gardiner: That is probably where they got the experience which indicated that they should withdraw them.

We were told here that the outgoing Government had not kept within their expenditures and that there was no equalisation of expenditures over the constituencies insofar as highways are concerned.

There is only one thing I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and it is that on each and every occasion on which I get upon my feet I have had a considerable number of interruptions. I am not objecting to that; but I do object to my friends on the other side getting up two or three days later and saying that my speech was long when it is due to their interruptions that it is long.

Premier Anderson: Go ahead!

Mr. Gardiner: We have been building highways in this province since 1921. We started in 1921, as indicated by the minister this afternoon, and I am not going to retrace his remarks; but I am going to describe the system to show the result it has had on the province. In doing so, we started out with the knowledge that there are 63 constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan and that there are some 57 of these constituencies in which road work is being done. Those 57 constituencies were differently constituted and differently situated as regards road requirements. Taking all circumstances into consideration, we said we were going to keep the expenditures equalised over the whole province during the time this system was being paid for.

Now we have come to the end of nine years of that work, and what are the results? Well, there are four constituencies in the province in which the expenditure, during that period, both from revenue and capital accounts, has amounted to over \$600,000. There are four constituencies, Mr. Speaker, in which more than \$600,000 has been spent on road work during that period. Lumsden is the highest with \$809,000.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The banner constituency of Saskatchewan!

Mr. Gardiner: And I am not going to apologise for that, for Lumsden is situated about on all four sides of the greatest centre of population in the province, and the road work cost consequently and necessarily has been high. Lumsden, \$809,000. Then comes Maple Creek which is situated on No. 1 Highway at the western end of the Provincial System with \$645,000. Prince Albert is next with \$600,700 and Melfort with \$600,500. Both those constituencies are high for the same reason. In Prince Albert there is a large steel bridge which is maintained by the department, and through it runs the road to the famous National Park which is one of the main roads mentioned in my honourable friend's scheme. Then in the constituency of Melfort, the same condition prevails. There is the large bridge costing \$268,000 which we built last year over the Saskatchewan river. That explains why Melfort is high.

Let me remind the House of this: We were accused by the Minister of Highways and by other members on the Government side of having spent money after June 6 and previous to September 8 in Liberal seats in the province, and not spending money in Conservative seats. Well, in that group, I submit, two of them are Liberal and two Conservative, and the one in which the largest expenditure was made is a Conservative seat. So we did not discriminate.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Were not your contracts let in these seats before June 6?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, if you discuss it from that angle

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They were Liberal seats then!

Mr. Gardiner: Just wait until we get along with this and you will see we will dispose of your previous argument. Now, in the next group of constituencies where there was from \$500,000 to \$600,000 spent, we have Swift Current, \$560,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was a Liberal seat at the time and has been for the last 24 years.

Mr. Gardiner: Yes. Yorkton second, with \$554,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was a Liberal seat for twenty-four years, but never again!

Mr. Gardiner: Biggar third, \$553,000; Willow Bunch, \$554,000; Wolseley, \$516,000; Gravelbourg, \$516,000; Saskatoon County, \$511,000; Pheasant Hills, \$506,000, and Elrose, \$501,000 — nine. You will notice I have not yet got to my own seat.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You did pretty well — you must be getting close to it.

Mr. Gardiner: Out of this group of seats, Mr. Speaker, thirteen in all; we have six Liberals and seven Government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Were these Conservative during the nine years of which you are speaking?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, one was Conservative.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes! Only one!

Mr. Gardiner: There were not many Conservative seats at any time.

The next group is comprised of Rosthern, North Qu'Appelle, Notukeu, Wadena, Moose Jaw County, Bengough, Shellbrook, Saltcoats, Thunder Creek, Weyburn, Turtleford, Redberry and Morse. If members would like to know the amounts, I have them here: Rosthern, \$490,000; North Qu'Appelle, \$487,000; Notukeu, \$481,000; Wadena, \$472,000; Moose Jaw County, \$461,000; Shellbrook, \$462,000; Bengough, \$450,500; Saltcoats, \$465,000; Thunder Creek, \$442,000; Weyburn, \$428,000; Turtleford, \$421,000; Redberry, \$403,000, and Morse, \$405,000. Seven of those are Liberal and six Conservative, and we did not interfere with expenditures after June 6.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You are quoting for the last nine years and none of them were Conservative

Mr. Gardiner: Well, that is not our fault! I am quoting all the time over the nine years in order to show my honourable friend that expenditures were equalised.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Will you quote the Opposition seats?

Mr. Gardiner: We have thirteen seats in this second group, seven Liberal and six Conservative. In the previous list, there were 13 seats, seven being Conservative and six Liberal. That is thirteen of each, in the two groups. These twenty-six constitute the constituencies in which the largest expenditures were made. The plan followed was to put about twenty seats out of the fifty-seven on the authorised programme each year. We took twenty the first year, and then twenty more in 1922 and twenty more in 1923 and in that way got around all the constituencies in three-year cycles. By this method you get to the position we are in today. In accordance with the system of equalisation in this, the tenth year, those constituencies in which the expenditures are below the \$400,000 mark are the constituencies that should have been placed in the road programme for this year, if the honourable gentleman intends to keep the expenditures equalised — but they are not in the programme.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Would the honourable gentleman answer a question? Where did Hanley, Moosomin and Kindersley come in that particular category?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, Moosomin was either highest or second highest constituency for two years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What was it over the nine years?

Mr. Gardiner: During the time I was Minister of Highways, the member for Moosomin in 1925 went all over the constituency and asked the people to vote for him because he had got more than I had managed to get, and he was elected because of that argument.

In the next group, we have constituencies where the total expenditure runs from \$275,000 to \$400,000, constituencies in which the expenditure should have increased during the next year. We have Lloydminster with \$397,000 . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, what about that one?

Mr. Gardiner: You are spending some in that this year. Then we have Last Mountain, and you are spending some there this year. That is possibly all right. Arm River, \$385,000. All these seats were Liberal seats during the period. Arm River, \$385,000 — and we had a famous by-election in that constituency and still we did not bring them up after all the comment that was made there. Jackfish Lake, \$383,000; Wynyard, \$371,000; Moosomin — that is the first one Conservative in this group — \$371,000.

Premier Anderson: Quite a lot lower.

Mr. Gardiner: Vonda, \$369,000; Estevan, \$365,000; Touchwood, \$359,000; Battleford, \$361,000; Milestone, \$354,000; Happyland, \$350,000; Rosetown, \$346,000; Kinistino, \$347,000; Tisdale, \$336,000 — that is the second Conservative one; Pipestone, \$330,000 — and the member for Pipestone (*Mr. W. J. Patterson*) was Minister of Highways for part of that period; Humboldt, \$327,000; Souris, \$321,000; South Qu'Appelle, \$323,000; Kerrobert, \$312,000; Cannington, \$310,000; Pelly, \$312,000; Kindersley, \$292,000. — My honourable friend was right in saying he was low — that was another Opposition seat; Wilkie, \$290,000; Canora, \$282,000, and Cypress, \$275,000. That is the list, and in that list there are twenty-six seats and taking the present Liberal and the present Conservative seats, you will find that there is again an even break.

Below that again, you have Cut Knife, \$208,000; Francis, \$176,000; and Hanley, \$223,000; Cumberland with \$105,000 and Ile à la Crosse, \$252,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why is Hanley in that class?

Mr. Gardiner: Because of the nature of the seat. Hanley is a long, narrow seat with the highway going north and south and thus giving a very short distance traversing the constituency.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: What about the one going east and west?

Mr. Gardiner: The one going east and west only cuts through the corner of the seat and runs through into Saskatoon County. There is another reason, too, for Hanley being low although Hanley, during most of that period, from 1921 to 1925, was Liberal and still Hanley is not in the higher class. Hanley happens to be situated between the two cities of Regina and Saskatoon, and the roads have started out from Regina and Saskatoon and eventually Hanley is bound to be on both of the main highways north and south and my honourable friend is providing two of them simply because we have got the roads to Hanley from both sides.

Francis has always been a Liberal seat and the reason why it is in that class is that the people in that constituency never could agree as to where the road should be situated — whether it should go along the railway or zig-zag across the railway. Possibly they are now about to agree on building the highway along the railway as in the case of the Soo line.

With these things in mind, I think members of the House will agree that at least an attempt was made to keep expenditures equalised in the province of Saskatchewan during the last nine years and that the expenditures have been fairly well equalised taking all facts into consideration. Four constituencies are out of line because they surround cities like Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert; three are out of line because they are sparsely settled or due to other special conditions such as I outlined a few moments ago. All the others, Mr. Speaker, have expenditures between \$300,000 and \$600,000. The lower group of thirteen Liberal and thirteen Conservative seats, contains the seats, I submit to the House, in which the honourable minister should be doing most of the work this coming season.

But what is he going to do? Insofar as his statement to the House the other day indicates, he is going to spend the bulk of the money on four trunk highways in the province, running through twenty-five seats represented on the Government side of the House and twelve seats represented on this side. Then he indicates that his expenditures are going to be larger in the municipalities. I am not going to discuss that with him at this time. I can do so more intelligently a year from now, after those expenditures have been made.

I want to show, in conclusion, that there is one matter of criticism more important than mere detail in connection with highways in the present Budget. That is, Mr. Speaker, that the present Government proposes to increase the public debt of this province by approximately \$14,000,000 during the coming year. We need only go back over the record created during the twenty-four years the Liberal Government was in power and even if we allow what they accuse us of (which we do not) — that we are responsible for all the public debt added during the current fiscal year; even admitting that, the total public debt of the province at the present time is \$70,000,000 and the honourable minister proposes to increase it by \$14,000,000!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: No!

Mr. Gardiner: \$14,000,000 in round figures, Mr. Speaker and if his supplementaries are as big as for this year . . .

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: But the Provincial Treasurer has not admitted \$14,000,000.

Mr. Gardiner: If his supplementaries are as big as this year, it will be more than that. Then, in addition, we have a Bill now before the House to set up a whole new department of Government to administer the Natural Resources with not a single dollar in the estimates for it! And the agreement when it is entered into with the Federal Government will involve an expenditure, according to estimates, that will require practically the whole of the subsidy received in lieu of natural resources for administrative purposes; revenues which we have had to finance other departments. We are going to have a Research Council set up for which no provision has been made — and yet my friend says he is going to keep the Public Debt down to \$14,000,000 approximately, for this year! Well, \$14,000,000 a year for four years, means an addition of \$56,000,000 to the Public Debt and the greater part of this amount, except perhaps that in connection with Power, is for undertakings which will mean a burden on the taxes and a drain upon the people of the province. At the end of four years, if the Government intends to add to the Public Debt of the province at the rate of \$14,000,000 a year, we will have a Public Debt of around \$126,000,000 . . .

Premier Anderson: What will it be in ten years?

Mr. Gardiner: In ten years you won't be there. It will be \$126,000,000 in four years if this Budget is an indication. What will the cost be to the province? We were told in connection with the Farm Loan investigation that it costs the Government 5 1-3 per cent. to borrow money and that 5 1-3 per cent. did not take care of it from 1917 to 1929. Let us estimate it at 5 1/3 per cent! At that rate, it will cost us to carry the Public Debt alone — in interest and other charges upon the borrowings — \$6,670,000 a year. That is to carry the Public Debt alone. Part of the amount borrowed, it is true, will earn its way, that is the part invested in the Telephones will earn its way, and the part invested in the Farm Loan Board will earn its way if handled as carefully as in the past, and the amount invested in elevators will earn its way.

Government Member: What about Power?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, they have not made much provision for power. Those accounts with a few others are earning their way, but they will carry their way only to the extent of one-third of the annual requirement. Therefore you would have to provide \$4,400,000 out of the taxes of this province before you would have a single dollar to spend on the administration of any department of Government. One-third of the whole estimates for 1928 would be required to pay interest charges alone on the net capital debt of the province! I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for members of this House to go about the province stating they are going to make future generations pay for the things they are doing, but there is no way in the world that any Government can find to make the people of the future find the money to pay for things done in the present. Governments before this have run cities, towns and villages into debt and practically bankrupted them. Why, even the great city of Chicago, we were astounded to read in the press the other day, is practically bankrupt because of its expenditures. Governments cannot do that kind of thing. They may think that they are taxing the future, but the taxes are going to be right on the backs of the people of the present. This policy indicated to us by the present Government will place about one-third more taxation upon every man, woman and child in the province, in the next five years, than is being borne at the present time or has been borne at any time heretofore. What I would like to ask the people of this province is this: Do you think that should be done in a year such as we are passing through, when even our great Wheat Pool organisation has been in difficulties, when farmers are in difficulties on every farm in some districts, when single municipalities are applying for relief as high as \$150,000, when we are doling out this relief, when we are sending a man to the Peace River to buy oats and paying him at the rate of \$455 a month when experienced grain buyers all over the province are being paid at the rate of \$150 a month and when he comes back and we find those oats have cost 95 cents a bushel?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Not yet!

Mr. Gardiner: Well, the minister told us 95 cents, and only this morning I got in my mail a bill for seed oats — and do you know what my seed oats are costing me? Sixty-five cents a bushel! But this Government was so anxious to cut down the deficit of the last Government that they paid this gentleman \$455 a month to go to the Peace River country to buy seed oats, put them in an elevator down here and say to the farmers they must pay 95 cents a bushel for them! I went out and bought seed oats from my own neighbour at 65 cents a bushel! Well, that is a difference of 30 cents a bushel on some 250,000 bushels of seed oats. That is going to make part of the expenditure of this Government which they are attempting to blame the old Government for.

Hon. Mr. Buckle: No. We will take the blame for that.

Mr. Gardiner: I could point to a whole series of incidents like that: One was the blame for the reduction in the liquor profits, and the reduction in the price of liquor. I can say that they fired a sufficient number of Liquor Board employees, up to the middle of January, to involve \$15,000 in the payment of extra salaries alone, paid to men in lieu of notice while putting others in their places, because they could not get rid of them fast enough to get their Tory friends in.

Premier Anderson: We were glad to get rid of them.

Mr. Gardiner: And there are certain reasons why you are glad. There is not a man in this city who will say that men like the last Chairman of the Liquor Board will not size up very well with the type of individuals mentioned in the answers the Government has given to the questions we have asked. Never before have there been

so many answers given by a Government in regard to men who have been appointed, who had records in the police courts of this province behind them . . .

Premier Anderson: Nonsense!

Mr. Gardiner: And all the answers have not been brought down yet! Men have been fired all over the province — I do not complain about that. We expected that, if there were a change of Government, some men would be fired. But I did think, and I had a right to expect, that when good, decent Liberals were dismissed, good, decent Tories would be put in their places — or good, decent Progressives, as the case might be. I did not think, nor did I expect, that these positions would be filled by men such as those about whom questions have been asked and answered in this House, some of whom actually were dismissed after the answers were given. These are some of the facts that my honourable friend has admitted, and I would suggest to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that he make a further check on the finances of the province, in view of that fact, and I would suggest that this Government be more careful in the employment of civil servants in the next few months than they have been in the few months that have gone by since they took office.

In connection with the report of the Public Service Enquiry Commission which has been brought down, I would urge that, when the House is considering the new Civil Service Act, we should ignore the recommendation of the minority report made by the Minister of Public Works, and that we should do what the majority of that Commission recommend should be done: that this House should see to it that a non-partisan Board is appointed. I would suggest that the proper way to go about it is to select a committee — we have 28 Liberals over here and there are 24 Tories over there — that they give us an even break, give us equal representation on that committee. Then, with members of the Independent and Progressive groups holding the balance of power, let this committee choose the Chairman and members of the Board and recommend them to the House. Then let us sit down here and appoint the Board in the House. Then let the Board have authority to deal with the whole Civil Service in accordance with the service they have given. Give them power to deal with those appointed before September 9, last, and those appointed after that date, so that they might give this province a service at least equal to that which we had before September 9 — and they will get the support of this side of the House.

We, in this province, have been used to Budgets coming down that placed this province in an enviable position among the provinces of Canada in regard to its finances and its credit standing, but it is obvious that this condition will not continue, in the light of the Budget which has been presented to this House by the present Provincial Treasurer. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the present Budget, and would appeal to members of the House to do the same thing.

THE HONOURABLE HOWARD McCONNELL, B.A., LL.B., K.C.

(Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Municipal Affairs)

(Closing Debate)

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—I have listened with more than the usual amount of interest to the debate on the Budget Address because, in my humble way, and without prejudice, I did endeavour to present to our citizens the financial affairs of the province.

The debate started with a speech by the former Provincial Treasurer. During the week and a half that has elapsed since that time, the debate has continued until it was concluded by a speech from the former Premier and the present Leader of the Opposition. There has been criticism; there has also been commendation. If one were to believe, however, all that the Leader of the Opposition has said, one would be convinced that the country was going completely to the bow-wows.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal as briefly as I can with some of the comments made by the various speakers, particularly from those members to your left.

One remark I heard passed was, that we were "True Blue" Tories on this side of the Chamber, and that we were carrying on in "True Blue" Tory style. I wish someone would come along and give our friends opposite us some new ideas. I should be very glad to hear a new phrase from them once in a while. I have been hearing that kind of thing ever since I was old enough to read and I know supporters of the Government have heard it, too. But Sir, because some of the gentlemen to your left cannot grasp new ideas, they repeat and continue to repeat something they do not know the meaning of at all. May I say that I am not the Tory certain gentlemen on your left say I am. I suggest this to you, that the honourable members on this side of the House are just as close to the common people, whom they represent here, and just as well acquainted with them as any members in the Legislature. I say this because we on this side are common people ourselves. I shall admit that perhaps in the early days in England, the word "Tory" meant something. But we are not living in England. We are living in the western world where the word does not mean so much. Even the member for Prince Albert knows there are Tories to your left, Mr. Speaker, so he need not hurl that word over at us.

Here is an instance to show which way the wind is blowing. It will show where the real Tories are. I recall the first time I came to Regina to the Legislative Buildings. As I came up the walk toward the entrance, I noticed a sign on the sidewalk which said: "Enter by the West Door." I asked why this was and was told that "The main entrance is reserved for Cabinet Ministers, their wives and distinguished visitors." What could I conclude? Was it because the former Liberal Government feared that the people would dirty the carpet on the stairway, a carpet that the people themselves had paid for? Anyway, we were invited to this fine structure by the Liberal Government but were told that we had to go to the back door. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that one of the first things the new Co-operative Government did was to say: "The people of Saskatchewan paid for this beautiful building and we are anxious for the people to come here and enjoy the beauties of it and to see this Chamber." It said to the people, "The new Government wants you to come in by the main door and to get as much pleasure out of your own property as you can, and if you dirty the red carpet on the stairs, it will be cleaned." That is what this new Government said and did.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that any Government that succeeds us will never relegate the people of this province to the back door again.

I was much interested in the criticism which was directed at the few remarks I did have to make. Every person should be benefitted by honest criticism. There is not a speech delivered anywhere but merits criticism.

I appreciated the remarks of the honourable member for Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*). I also enjoyed the contribution of the honourable member for Touchwood (*Mr. Parker*). They were well meant and well taken. I enjoyed also, and listened with a considerable degree of appreciation to the speech of the former Premier, the Leader of the Opposition. I was particularly interested with respect to the apology delivered by him by which he endeavoured to justify the past Liberal Government's administration of one department, the Telephone Department, in connection with the expenditure of \$459.45 made to bring men into Regina from different parts of the province so that they could vote for Charlie Dunning in the Federal Election.

Opposition Members: How do you know they voted for Charlie Dunning?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: And, of course, he characterised this as a very unimportant matter, a mere detail. "Why," he said, "this is going on in every large corporation in the world. They pay their employees' transportation costs to enable them to go to their home towns to vote." I do not know what corporations the honourable member was talking about. I do not know whether other honourable members know of any, but I want to tell him that within my knowledge, they do not spend one nickle to get their employees home to vote. The Railway Companies were mentioned. The Railways may allow time off, but they do not spend one cent in order to allow their men home to vote. Is anything more preposterous or ridiculous than for the late Premier to get up in his place and say that from the taxes that are being poured into the coffers of the Government by the people, it is all right to use a portion of that money to fetch a certain group of men down to Regina to vote in a Federal Election for Mr. Dunning.

Mr. Davis: How do you know they did?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I know enough of the old "Machine" to know that it did not bring them down here without knowing which way they were going to vote.

The honourable gentleman who has just taken his seat (*Mr. Gardiner*) suggests that, because of the condition of some of the farmers of the province, there is need for real economy. And I say, "Amen," to that. The former Government should have practised while in office what it is now preaching. When the late Government was defeated at the polls, it did not give us a chance to take the reins of office but went to work and spent over \$2,000,000 without authority of the Legislature. Yet, in the face of that, we find the honourable Leader of the Opposition getting up and suggesting that, because of conditions which they themselves refused to recognise and would not take into consideration, we should for the next year, pare and cut down on our expenditures on highways. Mr. Speaker, the policy of the present Government is to give the farmers just as much relief as they possibly can get by giving work on those highways. Just because we are proposing that the major portion of the expenditures on highways should be spread over a period of years and charged to capital account, they are objecting to it. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditure is entirely justifiable and is one that the public or the province will commend.

Some reference was made by the last speaker to a statement that appeared in the press on September 19, 1929, in which it was stated that I said there was a deficit. I said nothing of the kind. I have stated this, that the former Government had over-expanded on revenue account \$2,750,000 more than they had received.

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman says that I made the statement. It was the "Independent Newspaper" in Regina that made the statement.

Mr. McConnell: And you repeated it and never corrected it, but I am correcting you now.

Mr. Speaker, one year ago last September, because of over-expenditures of money by the late Government, there was an operating deficit on revenue account of about \$1,350,000 and one year later, that is last September, that had grown to \$2,750,000 on revenue account.

Mr. Gardiner: What about it?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Well, if it does not mean anything to you, nothing will. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in order to maintain the credit of the province abroad, we have stripped the cupboard bare. What did we do? To pare down this deficit (and I have been asked a number of times why we did it, and I suggest to you that every resource we had recourse to was justifiable) we propose to take in the amount of \$159,200 which was handed over to the Co-operative Creameries to purchase some of its Amalgamation Series A bonds and capitalise that. I do not think there is anyone on the Opposition side of the Chamber who can criticise that action.

We also propose to take in, if necessary (because we cannot tell you yet just how much will be required) the \$70,000 spent on guarantees for local improvement districts. Is there anyone on the other side of the House who will say that is not good business?

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): What are you going to do with it?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We propose to capitalise it under The Deferred Charges Act. The honourable member very well knows we can do it under the authority so conferred. We propose also to take the \$350,000 spent for relief work on highways in the dried out areas, which we can declare to be emergent expenditure, and capitalise that. Is there anyone who will say that is not proper in order to maintain the credit of the province?

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, I will say it is not.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We have spent around \$250,000 on freight charges on fodder shipped into the dried-out areas. Is there anyone here who will say that this is not an emergent expenditure, and that we should not capitalise it? Then we have spent over \$100,000 on seed oats to assist these farmers, and, by the end of this year, this will probably be nearer \$200,000. We have spent \$30,000 on unemployment relief. That is an emergency expenditure, Mr. Speaker, and we propose to capitalise both of these items. Is there anybody here who says that that is not a strictly proper thing to do?

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): I would like to be sure on that point. I presume the Minister means, when he says "proposes to capitalise," that it is under The Deferred Charges Act and not on long term?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Yes over a period of five years. Might I say with regard to the seed oats' purchase, which appears to the gentlemen opposite so much, that the executive of the Wheat Pool came to us and suggested that we purchase a quantity of seed oats.

Mr. Hogan: That does not say it is right.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The honourable member for North Qu'Appelle (*Mr. Gardiner*) told us of having purchased his seed oats from his neighbour. That is a very easy thing to do in small quantities, but if you go out to purchase 200,000 bushels, it is a different matter entirely.

Mr. Gardiner: I did not complain of buying the oats. I complained of them costing 95 cents a bushel.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: All right. Let's check up on that. That price was the going price for oats at the time they were purchased. We employed a man who knows this business to do it. Surely, because of the fact that the market fluctuates, we are not to blame. If the price goes down, we shall have to take a loss. That is all there is to it.

The previous speaker enunciated a list of things with particulars, in which he says we should have economised. He mentioned criminal prosecutions. We are not responsible for crime. Might I tell honourable members, however, that if there is one thing more than another that destroyed the confidence of the people in the late Government, it was the widespread feeling that there was not an impartial enforcement of law in Saskatchewan. When we came here, we came in committed to strict and impartial enforcement of the law and we have been commended by former supporters of the late Government who said to us "There is one thing you did do. You said you would prosecute offenders and you have done that."

Mr. Davis: Yes, you have done everything but convict them.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: And with not a file in your office on it.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: More than \$1,900,000 was spent by the late Government on highways over and above the appropriation voted by the Legislature last year. We did not step in and cancel every contract because we knew there was going to be some suffering as a result of the drought. We did, however, cancel \$300,000 on contracts, because we wanted to be as economical as possible.

With reference to the supplementary estimates of over \$5,000,000 passed by this Assembly of which the former Premier has so much to say, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that every cent of that money was spent by the former Government except a matter of \$800,000. This \$800,000 has been spent largely on account of relief and on account of matters beyond our control. This in itself, while a large amount, represents only a small fraction of the more than \$5,000,000 in the supplementary estimates, the major portion of which, as I say, the old Government was responsible for. Yet we hear the childish twaddle that we are responsible for the whole amount of these estimates.

The honourable member said tonight, when he was discussing highway appropriations, that he had taken the wise precaution when he left office of taking a certain document with him. It seems to me he must have had a guilty conscience and was fleeing from the wrath to come.

Mr. Gardiner: Would honourable gentleman repeat that statement?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: My honourable friend, the member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*)

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman, I think, made some personal reference to myself having taken something away. I would like him to repeat the statement if he remembers it himself.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I understood my honourable friend to say, only a few moments ago, that when he left office he had fortified himself by taking with him certain documents.

Mr. Gardiner: No, I did not say anything of the kind. I said that I had here a statement from the Highways Department at the time we went out.

Hon. Mr. McPherson: To protect yourself.

Mr. Gardiner: It was a statement as to what were the authorisations of the Highways Department at the time we went out.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Well, the honourable gentleman evidently thought he would need it. The honourable member for Maple Creek was very anxious to know what the Minister of Railways (*Hon. Mr. Merkley*) was doing to justify his existence. I am very glad to tell him tonight, that the Minister of Railways has done a very great deal and has been very active. I have here a letter from the Vice-president of the Canadian National Railways to the effect that the Sturgis Cut-Off, making a short run between Regina and Hudson Bay Junction will be in operation about May 14 next, and that freight rates to the Bay will be reduced around that time.

Certain references were made in speeches of several of the members as to the lack of any appropriations by the House for the Natural Resources Department. Might I tell honourable members that, at the time we brought down the Budget, we knew we were dealing with a Liberal Government at Ottawa. We hoped we should have these resources, but we did not know for a certainty when we were going to get them. So we did not want to put figures in the estimates anticipating something that might not be realised. I am glad to say we are going to have these Natural Resources and the agreement with the Federal Government has been signed.

The former Minister took great delight in saying that never in the history of the Government in Saskatchewan had any administration hired so many crooks. I have in my hand a document testifying that the late Liberal Government engaged a man who had served time for manslaughter and had made him a guard at the gaol. We had to fire that man.

Mr. Gardiner: And you put a man in his place who also had served time in gaol.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I appreciated the criticism of the Budget address by my honourable friend from Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*) because he meant well. I appreciated also the criticism by the honourable member for Touchwood (*Mr. Parker*) because those

criticisms were to the point. I regret to say there was one gentleman on your left who went beyond the bounds of ordinary courtesy, not criticising anything which was in the Budget but levelling a personal attack upon myself. May I say this, the minute a man sets out to attack and attacks a person instead of a principle, he is admitting that he has a mighty poor case. Honourable members who sit in this House with the honourable member for Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*) (and I may say that never have I said anything of a personal derogatory nature affecting the member from Kinistino) know that he went out of his way to say things of an uncomplimentary nature to myself. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are told there is a legend which says that an Angel of Light hovers over a great many homes where a birth is about to take place and as a result the child is born under a benign influence and grows up to be either a lady or a gentleman. Judging from the honourable gentleman's speech, however, I doubt very much if that Angel hovered over the home where he was born.

Honourable members who were in the House previously have heard the honourable gentleman speak ever and anon. (He used to occupy the seat in the House now occupied by the honourable member for Kerrobert (*Mr. Hanbidge*)). I recall that on every possible occasion whenever the former Premier was assailed, he jumped to his feet and defended the Premier until those who sat in the seats to the left of you, came to consider him as the "yes-man" or "water boy" of the former Premier. On one occasion, which has been reported in the little "Red Book" (*Liberal Handbook, 1929*) he got up in his place and delivered what was supposed to be an oration, in which he eulogised the former Premier and stated in the most positive terms that the coming election would, by its results show the present Leader of the Opposition to be one of Canada's greatest native sons. Well, Mr. Speaker, see how the mighty have fallen. We occupy the treasury benches and the honourable gentleman from Kinistino, what about him? He is where he is.

I come now to the matter of the deficit of \$400,000 which I said was facing the province at the end of the year. I listened attentively to the remarks of the former Provincial Treasurer (*Mr. Patterson*) in which he, to his own satisfaction, turned that deficit into a surplus. He computed the Gasoline Tax at \$2,000,000. He forgot to deduct the refunds amounting to \$800,000. Hence his surplus was all shot to pieces. I may tell him also, that there was some \$159,000 paid out on account of maturing debentures of the Creameries. Why, Mr. Speaker, if we had to live on the kind of surplus the former Provincial Treasurer gave us, we should all starve to death!

I turn now to the expenditures on revenue account in 1929-1930: Our estimated expenditures on revenue account were \$15,947,175, and I should like honourable gentlemen to your left to take their pencils and take this down. We have heard so much about deficits that we should be getting down to facts by this time.

Mr. Hogan: Duke of Deficits.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Estimated expenditure \$15,947,175. Take that down!

The supplementary estimates tabled in this Chamber the other day showed an additional estimated expenditure on revenue account of \$2,300,000. This was an expenditure incurred for the current fiscal year for which the old Government is responsible. This makes total expenditure on revenue account for the current year of over \$18,000,000. We propose to expend during the coming year, according to the estimates before you, \$17,740,000 on revenue account. This is a smaller amount than was expended last year by the late Government and yet they tell us, Mr. Speaker, that the country is going to the dogs.

Let us consider now the gross amount of expenditure \$26,000,000, capital and revenue. There was a streamer head-line in the papers and I have heard various members discuss this and say that we are proposing to spend \$10,000,000 more this year than last year. This is not true. The total amount of money in the supplementary estimates was in excess of \$5,000,000 and the past Government was responsible for every cent of that \$5,000,000 over the amount spent by this Government in relief measures.

Mr. Gardiner: Is the honourable minister trying to argue that he is not going to have any supplementaries this coming year?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: When we come to that matter we shall consider it. I am trying to show that the performance of the old Government in comparison with that of the new Government

Mr. Gardiner: Take them on the same basis!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The basis I am taking them on is our position at the present time. The past Government is responsible for the expenditure during the fiscal year of an amount in excess of \$31,000,000. That is something that has never been stated in the newspapers, but it is true.

I have in front of me the total of the supplementary estimates, \$5,237,890. Add that to your \$26,000,000 and you are going to get an excess of \$31,000,000. This is the amount the former Government spent for the people of Saskatchewan during the past year.

Mr. Gardiner: Is the honourable gentleman going to give the former Government credit for all that happened in the last eight months of the current year?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, the last Government was in power from May 1 until September 6, and my honourable friend, as former Minister, well knows that those are the spending months in which nearly the whole \$5,000,000 was spent.

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): Might I ask the honourable minister a question? If he admits those are the spending months why did he not say so in his statement to the Press at that time?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: What I said was true, and I do not retract a single letter or a word. What I say now is that during the four months the former Government was in office, it committed the present Government to certain things and we had to assume them and now we are saddled with that \$5,000,000 expenditure. Yet the former Leader of the Government says that never in the history of the Government in Saskatchewan have there been supplementary estimates of \$5,000,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, in damning that he is damning his own late Government for the responsibility for those supplementary estimates belongs to his own Government.

Our estimated expenditures for the coming year amount to \$34,896,000. This is an increase over the money expended by the former Government of just about \$3,000,000. How do we make this up? I am going to ask at this time, Mr. Speaker, if any honourable gentleman on the opposite side is opposed to any of these expenditures, let him get up and declare himself and move that they be reduced or dispensed with altogether.

Mr. Davis: Which are those?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just listen to them.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The first expenditures we are making are in connection with the Power Commission for the distribution of electric power. Yet they get up in their places and say we have no power policy. Does the honourable gentleman (*Mr. Spence*) object to that amount?

Mr. Spence: What was that?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: You see he is not even listening.

Mr. Spence: I was not interested.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: He has lost interest. He has enough troubles on his hands at the present time, therefore he is not anxious for any more. Last year the Government of the day placed in the estimates \$1,700,000 for the development of a power policy and now they have the temerity to get up and say that we are dodging that issue.

Mr. Gardiner: Who said that?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Oh! It was said all over the country when we did not get the Moose Jaw plant.

Mr. Gardiner: You did not try to get it.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We did not try to get the Moose Jaw plant it is true and the reason for that was, not because we were derelict, but because there was nothing in the Statutes of the Province to prevent the sale of municipal plants to private purchasers at exorbitant prices.

Mr. Davis: Why did you not introduce a Bill?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: We are going to do this at the first opportunity.

Mr. Gardiner: Your bill does not do that.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: It is going to prevent sales at unreasonable amounts. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are appropriating over and above the amount the old Government appropriated, the sum of \$1,300,000. If there is anybody in this House who disagrees with that item let him get up in his place and say so. In planning a definite power expansion policy, this extra sum is needed. So, Mr. Speaker, we have not been derelict in our duties.

Last year when the old Government was approached (in spite of what my honourable friend has said about cutting down expenditures requested by different departments) they were not able to resist the blandishments of certain people of the province and they spent on public buildings the sum of \$2,324,000. We are effecting a saving this year, of \$1,819,000 in that regard. We propose to spend \$505,000. I suggest to you that this is in the direction of economy.

Here is another increase and I would like to hear some criticism of this expenditure. We are proposing to spend the sum of \$115,000 for the purchase of radium to assist us in a cancer program. Has anybody any exception to take to that expenditure? If so, let us hear it!

We have some further increases in expenditure to show how this total increase of \$3,146,000 is arrived at. We are spending \$84,000 for the printing and binding of the Revised Statutes. This is an expenditure which comes along every ten years, but we are going to get it done not following the method of the former Government, but by calling for tenders.

There is also an increase in Treasury items to provide interest for the Public Debt. The former Premier said that this increase was accounted for by some of the roads we are going to build this year. This is true in part. A portion, however, will have to be made to take care of the Highway expenditures which the old Government made this past year which we have capitalised.

Then there is another increase. We are spending \$77,000 more on the Farm Loan Board this year by way of interest. Has anybody any objection to make about this? No objection, Mr. Speaker! We shall have everybody agreeing on this Budget before we get through.

Regarding the Department of Education, there is a slight increase of expenditure there. We must naturally look forward to a normal increase in school population and must keep pace with it in the matter of facilities, more schools, more school districts and more school grants. This is an expenditure we cannot control. It is entirely justified. I think we are all agreed on that.

Then we come to the Department of Agriculture. There is provision made this year for an increased appropriation for the campaign against weeds. Has anybody anything to say against that?

Mr. Gardiner: We are not in committee yet.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: There is another increase and our friends to your left, Mr. Speaker, were responsible for this. It is an item of \$87,370 to take care of increases of salary to employees granted before the late Government went out of office.

Mr. Patterson (Pipestone): You are omitting Highways.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I am coming to that. The increase for highways, has anybody anything to say about that?

Let us come down now to the Department of Public Health. The member for Vonda will be interested in that I know. Last year the Expenditure on Public Health was \$1,087,102. This has been increased roughly \$100,000 this year: the Cancer services, \$30,000; maintenance of Mental Hospitals, \$58,000 more; expenditures under The Hospitals Act and The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act, 1923, up \$8,000. Does anybody criticise these increases?

Then there is another increase, and we cannot condemn this. It is an increase in Old Age Pension requirements.

These are some of the increases for which the Government must provide and I shall leave it to the members of this House and to the people of the province to say if this is any wild orgy of expenditure.

Mr. Davis: Now give us some of the decreases you are making.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I have only pointed out the departments where increases are being made and the total increase is around \$3,000,000.

Now we come to the Department of Highways. Last year, the Legislature appropriated the sum of \$4,250,000 for this purpose but presumably because it was election year, the Government of the day over-expended that amount by \$2,130,000 without authority of the Legislature and not by special warrant at the time.

Mr. Patterson: Might I just correct the Honourable Minister's statement. No money has got to be paid out until the work is completed. He knows that.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, expenditures were made which were subsequently authorised by special warrant. But I am saying this, in some cases expenditures were authorised by special warrant and in some cases this procedure was not followed. I know what I am talking about.

In connection with expenditures on Highways, one of the planks in the Conservative platform was to the effect that we should keep pace with the times and spend more money in order to give our people better roads. But we considered that this expenditure should be met out of capital partly, and the balance out of revenue. So, in this department, we have an increase of approximately \$4,000,000 capital expenditure. I do not think any of the citizens of our province will say that this is a piece of extravagance. These are facts which will be set forth in detail when these items of expenditure are considered in committee. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the total expenditure for the coming year, as set forth in the estimates now before you, is only \$3,000,000 more than was expended by the late Government last year.

Something has been said in this debate in connection with the Co-Operative Creameries, and it was the fervent wish and prayer of the former Provincial Treasurer that politics would be kept out of these Creameries. I should tell him one thing—this Government feels that there has been too much duplication of plants, too much over-lapping in the organisation, and we feel that the people of Saskatchewan believe that in part this is due to political interference in the past.

Mr. Patterson: In what way, may I ask?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The Company went into places where it was not needed and built creameries.

Mr. Gardiner: Is it not true that cold storage plants were built during war-time by the Federal Government and were found to be a losing proposition and were closed?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: My honourable friend knows very well there were cases in this country where they were not needed and the Co-Operative Creameries went in and built.

Mr. Patterson: What did the Government have to do with it?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: The Government should have stepped in and prevented that duplication.

Mr. Gardiner: Should the Government not have been a friend of that institution?

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I have been told that the late Government was more of a devil than a friend to this institution and that it would have been much better had it kept its hands off it.

With further reference to the subject of Highways, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this criticism—"The Legislature is not told where the highways are going to be built, and yet it was advised that it was the policy of the Government to tell where the money was going to be spent."

We even had a member get up in his place and say that the Minister of Highways in giving the Legislature this information, was bringing the highways into politics. He never did anything of the kind.

I remember when the member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*) asked for his \$4,000,000 appropriation for highways, when he sat here last year, we asked him where he was going to build these roads and he told us that he did not know. Probably he did not know, Mr. Speaker, because he had not yet been informed where his political friends wanted the money to be spent.

The policy of the new Government is to come out in the open and tell the people of the Province where they are going to spend the money on roads. We were buying a "pig in a poke" when we voted the highway appropriation in past years but we are not going to stand for that anymore in this Province.

Mr. Gardiner: When were we told where the Government was going to spend the money? We were told yesterday by the Minister of Highways (*Hon. Mr. Stewart*) only that the money was going to be spent somewhere between the Manitoba and Alberta boundaries.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Why Mr. Speaker, in all the daily newspapers of the province a list of the highways on which the money was going to be spent was published.

Mr. Gardiner: I did not understand it.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Well that is not our fault. It does not take a man of superlative intelligence to understand it. It was clear enough.

In their criticism of the Farm Loan Board, the honourable gentlemen opposite have tried to tell the people of this Province that this Government is out to "gyp" the farmers and wreck the Farm Loan Board. I do know this—we have shown what our attitude towards this scheme is, by our appropriation of \$1,500,000 for loaning purposes. We are going to see that this enterprise succeeds as it should.

Then there was some criticism of the Minister of Highways on account of a "jaunt" he made down to the southern part of the Province, and it was said that he had paraded himself around the affected districts as a "Santa Claus." I should like to know what would happen to the former Provincial Treasurer if he had gone down and made a speech of this description from the same platforms with the Minister of Highways present. The Minister went down and saw for himself what the needs in these communities were, and as a result we have spent this sum of \$340,000 on relief work on highways in these districts.

Some reference was also made by the former Provincial Treasurer about Sinking Funds. He asked what provision was behind made for same. I should like to tell him that the same provision is being made as was made by the previous Government. We think it good business practice.

Then the former Provincial Treasurer referred to the Price-Waterhouse report and said there had been no criticism of it in the Budget Speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we complete that report, then will be the proper time to say something about it.

There was criticism also, that the Budget Speech revealed no policy for the future. If that be true, then there was no policy of any kind in the Budget speeches of the former Provincial Treasurer or of the present Leader of the Opposition when he occupied that office.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the main criticism made by most of the members opposite with regard to the Budget Speech was that it is a political speech.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Surely they did not expect me to get up and make the same kind of a Budget Speech as all Provincial Treasurers have made—full of praise of the late Government and not one word of criticism! I have heard three Budget Speeches already in this House, and every one was an eulogy of the late Government. Everything was lovely—the goose hung high. The people of this province want none of those namby-pamby speeches with no criticism at all. We were not sent here to make speeches of that kind at this session. The people were not satisfied and they said to us on June 6, "If you find anything to criticise stand up and make your criticisms." Why, Sir, even

the writers in the *Regina Post* in their column, "By the Banks of the Wascana," remarked that the Provincial Treasurer was not nearly so severe as he might have been in his criticism of the old Government.

There is not a speech delivered in this Legislature and there is no business of any kind transacted here which is not political. When I say political I mean political in its highest sense. I did criticise the former Government and I have criticised whenever criticism was due. In that regard, I am content, not to leave it to the gentlemen to your left, Mr. Speaker, to say when criticism is fair and just, but I am satisfied to leave it to the people of Saskatchewan and let them be both judge and jury.

SPEECH ON
THE SECOND READING OF
AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A
PERMANENT CANCER COMMISSION

THE HONOURABLE F. D. MUNROE, M.D.

(Minister of Public Health)

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In moving the second reading of this Bill to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Cancer Commission I desire to present some information on the cancer problem to the honourable members of this House: what the problem comprises; how it can be dealt with, and what results can reasonably be expected.

What is cancer? Briefly, cancer is an uncontrolled growth, or, rather, overgrowth, of certain tissues of the body. Practically all tissues may be affected by one or other of the various forms of the disease, but the point I wish to emphasise is that cancer growth is always, in the first instance, a purely local condition.

Medical science has not as yet determined the true cause of the disease, if it can be assumed that there is only one common cause for all forms of the condition. It is known, and recognised, however, that chronic irritations of various kinds bear a definite relation to the development of cancer in certain areas — as in the case of cancer of the mouth, skin and certain internal organs. Many investigators have suspected or condemned certain forms of dietary indiscretions in connection with stomach and intestinal cancers, but no proof of this theory exists at present, other than the fact that cancer has increased among civilised peoples, with the attending changes of diet which invariably accompany civilisation. I think one can best describe cancer as an accelerated local growth of certain cells of the body tissues, without any organised control, into tumors, with gradual invasion into other tissues of the body.

The preliminary report of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicates that, in 1928, the death rates per 100,000 of population for the provinces of Canada were as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Prince Edward Island | 114.0 |
| Ontario | 106.6 |
| Nova Scotia | 104.2 |
| British Columbia..... | 98.8 |
| New Brunswick | 92.3 |
| Manitoba | 78.8 |
| Quebec | 77.2 |
| Alberta | 65.3 |
| Saskatchewan | 55.2 |
| All Canada..... | 88.2 |

This table shows the favourable position occupied by this province at the present time, but it should be remembered that the provincial death rate from cancer has

increased since 1905 from 8.8 to 55.2 per 100,000 of population in 1928. In the last ten years, there has been an increase in the cancer death rate of 22.1 per 100,000 of population. I may add, while the death rate in 1928 was 55.2, in 1929 it was approximately 57.4. Further, in the ten-year period previously mentioned, the cancer deaths have increased from 38.3 per 1,000 deaths from all causes in 1919, to 76.2 in 1928. In other words, the proportion of cancer deaths to deaths from all causes, has practically doubled.

As I have said, the situation in this province may be regarded as favourable when compared with that existing in other provinces; but when the increased death rate is considered, it shows that the present time is not by any means too early to make a serious and determined effort to deal with the cancer problem.

The length of life of the average cancer patient, without treatment, is found to approximate about two years from the time of the onset of the disease. There were 470 deaths in the year 1928, and we may estimate that there were, at any one time during the past two years, approximately 1,000 cases of cancer existing in the province. However, in addition, we must take into consideration the fact that a certain number of the severe types of cancer are treated today by radical surgery, lengthening the life of the patient from one to ten years, and, in many cases, effecting permanent cures; and, of course, we know that a large proportion of external cancers are cured. Therefore, it is comparatively safe to estimate that at least 1,500 cases of cancer exist in the province at the present time.

Cancer is a disease which usually occurs in that period of life after 35 years, but the great majority of the deaths are recorded for the age-period between 50 and 79 years. It is a disease pre-eminently of late adult life. Consequently, in order properly to evaluate the situation in this province, we must consider the age distribution of the population.

Saskatchewan is a comparatively young province as regards the average age of its population. The 1921 census showed that of persons living between the ages of 50 and 79 years, Saskatchewan had only 9.07 per cent., while Ontario had 16.93 per cent. When making a comparison of the death rates from cancer for the various provinces of Canada for the year 1921, when the last Dominion census was taken, it is seen that the cancer death rate bears a fairly definite relation to the percentage of the population living at the age of 50 years and over. The following are the statistics for the year 1921 in the order of the cancer death rate:

| | Cancer death rate, 1921 | Percentage of population over 50 years of age |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Nova Scotia..... | 93.9 | 17.99 |
| Ontario | 88.1 | 17.78 |
| British Columbia | 74.9 | 15.09 |
| Manitoba | 74.7 | 11.61 |
| New Brunswick | 71.9 | 16.50 |
| Quebec | 55.8 | 13.47 |
| Alberta | 47.9 | 10.43 |
| Saskatchewan | 38.4 | 9.28 |

You will note some variation in the relation as shown by that table, notably in the case of Manitoba; but it must be remembered that many factors besides age enter the question. In any case, the age distribution of the population is a fairly reliable guide by which to estimate what death rate may reasonably be expected in the future, until the population age has been stabilised to a certain degree. Consequently, it is in order to assume that in Saskatchewan we may look forward to a continual increase in the deaths from cancer as the population becomes older. This fact is amply illustrated by the death rates from cancer in the older countries of the world: Switzerland had a rate of 135.3 per 100,000 in 1926; Denmark, 135 in 1925; Norway, 114 in 1924; Sweden, 110 in 1923; Germany, 108 in 1924, and France, 78 in 1925. England had a rate of 137.6 per 100,000 in 1927, showing an increase from 121.5 in the year 1921. I may add that the increase in England has been constant since the 1847-50 records were made.

In the practice of medicine at the present time, it is found that the elimination of early internal cancer as a probable cause of any suspicious symptoms which may be presented by a patient, involves a thorough investigation by the physician, and even

then the early stage of cancer may be overlooked, and correct diagnosis made at a time when curative measures may be very difficult or impossible. On the other hand, the early symptoms of internal cancer are often so deceptive and insidious that the patient himself does not consider them serious, and so much valuable time is lost. One of our main objectives must be the correcting, as far as possible, of these two factors which operate so fatally in dealing with this problem — lack of thorough investigation on the part of the physician and carelessness on the part of the patient.

In Saskatchewan there is no doubt that the training and ability of the medical profession compare very favourably with that in any other province or state on this continent. In our hospitals and larger centres the facilities for differential diagnosis and adequate, efficient treatment are available, with the exception of radium therapy. The province covers a wide area, with sparse settlement, and, in order to obtain the best results in the control of cancer, it would appear advisable to co-ordinate, and augment when necessary, these facilities, so that they may be made available to all patients requiring them. This, I may state, is another objective of the Bill now before you.

The lack of co-ordination of all the facilities that exist for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer makes for individualism, and it is very doubtful if the best results can be thereby obtained in dealing with this problem. It has been well said that "experience is a great teacher," and this is particularly applicable to cancer diagnosis and treatment. The recommendations of the Cancer Committee of the Saskatchewan Medical Association in connection with the formation of cancer conferences among local physicians on all cancer cases would do much to promote greater efficiency in both the diagnosis and treatment of cancer. It should be obvious to anyone that the more cases of a certain disease a physician has contact with, the more expert he becomes in its treatment.

The one great handicap under which all physicians labour at the present time in connection with cancer, is the delay on the part of patients in consulting them and, in addition, the delay which very often occurs in having a differential diagnosis made through consultation, when any doubt exists in the mind of the physician in attendance. Statistics on this phase of the question are not available for Saskatchewan, but they are being obtained. Even so, cancer is very much the same disease the world over, consequently figures from other places can be applied, with possibly some reservations, to this province.

A study was made by Dr. B. J. Shore in connection with 1,000 consecutive cases of cancer admitted to St. Luke's Hospital, New York City, between the years 1923 and 1927, both inclusive. He found that: 62 cases were declined admittance on account of being too far advanced; seven cases refused operation; 359 cases were inoperable on account of being in too advanced a stage, and 632 cases were treated surgically. But of the 632 cases treated surgically, 312 cases were given only palliative or exploratory operations and only 320 cases were given curative operations.

It may be seen from a study of these figures I have just quoted that only 320 of those 1,000 cases of cancer reached the surgeon sufficiently early to justify the performing of a curative operation. Only 29.4 per cent. of the total of 1,000 cases left the hospital with some assurance of cure.

From France, Professor T. Marie, of Toulouse, gave similar statistics in 1926 at the Lake Mohonk Symposium on Cancer held under the auspices of the American Society for the Control of Cancer. He stated:

"Complete statistics on those cases sent to the Toulouse centre for radiation show: 30 per cent. are hopelessly incurable; 40 per cent. are already in a condition of generalisation which has become more or less advanced; 30 per cent. arrive in a condition favourable for effective treatment."

There can be very little doubt that the two studies just mentioned are reasonably representative of the cancer problem today, so far as it relates to the stage of the disease when the patient reaches the surgeon. This being the case, I want to emphasise the fact that any programme dealing with this great problem must be based upon two important factors: first, the education of the public to the necessity for early and thorough examination, with special emphasis on the periodical examination of apparently healthy persons; and, second, the provision for adequate and efficient diagnostic and treatment service.

In what way can this problem be dealt with? The answer to this question, I may state, is the principle of the Bill now before the House.

In a number of the European countries organisations have been developed to deal with this problem, some with governmental assistance or subsidy, and others under government control. On this continent, only one state or province has, to date, developed a programme to control cancer, and that is Massachusetts. It is true that many isolated institutions with municipal or private assistance, have responded to the urge that the problem has stimulated, and are attempting to do what they can; and many of the hospitals and universities in affiliation with hospitals have provided cancer services, but in only one state has a comprehensive programme been inaugurated to deal with the whole question — education, diagnosis and treatment.

In an address before the Conference of State and Provincial Health authorities of North America on "Cancer as a Public Health Problem," Dr. James Ewing, Professor of Pathology at Cornell University, and Director of Cancer Research, Memorial Hospital, New York City, stated:

"Fifteen years ago the Government of Sweden purchased a large amount of radium and has the foremost cancer institute in the world, devoted to radiation therapy and diagnosis. Practically all cases are required to attend for treatment and follow-up supervision, the government paying railroad fares and maintenance charges.

Norway is almost equal to Sweden in organisation, and Denmark is following rapidly.

The British Ministry of Health has raised \$2,500,000 to purchase 30 grams of radium (the government paying half). Various quantities of the radium, with modern X-ray machines, are to be located in 10 different centres for diagnosis and treatment.

Massachusetts has devoted funds for the establishment of special cancer hospitals and for the provision of special cancer diagnosis on a modern basis."

He concludes with the following pertinent statement:

"When the public is assured of the best results of treatment at the hands of thoroughly competent physicians, it will not fail to show appreciation in the proper manner. When the cancer service is brought up to the highest possible standard there will be less excuse for the indifference and fear of the patient."

In addition to those activities mentioned by Dr. Ewing, France has also embarked on a national cancer programme and has established thirteen centres; Australia, in 1927, purchased 10 grams of radium, and is distributing it to different states upon condition that efficient cancer services are established; Germany and Italy are also working out programmes but as yet their efforts have not assumed a national scope.

It will be seen, therefore, that what we are proposing to do in Saskatchewan has authoritative precedent, and it is my intention that this province shall lead the way in Canada, so far as provincial action is concerned, in dealing with the cancer problem on a province-wide basis.

The Bill I have presented makes specific provision for the education of the public, and this is one of the most important phases of the whole matter. It is intended that this aspect shall receive constant and persistent attention, because, no matter how efficient the methods of treatment, if patients do not seek early advice and examination, and are not prepared to accept the information given them, we can hope to accomplish very little. I cannot conceive, however, that an informed public will be prepared deliberately to commit suicidal acts with cancer as the specific agent, when the way is open to prolong life or to remove the scourge which is attacking it.

May I instance, in this connection, the history of the treatment of tuberculosis. It is not many years ago that it was considered a blot on the family record to have to take treatment for this disease, and there was decided antagonism to sanatorium treatment. You all know how effectively this faulty conception of sanatorium treatment has been corrected; and it is, I think, not too much to hope that as much will be accomplished with cancer.

Dr. Louis I. Dublin, an eminent statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in the United States, makes the following observations:

"The efforts that have been put forth during the past ten years are, in the light of our figures, relatively puny. Where we ought to be spending millions for research, we are spending thousands; where we have a few hundred physicians trained to recognise and treat cancerous states, we need thousands. The recognised facilities for the care and treatment of hopeful cases are pitifully inadequate and

unorganised. The question I wish to raise is: What are intelligent laymen, physicians and surgeons going to do about the huge cancer hazard which confronts the average citizen today?"

And so one could continue to quote statements made by prominent authorities on the cancer problem, emphasising the value and need of action. Any person who cares to familiarise himself with the subject can obtain plenty of literature, but surely it is unnecessary to stress the necessity for action. The cases of cancer of which we all know, among our friends or, it may be among our relatives, serve to emphasise this. However, one of the important features of the problem is the necessity for diagnosis, early diagnosis, and you will note that, in the Bill before you, provision has been made for the establishment of consultative diagnostic clinics. If worth-while results are to be obtained, it is absolutely essential that both patients and physicians shall have available the best possible service for consultation and early diagnosis. This we intend to provide as an essential part of our programme, and in co-operation with the medical profession. The opinions of all authorities on the subject confirm this requirement. Even such an authority as W. Sampson Handley, F.R.C.S., London, has this to say on the matter of diagnosis:

"I venture to assert that the detection of early cancer is not a one-man job. It may require the co-operation of the patient, the family doctor, the specialist and the pathologist. In medical matters breadth and depth of knowledge are both necessary, but the qualities cannot be combined in one person. The treatment of the patient with cancer is a salvage operation requiring the combined effort of the family physician and the specialist."

In certain European centres and in some places on this continent, the development of radium treatment of cancer has made quite rapid strides. In those places where adequate amounts of radium are made available, and where it is applied by expertly trained physicians, very excellent results are being obtained. In some forms of cancer, the cures equal those of surgery and this without the dangers attendant upon surgical intervention, when the treatment is applied under the supervision of competent personnel.

The one great difficulty about radium, however, is that it is prohibitive in cost for the individual physician or institution to obtain in proper amount for general use in all forms of cancer. There is not only the initial cost to be considered but, when the initial outlay is so large, it is the part of economy to see that the radium is kept in constant use, not lying idle, and it is only by proper organisation that this arrangement can be made. It is our intention, therefore, to obtain an amount of radium suitable to our needs, and establish centres where this form of treatment can be administered to cancer patients under thoroughly trained and competent physicians. I need only add, in referring to the inability of the individual physician to obtain a sufficient supply of radium, and to be able to use it economically, that radium costs approximately \$70,000 to \$80,000 per gram, which is the equivalent of about 15 grains.

Radium is used in the treatment of cancer in two ways. In the great majority of cases the radium salt is used in various types and forms of containers and needles, but there is a field for its use in the form of radium gas. The gas is collected from a quantity of the radium salt in solution, into very minute tubes of gold, called "seeds." A somewhat elaborate apparatus is required to generate and purify this gas and, as well, to collect it and regulate the dosage in each seed. From information I have received from members of the medical profession in the adjoining provinces and British Columbia, the opportunity of procuring these seeds from this province would be welcomed, and excellent use could be made of them in the treatment of cancer patients.

There is one feature of the emanation plant, however, which merits careful consideration. It is necessary to be reasonably certain that there will be sufficient demand for the seeds, in order that the gas which is constantly being generated can be used. When we are assured that the demand for the gold seeds will be sufficient to keep the plant in operation, it is our intention to establish the plant at the University, provided suitable arrangements can be made, which I have no doubt will be the case. The Physics Department has the necessary facilities for caring for such a plant and it has also the technical staff capable of caring for the radium, measuring dosages, and so on. In addition, there is the further consideration that the establishment of the plant at the University will provide the stimulus and necessary material for a certain amount of research with regard to the properties of radium as a therapeutic agent.

From advice I have received, it is evident that such a plant will fill a need which has been apparent for some time, and we shall be able to supply most, if not all, the radium seed requirements of the physicians and hospitals of Western Canada. The very

fact that this emanation plant will be under government supervision and control, will add much to the stability of the undertaking, and its being under the expert attention of the University authorities will add a prestige which will, without doubt, be thoroughly appreciated by the physicians using this product.

This part of our programme explains the necessity, as indicated in the Bill, of making regulations governing the sale of radium emanations and derivatives. This sale will, no doubt, materially assist in providing revenue by which this undertaking we are inaugurating may be made a self-sustaining venture.

As to the physics of radium, I want to quote you an extract from an expert on the subject, Professor E. L. Harrington, of the Department of Physics, University of Saskatchewan. This, I may state, is written from the lay standpoint:

"Briefly stated, we believe that all molecules consist of nuclei surrounded by one or more electrons, the nucleus itself being made up of protons and electrons and perhaps combinations of them. The atoms of most substances are quite stable, but in the case of a few substances they are not, such substances exhibiting — due to their instability — what is called radio-activity. The atoms of radio-active substances give out three types of radiations, alpha, beta and gamma rays. Alpha rays are of atomic size and come from the nuclei, in fact they are really a part of the original nuclei. Of course, any atom that suffers such a loss will have a remaining weight that is less than that of the parent atom, and will, therefore, be an atom of a different element. This new atom may or may not be stable; if not, then it, too, will break up by giving out a part of itself, the remainder constituting an atom of still a different element. This process will continue until the remaining element is stable, 'lead' usually being the end product of such a series. Alpha rays are incapable of penetrating any appreciable thickness of matter, cannot even escape through the thin walls of the needles. They are, therefore, of no importance in radium therapy.

"Beta rays, like alpha rays, come from the nuclei of atoms, and in a similar way, leave the nuclei from which they are ejected with properties differing from those previously possessed. In other words, they transform the original atoms into atoms of a different element. Beta rays have very high velocities and are able to penetrate considerable thicknesses of glass, metals, tissues, etc., though only thin sheets of heavy metals like gold or platinum. Beta radiation so completely destroys the tissues that it is found wise to surround radium or the radio-active substance used in therapy with gold or platinum sheathes.

"Gamma rays are exactly the same as very penetrating X-rays, and have the same action on the tissues that equally hard X-rays would have were one able to produce them (not at present possible). So far as I know, only the gamma rays are of any importance in radium therapy.

"Now to take the case of radium. Radium itself does not give off any gamma radiation. A very small fraction of its molecules break each second, such atoms after radiating becoming atoms of radium emanation. Radium emanation (usually called 'radon' now) gives off only alpha rays, so it is seen that neither radium nor radium emanation is directly used in radium therapy. The next product of disintegration, radium A, is likewise useless, since it, too, gives out only alpha radiation. But the next two, radium B and (particularly) radium C, are extremely active, and both give out beta and gamma radiations; and it is these radiations we utilise whether we use radium or radium emanation as our parent source. This answers the question so many are asking as to the relative merits of the radiations from radium and from radium emanation, the answer being, obviously, the radiations used in the two cases are exactly the same. Only the radiations from radium B and radium C are used in either case, and whichever is employed you get these same products of atomic disintegration.

"It becomes, then, a practical matter as to whether the radium is sealed up in salt form and used directly, or whether you prefer to have the radium in solution and use the emanation itself, leaving the parent radium undisturbed. In case the radium is used in tubes the emanation it forms stays in the tube with it where it forms the succession products in due time producing the elements actually employed. The only function of the radium is to keep up the supply of emanation. On the emanation plan you take only the emanation away, and the radium is left behind accumulating emanation for the next dose. Using the homely analogy I mentioned the other night: Suppose I want butter for a certain use. In one case the farmer ships the cow that gives the milk from which one gets cream and finally the butter; in the other case, he keeps the cow, merely sending the milk that makes the cream

that makes the butter. I have collected a great deal of information as to the relative merits of the two systems, which I would be glad to make available to you when you have need of it.

"The amount of radium purchased should be approximately the same as will be employed at the busiest time, for there is nothing we can do to stop its working when its full output is not needed. Yet one need not worry about that, in a sense, for radium will keep up this process indefinitely almost, for in seventeen hundred years you will still have half your original radium. The loss we sustain is exactly analogous to the loss we are now sustaining by not making full use of the potential water power. Any power we omit getting out of a waterfall is gone forever though the water will be just as useful when we do get ready to use it as though we had been using it all the time. In the same way radium emanation produced but not employed will decay and be gone without having done us any good, but the parent radium will keep up our supply for the times it may be needed, irrespective of this."

When these centres for diagnosis and treatment have been established, and are ready for operation, and this, you will understand, will take some time, we must recognise that the medical profession will be in the forefront of the army attacking this scourge. It is the physician who first sees cancer cases, early or late, and may I state here that we expect (and not only expect but know) that we will have the sincere and hearty co-operation of the whole medical profession of the province in the work we are attempting. No doubt all of you have read the press reports of the convention of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, held last October, when a Cancer Committee was appointed to investigate the whole cancer problem. The action I am taking at the present time in introducing this Bill is based largely upon the recommendation of the Executive of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, as prepared from a report submitted by this Cancer Committee. You will all recognise the necessity for the sympathetic co-operation of the medical profession, and I desire to assure the honourable members of this House that it is not our intention, in the administration of this Act, to disturb in any way the relation which exists at present, and which should continue to exist, between the patient and his physician.

I should like to emphasise here that the administrative duties of the Commission will include also thorough investigation into all phases of the cancer problem, both in this province and other places. In the compilation of the records and statistics collected in connection with this programme, with regard to both diagnosis and treatment, it is hoped and expected that much valuable data will be assembled which will add to the general knowledge of the cancer problem. It is only by such investigation that our methods of dealing with this scourge can be improved.

The Swedish Cancer Institute, called the "Radium-Hemmet" and situated in Stockholm, is perhaps the oldest and foremost institute in the world for the radiation treatment of cancer. Professor Gosta Forssell, of Stockholm, published a report of an inquiry into the results that have been obtained at this institute and compared them with those secured by surgery. He says:

"The results of our comparison between the final achievements of surgery and radio-therapy, as regards the treatment of malignant tumors, is as follows: In those types of tumors that offer a fair chance of obtaining a primary healing by radiological treatment, the duration of the healing obtained by radio-therapy is, both as regards the relative and absolute performance, in every way comparable to the results obtained by surgery."

Dr. Claude Regaud, Director of the Pasteur Laboratory of the Radium Institute, Paris (and I need hardly mention that this institute is on a par with the Swedish, judged by the results it has achieved in radium therapy) supports the contention made by the authority just quoted, Professor Forssell. Regaud states:

"X-rays and radium have taken on a growing importance during the past 20 years. At first they had only the modest end in view of relieving the pain of inoperable patients, and prolonging their existence. Later on, it became possible to obtain such favourable results that even operable cases belonging to certain pathological species and to certain localisations in the body could be taken care of without surgery, at first exceptionally, and, later on, quite regularly. In contrast with the slowness of the progress of surgical methods, the last ten years have seen the rapid march of radiological methods. The result is that the surgeon, in the role of operator, is no longer the sole arbiter of the eventual care of cancer patients."

I have indicated, previously, the very high cost of radium, but I should also indicate that very minute quantities are used in treatment. The Cancer Committee of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, after canvassing very thoroughly the whole situation with regard to mortality from cancer in the province, and after considering what amounts of radium are considered effective in other places where radium therapy is being used with excellent results, has recommended that, for the present, one and one-half grams of radium be procured. The capital cost involved in the purchase of this amount will be approximately \$105,000 to \$115,000, depending upon the type of containers that are obtained. The larger the containers, and the fewer, the less the cost; but experience has shown that, with the smaller containers, better results are obtained. The reason for this is that the smaller containers lend themselves to the more accurate regulation of the various dosages required.

In considering this large capital expenditure, however, we must remember that, with proper care and supervision, there is practically no deterioration or depreciation in the potency and quantity during its use. The depreciation is estimated at about 2 per cent. in 50 years. However, other costs are involved such as the provision for insurance and equipment which will be required in a diagnostic and treatment centre, high voltage X-ray machine for deep therapy, other electrical equipment and so forth. Further, provision will have to be made for the cost of administration, for the establishment and maintenance of the Commission, and for clerical assistance, in addition to the expense involved in providing for the operating of the centres and the payment of professional and technical personnel.

It is not the intention, at present, that the diagnosis and treatment of cancer shall be a free service. I feel that the great majority of the people of the province realise that a free service would tend to lower the prestige of the work being done, giving the undertaking the appearance of being a charitable enterprise, and consequently applicable only to those who are unable to pay. It should be borne in mind that cancer is no respecter of persons or of their financial status, and the prosperous will require this special treatment and service as well as those less fortunate. However, notwithstanding the fact that it is intended that there should be a charge, provision must be made so that everyone may receive the necessary service, whether able to pay for it or not. I can assure you that any charges made will be very reasonable and will be based upon the fact that the people are supplying the money for the development of this great work, and adjusted with a view to meeting the financial obligations of the programme and the carrying charges on the initial outlay.

As I have already stated, the cancer death rate in this province has been steadily increasing, and I have tried to show you, by quoting authoritative opinion, that with efficient action much can be accomplished. I do not want to leave the impression that we believe we can prevent all the deaths which might occur from cancer. Not by any means. If we can prevent some proportion of them and minimise the increase which is otherwise inevitable, I cannot help feeling that we are justified in the action proposed in the Bill which is before you.

Saskatchewan had, in 1921, only 9.28 per cent. of population over the age of 50 years, but in the quinquennial census of 1926, this proportion had risen to 10.66 per cent., and the death rate had increased from 38.4 per 100,000 in 1921 to 45.2 in 1926. There is also an increase of 2.82 in the percentage of the population over the age of 40 years. As this province approaches the age distribution of the population which exists in the older provinces, so will it have a corresponding cancer death rate. It would appear, then, that this is the opportune time to deal with the whole cancer problem, and if we do our part in preventing the increase in the number of deaths from reaching its maximum (which inevitably will occur if we do not act) we shall have contributed something, at least, of value toward the welfare of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker: I listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the addresses from the gentlemen to your left and especially to those of the honourable members for Notukeu (*Mr. Grant*) and Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*), wherein was stressed the co-operation the opposition side of the House would render the Department of Public Health on this side. The member for Maple Creek stated that the co-operation was unusual in that my honourable friend from Rosthern (*Dr. Uhrich*) in an earlier debate had been good enough to make my "cancer speech" for me.

I assure the honourable gentlemen that I appreciate this co-operation; we want it and I promise that we will do nothing to make conditions otherwise. However, I have had an opportunity of perusing in greater detail the speech of my predecessor in office (*Dr. Uhrich*) and I may say it was a speech absolutely ethical in every respect and

very generous. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, very little criticism can be made of that speech and, until a few days ago, I had no intention of making any reference to it other than to thank him for the co-operation he offered. However, in what we are planning to do, Regina is likely to become the public cancer centre of the Dominion and as we are being besieged with statistics, it is becoming apparent that we should see that the proper deductions are drawn from these statistics. Consequently, with some of the conclusions and statistics which my predecessor in office used, we realise that these should not go out without an explanation thereof, or we are going to encounter difficulties in our programme at the start.

That it is necessary to go carefully in matters of that kind is indicated in the address of the honourable member for Rosthern. An instance of that is this. One statement is made in his address which reads:

"There is no doubt that cancer is more frequent in the larger cities than in rural districts,"

and, in order to support this contention he quotes the figures for some of the larger American cities: Albany, 162; San Francisco, 161; Boston, 145; Sacramento, 141; Topeka, 137; Los Angeles, 132; Spokane, 136; New Orleans, 125; Cincinnati, 120; — that is the cancer mortality per 100,000 of population. These figures are evidently quoted from the writings of Frederick L. Hoffman, of the Prudential Life Insurance Company, for 1922, and I admit they are correct — for that year. But I am going to quote from the same authority, Hoffman, for 1928. After compiling statistics on cancer deaths for 143 American cities, Hoffman in 1928 stated: "Cancer is not apparently influenced very much by population aggregates. Many of the largest cities of this country have rates measurably below the general average as shown by the table following, for 1928:

| | Deaths | Rate per 100,000 population |
|--------------------|--------|-----------------------------|
| Chicago | 3,500 | 110.9 |
| Detroit | 998 | 72.4 |
| Los Angeles | 1,373 | 91.5 |
| New York City..... | 7,725 | 128.8 |
| Philadelphia | 2,524 | 122.3 |

"The rates for Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles," he adds, "are below the average for all cities; those for New York and Philadelphia are above it."

The honourable member also quoted the figures for cities in the Dominion of Canada, as follows:

"Toronto, 112.5; Quebec, 67.2; Ottawa, 105.9; Hamilton, 105.5; Halifax, 135.3; Edmonton, 144.4; Calgary, 78.9; Regina, 84.0; St. John, 102.7; Saskatoon, 70.6; Vancouver, 149.4; Victoria, 175.4; Winnipeg, 88.8."

Those also are apparently taken from Hoffman for the year 1924 and are correct for that year. But the honourable member adds this statement: "This is an average of 98.1 for the cities compared with 55.2 for the Province of Saskatchewan." In other words, he says that Regina had a death rate from cancer in 1924 of 84 per 100,000 of population as compared with 55.2 for the whole province, therefore it is only reasonable to ask the why and the wherefore of the death rate for Regina of 84 as compared with 55 for the whole of Saskatchewan.

If those rates are brought up to date, Mr. Speaker, with the growth of population, Regina would have a death rate of 144 from cancer instead of 84 as compared with 55.2 for the whole of the province. That is the principal reason why I am bringing to the attention of this House the statistics as submitted in his speech by the honourable member for Rosthern (*Dr. Urrich*). Hoffman, in the figures quoted by the honourable member, gave Regina in 1924 a cancer death rate of 84 per 100,000 of population. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, deaths were not recorded by cities in the Department at that time, nor are they now, but the Regina City Health Department reported a resident death rate of 20 in that year, or approximately 54 per 100,000, and 10 non-residents, making a total of 81 per 100,000 of population. In 1928, with a population of 56,000, Regina, according to the City Health Department, had 29 cancer deaths giving a rate of 51.78 per 100,000 and if 31 non-resident deaths are added the rate jumps to 107.44 per 100,000. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, the death rate for Regina is 51.78 as compared with 55.2 for the whole province, that is with a much smaller death rate than the province at large.

Now let us take the city of Saskatoon quoted by my friend as having a death rate of 70.6 per 100,000 as compared with 55.2 for the whole province. The situation actually is that Saskatoon, in 1928, with a population of 40,000, had a resident death rate of 50 per 100,000 and a non-resident death rate of 57.5 making a crude rate of 107.5. That is, Mr. Speaker, the non-resident death rate both in Regina and in Saskatoon is greater than the resident death rate, and I submit it is unfair to include in the Regina death rate the non-resident death rate; and I submit that the statement that cancer is more prevalent in the cities than in the rural districts is not acceptable, in the light of these facts. I submit that the only reasonable basis of comparison is the age distribution — the proportion of the citizens over 50 years of age.

Another reference my friend from Rosthern made was this in speaking of cancer of the stomach:

"As far as treatment is concerned, we know that 20 per cent. of all cancers are stomach cancers and of these not one per cent. are saved today. It is nearly 100 per cent. fatal."

In this regard let me quote from Donald C. Balfour, M.D., professor of surgery, in the University of Minnesota Graduate School of Medicine, and surgeon in the Mayo Clinic, Rochester. With reference to cancer of the stomach he has this to say:

"Cancer of the stomach can be cured by the removal of the growth in an early stage of the disease. This must be the keynote of any campaign to lessen the number of deaths from this disease. Unfortunately the conditions which make cure possible are too infrequently met with, and many victims die unnecessarily, because there was a time when the cancer could have been recognised and even eradicated. The basis, therefore, for the successful treatment of cancer of the stomach, as for the treatment of cancer anywhere in the body, is early recognition."

And here, Mr. Speaker, is the point to which I would draw your attention:

"In the Mayo Clinic we have seen 6,000 cases of cancer of the stomach since 1910, and in 50 per cent. of this number it was considered advisable to explore the stomach to determine whether or not the growth could be removed. In 40 per cent. of the cases thus investigated it was found that the growth could be removed. In 22 per cent. it was found that gastroenterostomy could be performed, and in 38 per cent. nothing more than exploration was done. The prospect of permanent cure after removal of the growth depends largely on the extent of the disease.

"When the cancer was confined to the stomach and the lymph nodes were not involved, 63 per cent. of the patients were found to be alive and well three years after the operation. When the disease had spread into the lymph nodes only 20 per cent. were alive and well three years after the operation."

This, I submit, is considerably below the 100 per cent. fatality mentioned by the honourable member for Rosthern. Another statement made by the honourable member is this: "It is only by accident that really early cancer of the stomach is recognised." In this connection, I would like again to quote the same authority, Dr. Balfour, from his address on "Cancer of the Stomach," given at the Lake Mohonk Symposium:

"If it is true that cancer of the stomach may actually be present with few or no signs on clinical examination, have we any other method at our disposal which will make it possible to recognise the disease before it has given rise to pronounced symptoms?

"Fortunately, such a method is available, namely, examination by the Roentgen ray; and it is safe to say that it is the greatest contribution which has been made to the earlier diagnosis of cancer of the stomach. It is now more important than all other methods of detecting the disease. The competent roentgenologist can disclose by fluoroscopic examination the smallest cancers of the stomach, regardless of their situation."

Mr. Speaker, regarding the cancer programme and our Cancer Bill, which is now before you, we have had many letters and some telegrams of commendation and very few of condemnation. I am not going to weary the House by reading all of these missives, but, with your permission, I propose to quote three of them. The first I would quote is from Vancouver, a telegram from C. W. Prowd, M.D., Chairman of the British Columbia Cancer Committee:

"Your contemplated Cancer Act indorsed in principle and method by B. C. Cancer Commission. Such progressive legislation offers adequate solution of the rising and insistent cancer problem. Also maintains Saskatchewan's lead in Public Health matters."

I want to read to you, also, an excerpt from a letter from Dr. A. T. Bazin, leading surgeon of Montreal and now President of the Canadian Medical Association:

"As to the Bill — I have nothing but commendation for its broad and comprehensive outlook, as well as for its provisions against pauperising the people

My congratulations upon the very forward step you have taken."

And I would like also to read an extract from a letter from Dr. G. E. Richards, Director of the Department of Radiology, Toronto General Hospital, an authority on radium and radiology:

"I can only say that this meets with my very enthusiastic approval, and I think you are to be congratulated in taking these steps which will put this work in Saskatchewan far in advance of anything in Canada along these lines. One envies you the opportunity for constructive work which will be made possible by such an organisation.

"I have every confidence that, having undertaken the matter in the broad way which is obvious in this legislation, you will have no difficulty in working out a scheme which will solve your problem and redound to the credit of your province"

And this I read for the benefit of the Opposition and my predecessor in office:

"This will probably result in doing for the cancer problem what you have done for the tuberculosis problem, for which every one who is familiar with it has the greatest admiration."

Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to produce anything in the nature of a cancerphobia among our people but to aim to make Saskatchewan cancer-conscious. That is, in addition to the purchase of radium and the opening of the centres, to create by educational means an appreciation in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan of the necessity of early diagnosis and of the value of periodical health examinations, and so lessen the mortality from this disease. The Commission to be set up under the Bill is not a political board and this is not a political matter. It is our intention to devote those services to the benefit of all our people, and to the end that the ravages of this disease might be lessened. I may say our motto is identical with that of the British Empire Cancer Campaign:

"Quod refert quis opus faciat modo denique fiat?"

which being translated is: "What does it matter who does the work so long as the work is done."

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

SPEECHES
ON
RESOLUTION RESPECTING IMMIGRATION

MR. CHAS. McINTOSH, M.L.A.

(Kinistino)

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1930.

Mr. McIntosh, in speaking to the Resolution, moved by Mr. Horner and seconded by Mr. Eades:

“That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Provincial Governments should be consulted by the Dominion Government on all matters of immigration affecting such Provinces, and that this Assembly approves of the action of the Saskatchewan Government relative to the proposed Mennonite immigration,”

said:

Mr. Speaker,—Although I have not addressed the House so far this Session, it is not my intention to speak at any great length at the present time. I wish merely to make a few observations on the resolution now before the House.

It is my intention to comment upon some of the statements made by my honourable friend the member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) while moving this Resolution, acknowledging, of course, that he is apparently quite sincere in the views he has expressed, and that he has expressed those views in his usual vigorous style.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that, according to the resolution “the Provincial Governments should be consulted”; and it occurs to me that the honourable gentleman could quite well have confined the application of his resolution to the Province of Saskatchewan; that he might have stated what, in his opinion, the Province of Saskatchewan should do, and leave the other provincial governments to look after themselves. It is just possible that some other province might not see eye to eye with Saskatchewan on this matter, and I think my honourable friend should be satisfied to indicate what he thinks the Government of this Province should do, and permit other provincial governments to decide for themselves.

He has read a statement made by the Hon. George Langley before the Immigration Committee at Ottawa, and he has made references to the Immigration Commission presently holding sittings throughout the province. Does he not think it would have been well to have deferred discussion of the whole question of immigration until the report of that Commission was available for the consideration of members of this House? I think the matter of policy could have been discussed more intelligently if members had had an opportunity of studying the report of this Commission, the personnel of which has been lauded by the Attorney General and others. So far as the report which the Commission in due course will bring before the House is concerned, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that its value will depend on the accuracy with which it describes present conditions in the province and the soundness of the principles it establishes for guidance in the future under changing conditions.

I also would like to point out to the honourable member that his resolution contains a contradiction in terms. It declares that the Provincial Government should be consulted on all matters of immigration affecting the province and then proceeds to prove that it has been consulted. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker: The resolution first sets out

that the province should be consulted and then admits that it has been consulted in the matter of Mennonite immigration. It is true he had some statements to make to the effect that the previous Government had not been consulted; but in this connection I refer him to page 152 of "The Canadian Annual Review." There he will find that in August 1928, the Minister of Immigration himself came west, stopping off, first at Winnipeg, next at Regina, then at Edmonton, and lastly at Victoria, to discuss with the Governments of the western provinces matters pertaining to his Department and with reference to the bringing in of new settlers to Canada. The records will prove that for some years at least it has been the custom for the Dominion Government to consult with the Provincial Governments in matters of this kind. I think that fact has been established.

I think, too, that my honourable friend could have embodied in his resolution the idea that not only should the Federal Government consult with the Provinces, but that the Provinces should consult with the Federal Government. The honourable member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*), belonging to a "Co-operative Group," should easily be brought to agree that, in matters of immigration, there should be the closest co-operation between the responsible governments.

At the beginning of his address, the honourable gentleman appeared to be against immigration of any kind at the present time, and then, later, he said he was for some kinds of it. At the commencement of his address, he made use of a familiar phrase which we have frequently heard from the lips of the present Leader of the Government: "Surely the Province of Saskatchewan should have some say in the immigration policy of Canada."

Premier Anderson: Hear! Hear!

Mr. McIntosh: The First Minister says "Hear! hear!" If he would slightly amend his phrase and say "Surely the *people* of Saskatchewan should have some say in the immigration policy of Canada" I would say "Hear! hear!", too. Surely the people of Saskatchewan should have some say, and, Mr. Speaker, they have had it. Not through their provincial representatives, but through their Federal representatives. I think we shall have a great many troubles in Canada, more than we now have, if control of immigration is taken from the Federal Government, and every province has a policy of its own. I believe that it would bring about a most unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, something that my honourable friend did not say: I am opposed to the Railway Companies deciding the immigration policy of Canada. I think that policy should be determined by the Parliament of Canada with the help of, and after consultation with, the Provincial Governments. But I do think that the control should rest with the Federal Government. This is the only system that has been found satisfactory in the United States where the Federal Government takes complete control of immigration matters. I may add, too, that Mr. John Evans, Progressive member for Rosetown in the House of Commons, has declared most emphatically in favour of the same policy—that control should rest with the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as every member is aware, there has been a good deal of talk in this province about immigration. I do not object to that at all. I think it is proper and desirable that all questions affecting Canada, including the question of population, should be fully and fairly discussed. But perhaps I shall be permitted to say that in my opinion there has been a good deal of loose talk of late on the subject, a good deal of misapprehension and not a little misrepresentation. Public opinion is somewhat chaotic just now and somewhat nervous; and I do not think it has improved matters to have some people blowing hot and cold, one moment urging "full steam ahead" and the next, a "dead stop." That is no way to frame a policy, Mr. Speaker. Indeed I doubt very much whether such a method should be dignified by having the term "policy" applied to it. I was indeed surprised when my honourable friend said that on account of the danger of over-production immigration should cease altogether (he shakes his head), at any rate he made manifest his opposition to what I would call a well-balanced inflow of new settlers.

For a few moments at this stage, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the policies of the two major political parties in Canada touching this matter. Every member can recall that for quite a number of years there has been a definite desire, if not an agitation, for an increasing influx of settlers. The position of the Liberal party is well known. In 1925 and 1926, it was the Liberal policy that there should be "an energetic immigration policy." Before 1925 and 1926, and during these two years, the Conservative party was belabouring the members of the Liberal Government for not securing suf-

ficient immigration for Canada. That was the condition in 1922, '23, '24, and '25. And there is no doubt that during all these years the Liberal party advocated an increasing immigration.

What about the Conservative Party? Well, in the Conservative Convention at Winnipeg in 1927, the Federal Conservative Party declared in favour of "an aggressive system of immigration." That was their stand as late as the autumn of 1927. What of the attitude of the Conservative Party in this province? In 1924, they were in favour of "the establishment of an active Provincial immigration policy"; and in 1928 they changed the wording slightly and were in favour of "an aggressive immigration policy."

I think I can say then, without fear of contradiction that both the major political parties of Canada favoured a policy of increasing immigration, and that none of the other parties raised any particular objection. I think the general view is perhaps expressed on the first page of an informative and well-considered pamphlet, "Canada's Population Problem," written by C. W. Peterson, Publisher of the "Farm and Ranch Review," when he says:

"The outstanding and uncomfortable fact is, that in spite of a high degree of general prosperity in Canada, which in the past has led to a greater influx of people, the immigration into Canada for the first five months of 1928 is 18 per cent. smaller than it was for the corresponding period of last year, and the immigration from Great Britain has decreased twenty per cent. for the same period."

In other words, less than a year ago, he was greatly alarmed—because immigration was increasing? No, because it was *decreasing*.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that for a number of years the whole movement has followed the trend of encouraging further immigration, and that that condition existed until quite recently. The change—and change there has been in some quarters—is, in my judgment, merely a temporary change due to certain economic conditions—quite serious conditions—which exist in this province at the present time, conditions which we know to be temporary. I believe that, when this period passes, as we hope and trust it will, the people of Canada and the people of Saskatchewan will want to see an all-round, well-balanced policy on this matter.

I may say to my honourable friend that I am not one of those who want to see Canada filled up with settlers right away. I do not think we should cram them in too fast. If population is what makes a country great, China and India have us beaten to the wall. We can never catch up with them. Our duty is to make our own people contented, and the more attractive we make life in this country the more certain are we to hold our population. A year or two ago I had the honour of a conversation with the Governor of Minnesota and Mr. A. J. Bede, Editor of *Bede's Budget*, Duluth. Both were enthused with the possibilities of our country, and Mr. Bede said "You should have a population of one hundred millions in fifty years." Governor Christianson hesitated a moment, and then said: "Maybe; but I think Canada will probably be better if she has fifty millions in one hundred years." I am inclined to agree with the Governor's opinion.

But let me also say that I am opposed to stopping immigration altogether or even to discouraging immigration except as a temporary measure reluctantly adopted. The unemployment situation cannot be so serious judging from the statement made yesterday by the Minister in charge of the Department. In any event we are not suffering from over-population. We may be suffering from under-development, but not from over-population. Japan has a population of 323 to the square mile, Germany 350 to the square mile, England over 700 to the square mile, Scotland 164 to the square mile, Ireland 131 to the square mile, and Canada 2 to the square mile. Saskatchewan has less than 4, taking in the whole province; and if you say that only half of our province is being developed at present, less than 8 to the square mile. My opinion is that the population of this province can be increased by immigration during the next ten years, that the prosperity of the province can be increased by that means, and that the prosperity of the people now living in the province will not be reduced but increased if we adopt a sound immigration policy. To do this will involve the remedying of certain agricultural conditions in this province which are due to unbalanced production and other causes to which I will refer at another time, and which are certainly not attributable to the charge of over-population. My conclusion then, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not think the time has come when, except as a temporary measure, a suspension of immigration should take place.

As a matter of fact, I would hesitate at any time to prohibit a suitable settler from entering Canada if he wanted to come and was willing to take his chance. Indeed, I

would hesitate to admit him unless he really wanted to come. The first qualification of a good settler is a desire to come to Canada. If you have to coax him to come, you will likely have to coax him to stay. Stamina is one of the chief characteristics of the British race and so far as I know pampering is not in the British code.

In past years, efforts have been made to induce immigration by various methods including assisted passages: But at the present time many who formerly approved these courses hold that the sooner any form of assistance is stopped the better. Well, I would not make the offers too attractive at any time, nor would I abolish them altogether. The mover of the resolution spoke of the 400,000 who have come to the province during the last twenty years, and he might have gone back farther and included the earlier settlers. I think he will agree that the vast majority of the persons of mature age in this province came to it from other provinces and from other countries. The persons of mature age born in the province form what is probably a small minority. Most of the members of this Legislature are immigrants of one class or another. Only three of them are native sons, the Minister of Highways, the ex-Attorney General and the ex-Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Fraser: I would like to correct the honourable gentleman. There are two men over here who were born in the province.

Mr. McIntosh: I apologise to the honourable gentleman and pay him the compliment that is due to the pioneers of this province. What I was going to point out, Mr. Speaker, is this, that there are very many citizens of this province who would not have seen Saskatchewan had they not received assistance. When I look over the history of Canada I find that most of the immigrants that came to Canada in the early days got assistance. That famous body of immigrants, the United Empire Loyalists, got assistance to move into the Province of New Brunswick. The first farmer settlers in Western Canada were men of my own race who came by the Hudson Bay route to the Red River Valley in 1812—the Selkirk Settlers—and they got assistance. And I think if we were to ask those who have come to this land from other lands, that a large number would confess, and I believe would be proud to admit, that they had received assistance, and I do not think there is anything to be ashamed of. Surely, if we are determining now a policy to guide us in years to come we should have these considerations in mind, and not jump to rash conclusions.

Let me say that we welcome our kinsmen from across the seas. We welcome every one of them who is sound physically, mentally, and morally, and willing to work. My honourable friend was kind enough to suggest that perhaps the former Government of Saskatchewan and perhaps the present Government at Ottawa really did not want British settlers. Now that suggestion has been emphatically denied by the Prime Minister of Canada, it has been resented by Liberals throughout Canada, and it is resented by the Liberals of the Province of Saskatchewan. He told us that immense sums were being spent by the Government of Canada on immigration work in Europe. His figures are wrong and I want to give my honourable friend some information he does not appear to have—the facts, and the authority for them. I have in my hand a copy of Hansard dated April 10, 1929, that tells the story so far as expenditure on immigration by Canada is concerned. The questions were asked by a Conservative member, Dr. Manion, and the answers were given by the Minister of Immigration.

“Mr. Manion: How much was expended by the Department of Immigration in the British Isles in 1928 annual year?”

Mr. Forke: \$1,016,202.99.

Mr. Manion: How much was expended by the same department on the Continent of Europe in the same year?”

Mr. Forke: \$75,796.67.”

Mr. Speaker, over a million in Great Britain, seventy-five thousand on the whole continent of Europe. That is the answer to my honourable friend.

We want British settlers, but I may tell my honourable friend that it is going to be increasingly hard to get them. In the first place, there is not the same disposition to emigrate on the part of the people of Britain for reasons that are generally understood. In the second place, as Mr. Peterson points out, the birth rate of Great Britain is falling at an alarming rate and is now below that of France. Further, he says that the population of Britain is likely soon to become stationary.

“The birth rate in Great Britain is falling at a tremendous rate. It is now below that of France. Her population will presently be stationary. To talk about

any considerable volume of agricultural immigration from highly industrialized Britain is, in any event, fantastic. Immigration from the Mother Land has declined 25 per cent. in volume since 1911. To place any serious reliance on the few thousand agricultural immigrants annually available from the Scandinavian countries, is equally futile.

Furthermore, census statistics show that out of every hundred Britishers that come to Canada, only seven settle on farms and the remaining ninety-three take up residence in our over-crowded urban communities. This, by the way, is a perfectly normal proportion, corresponding almost exactly with the occupational figures in Great Britain itself. So, if we are to depend for our agricultural development on seven per cent. only of the small volume of British immigration reaching Canada, plus a negligible movement from Northern Europe, it is evident that future census returns will merely repeat the disastrous story of the 1926 census, which, for the first time in Canadian history, indicated complete stagnation in the rural population of the West."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are several countries in Europe that prohibit emigration to other countries and that impose severe penalties on those who try to solicit nationals to leave their native lands. In view of these opinions, it is quite possible that we may have some difficulties that so far we have not contemplated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to another part of my honourable friend's address, to the so-called "foreign menace" as it is supposed to exist in the Province of Saskatchewan, and as it does exist in the minds of some honourable gentlemen opposite. I wanted to say that I sometimes visit the Province of Manitoba, and now and then the Province of Alberta. In both these provinces, during the past year or two, I have been struck with the absence of acrimonious discussion on this subject. I can speak with assurance as to the Province of Manitoba where it does not seem to be giving very much concern. And the same is true of Alberta, generally speaking. My first reflection, of course, was that perhaps the situation was much more serious here than in our neighbouring provinces, and I turned to the Census Tables to see what the true condition was. I wondered whether there was some truth in the statement that Saskatchewan was "the dumping ground for foreigners" and the backyard of the Department of Immigration into which most of the undesirables who come to Canada were thrown, and I am going to take a few minutes of the time of the House to quote the information I have secured. I found at the outset that Saskatchewan has not been flooded with immigrants at all. That is the first thing I discovered. Saskatchewan has not been flooded with immigrants, Mr. Speaker, during the last ten years particularly. During these last ten years, Manitoba received 262,309 immigrants, Alberta 206,766 and Saskatchewan 190,003. Manitoba got 75,000 immigrants more than Saskatchewan, and Alberta 16,000 more than Saskatchewan. British Columbia got more than Saskatchewan.

I might also point out to the House and to my honourable friend that so far as the emigration of Canadian citizens and their departure to the United States is concerned, it is less now than at any time since the end of the War. And I would like to tell him that during the dismal years following the War, Saskatchewan was the only western province to maintain her natural increase. This is a record much better than that of Manitoba or Alberta, in spite of the lamentations that have been a good deal louder here than elsewhere.

I reached the interesting conclusion, too, that the character and distribution of the population of Saskatchewan are practically the same as in Manitoba and Alberta. Saskatchewan has grown faster but the character and distribution of our population are about the same. For example, I find that the percentage of British born in this province has increased from 68 per cent. in 1916 to 76 per cent. now. 76 per cent. of the population of Saskatchewan is British born. In Alberta 73 per cent. and in Manitoba 82 per cent. Then I find that 64 per cent. of Saskatchewan's population was born in Saskatchewan, that only 57 per cent. of Alberta's population was born in Alberta, and that 66 per cent. of Manitoba's population was born in Manitoba. I find further that in 1921 the number of people born in the British Isles and living in this province was 13.9 per cent. of the population of the province. And I was rather interested to know that only 15.35 per cent. of the population of Ontario was born in the British Isles. We are within 2 per cent. of the Province of Ontario in that regard, Mr. Speaker. That was according to the 1921 census. At the present time, the figures are these, according to the 1926 census: 11.95 per cent. in Saskatchewan; 16 per cent. in Alberta; and 16.33 per cent. in Manitoba. Then we find in this province 14 per cent. of our people born in Europe, in Alberta 12.68 per cent. and in Manitoba 14.30 per cent. Born

in the United States: Saskatchewan 9.20 per cent., Alberta 12.86 per cent., Manitoba 2.83 per cent.

But you may say—"These figures of those of British birth, or of those born in Canada or in other parts of the British Empire do not disclose their racial origin." Well, on the basis of racial origin, I find that 50.77 per cent. of Saskatchewan's population is of British origin, in Alberta 57.62 per cent. and in Manitoba 53.60 per cent. In Saskatchewan 5.73 per cent. of the people are of French origin, in Alberta 5.2 per cent. and in Manitoba 6.66 per cent. In other words, the percentage of French stock in this province is slightly higher than in Alberta, and decidedly lower in Manitoba. According to the 1921 census the percentage of people of French origin in this province was the third lowest among the provinces of Canada. 11.76 per cent. of the people of Saskatchewan is of German origin, in Alberta 7.75 per cent., in Manitoba 4 per cent. In Saskatchewan 8 per cent. is Scandinavian, in Alberta 8 per cent., in Manitoba 4 per cent. Of Ukrainian origin, 6 per cent. in Saskatchewan, 6 per cent. in Alberta and 10 per cent. in Manitoba.

These are a few figures—there are many more—which I think show fairly clearly that the populations of the three western provinces are essentially the same in character and distribution. And I am apt to wonder why, when the different races seem to live so peaceably in Manitoba and Alberta, why there is so much talk along racial lines in this province, and I am bound to come to the conclusion that it is largely political in its inception and in its purpose.

In reference to the naturalization of people coming to our province from Europe or from the United States, I should like to see them become naturalized and assume the responsibilities of citizenship just as soon as possible. I agree with my honourable friend that just before a provincial or a federal election is not the best time, but I am anxious to see them become naturalized, and may I inform the House that 70 per cent. of the aliens who have come to this province have already been naturalized: In Alberta 65 per cent. and in Manitoba 65 per cent. The Icelandic people have the highest percentage of naturalized citizens, and the Norwegians and some other nationalities stand high. I think we should be proud of the efforts being made by these people to get to the stage where they can apply for naturalization, and I would like to see them all become naturalized in the proper way as soon as possible.

Before leaving the references to racial origin, I wish to point out a relationship to voting power which I think will please my honourable friends. As they know, only persons of the age of 21 years or over have the right to vote. Well, of the adult population of Saskatchewan 54.51 per cent. is of British origin, in Alberta 56.43 per cent. and in Manitoba 57.62 per cent. and, of course, all of them have the right to vote. In each of these three provinces, then, people of British origin hold the balance of power, even if every alien became naturalized. But there is still quite a percentage of aliens unnaturalized which, of course, still further strengthens the position of the British vote. Indeed a careful study of the census figures will lead to the conclusion and prove the conclusion that at least 60 per cent. of the voters of this province have a sound British pedigree, as good as that of my honourable friends; and I think they should be satisfied with it.

Mr. Speaker, I have still a few of my honourable friend's criticisms to answer. He applied one or two of the tests often urged against the foreign immigrant. One is the literacy test. Well, from the Census, I learn that the general illiteracy in the Province of Nova Scotia of those over school age is 5.11 per cent.; New Brunswick 7.61 per cent.; Quebec 6.20 per cent. and Saskatchewan 5.92 per cent. You will observe that the percentage in this province is only slightly higher than in the Province of Nova Scotia. According to the latest figures, the illiteracy of those ten years and over in Saskatchewan is 4.81 per cent., Alberta 4.25 per cent. and Manitoba 5.71 per cent. In my opinion, that is a tribute to the character and to the quality of the people who come to this province and to their desire for education, and I think it is a tribute to the system of education which has been in force in this province.

Then complaint is made that the morals of the foreign born immigrant are not very high. If there is any truth in such a charge, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta should be expected to show up unfavourably when compared with the other provinces of Canada. Well, I am prepared to make the comparison. I have in my hand a statement from the Bureau of Statistics at Ottawa which gives by provinces the percentages of illegitimate births, and I may tell the House that this is usually considered a fairly reliable index in matters of morals. According to the statement, British Columbia is lowest with a percentage of 2.02 of illegitimate births; Saskatche-

wan is second lowest with 2.05 per cent; Prince Edward Island 2.06 per cent.; Quebec 2.7 per cent.; Alberta, 2.8 per cent.; New Brunswick, 2.8 per cent.; Ontario, 2.9 per cent.; Manitoba, 3.3 per cent. and Nova Scotia with 5.2 per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I wonder if my honourable friend could quote the figures for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. McIntosh: This is a statement which may be obtained from the Department or the Federal Bureau of Statistics.

I was rather surprised at the statement made by my honourable friend that the foreigner presented an uncomfortable problem owing to his criminal proclivities. At a former Session, I brought the matter to the attention of the honourable member for Rosthern, and on that occasion he submitted to the House figures that absolutely refuted the statements contained in the article which the mover of the resolution read a little while ago. And I may say to my honourable friend that if he will take the Dominion Census for 1926 and study the figures regarding crime throughout Canada by provinces and otherwise he will be convinced that the statements contained in the article he read were, to put it mildly, decidedly biased. Mr. Peterson has something to say on this subject in his pamphlet.

"Taking the census of 1921 and our penitentiary population for the same year, we find that our British and French population of 7,322,000 furnished 2,157 prisoners or 3.40 per 1,000, while our foreign population of 1,467,000 supplied 483 inmates or only 3.03 per 1,000. This hardly bears out such a sweeping contention. But the simple, hard working and law-abiding East European small farmers should not be classed indiscriminately with the large South European population of our industrial slum districts where most of the serious crime occurs. At home he seldom comes in conflict with the authorities and no particular reason exists why he should change his habits on coming to Canada."

My opinion is that the mass of our so-called foreign population can be placed alongside the rest of our population in the statement that the mass of the population of Canada are honest, industrious, intelligent, law-abiding, home-loving, God-fearing citizens. I would say to the honourable gentleman the member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) that if he comes up to northern Saskatchewan, I shall be glad to conduct him into some of the so-called foreign settlements to which he has referred where he will find thousands of citizens as good as any he can find anywhere within the confines of Saskatchewan.

I have refrained purposely this afternoon from making reference to statements regarding our people, statements made in this province and in other provinces for political purposes, statements which are utterly offensive to me and I hope to all the members of the House, statements made by men who should know better and who do know better. I am not going to repeat those statements, but I am going to read what one minister of the gospel has to say about the utterances of other ministers:

"It is gratifying—when we read some of the things that are being said against a large number of the citizens of this country—that Bishops do not agree on this matter. One Bishop of Saskatchewan tells us they are a menace. The Bishop of Edmonton who has lived there for 44 years says that he does not know any people who are making such a tremendous contribution to the progress and to the advancement of this country. "They are in the public schools, they are finding their way, many of them, into the secondary schools and great hosts of them are finding their way into the universities. The largest single group in the University of Alberta today is the Russian group!"

Now I want to refer just for a moment to the last part of the resolution—that which has reference to the Mennonite immigration. I do not intend to speak on this at any great length, Mr. Speaker, because, no doubt other members who will speak in this debate will refer to it. I will say this, however, I believe the Government could have handled the problem in a much better way. I certainly do not approve of the method which the Government adopted in this matter as revealed in the statements furnished to the press by my honourable friends. We are informed that, finally, the Government gave an absolute refusal to allow these people to come here, notwithstanding the fact that their compatriots in the province were prepared to take care of them. I am going to quote newspaper clipping which express my views on this subject. The first I would quote is the *Manitoba Free Press*, of December 16, 1929:

"Assuming that the guarantees offered in connection with the proposed admittance of a thousand Mennonite families can be relied upon, in what way can their

admittance add to the difficulties of the unemployment situation? Various persons, some of them highly placed, seem to think that this must be the effect of bringing them in; but they give no reasons for their fears.

"The Mennonites come in and begin farming. At once they are added to the consuming population of the country. They will buy land or assume an obligation to buy it; they will need horses, implements, vehicles, furniture for their houses, and all the articles necessary for even the simplest home. All these outlays will mean business orders and employment for workers in the towns and cities. They will produce cattle and grain and these will have to be transported to market and sold again, adding to the demand for labour. In what way, we should like to know, are they going to take bread out of the mouths of Canadians, native-born or otherwise?

"There may be those who think that the increase in agricultural production, due to their presence, will operate to the disadvantage of the producers already here. But can anyone really convince himself by any study of conditions that the prosperity and happiness of this country can be forwarded by a policy of restriction of production? We have had this year the involuntary reduction of the wheat harvest to half its normal proportions; is anyone better off because this has happened? If this is to be our policy, steps should be taken at once to prevent any further settlement in the Peace River country where grain production is going ahead by giant strides; and our cities should envisage and plan for a future of very slow growth. The whole future of Western Canada and in a measure of Eastern Canada, too, is tied up with the steady enlargement of our area of tilled land and an increase in production within these areas due to better methods. To renounce this is to admit that our policy of national growth through western development has been a blunder.

"If the Mennonites—given the necessary guarantees that they will go on the land and stay there and that they will not set themselves above the laws of the country—are to be regarded as not suitable immigrants, then it can only be said that the people of Western Canada have changed their minds on what was in the past a universally accepted point—that the great need of this country is a steady supply of industrious, agriculturally-minded settlers."

Then I find the *Western Producer* has an article which I do not propose to read except the last sentence:

"The announcement that the League of Nations was prepared to see that the Mennonite refugees now concentrated around the Soviet capital, are maintained until spring, makes our refusal to receive them less tragic in its effect. If, after due investigation, it is decided that a limited number of agricultural settlers should be admitted to the West, no better prospects could be found than the Mennonites."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the opinion of the *Western Producer* as expressed in its issue of December 5, 1929. Now I have here a clipping from the *Sentinel*, dated a short time ago, which shows that the Government of Ontario was considering the matter of providing for a number of Mennonites if suitable areas could be found for them; and Honourable Mr. Finlayson, Minister of Lands and Forests in the Ontario Government, is quoted as saying there was plenty of land in Northern Ontario suitable for settlement where the settlers could be provided for and where they would be in close proximity to existing small Mennonite settlements.

After all, Mr. Speaker, the subject of population is a subject full of interest and full of importance to the people of Saskatchewan, and it throws a challenge to us now and for years to come. The danger is that we will not practise earnestly enough what we profess to believe and what we know to be just. I am not less British than my friend opposite. I am British from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet; and I view the record and the history of our nation with astonishment and gratitude. I speak as one who wishes to be regarded as a good Canadian citizen, knowing that if I reach that desire, I shall be achieving an ambition worthy of my forefathers. I am not ashamed of the contribution Saskatchewan has made and is making to the strength and security of the British Commonwealth, and I believe all the people of the province, irrespective of race or creed, are entitled to the credit. Some one has said truly that "you cannot advance the British Empire by merely waving a flag. Jingoism never did us any good and never will. It may be all right for home consumption at election times but as a Christian people we must realize that there is no danger threatening the British Empire or any other Empire provided it is brotherly enough and generous enough and considerate enough; but on any other basis, it is in moral danger no matter what we

may think about it." We want the people who come to us from other lands to glory in our country's flag for the same reason that we glory in it. Not because it has been stuffed down our throats, but because under it we have freedom and safety and are able to press forward our own schemes of development and progress; and thus we grow into the institutions of our country and become part of them and proud of them, ready to uphold and to defend them, to respect our constitution and to love the flag.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that in its present form, I cannot give the honourable gentleman the support he desires for his Resolution, and I think many other members are in the same position. I intend therefore to exercise my right to offer an amendment in which I think every member can concur. Seconded by the honourable member for Pheasant Hills (*Mr. Dunn*), I move:

"That all the words after the first 'That' in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

'in the opinion of this Assembly, there should be close co-operation between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government on all matters of immigration affecting this Province.'

MR. CHAS. M. DUNN, M.L.A.

(*Pheasant Hills*)

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—It is not my intention this afternoon to make a speech or deliver an address on the question which is before the House, and yet, at the same time, I would wish to voice a few thoughts that I have on the matter which is before us for discussion.

I listened to the address of the honourable member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) yesterday afternoon and, while recognising that he may be an authority on restricted immigration, I am very much of the opinion that he is not an authority on the so-called foreign people of this province. I noticed in the course of his remarks he intimated that there was a danger of us losing our soul, even our country, and that he came to this conclusion after having travelled through some of the foreign districts in the northern part of the province.

Now, I happen to represent a constituency where there are large settlements of peoples from other lands. I have lived with them for the past twenty years, have had intimate association with these peoples of various nationality, from various countries of Europe. My first experience in this country was in the district of Lloydminster shortly after the Barr Colonists had settled in that part of northern Saskatchewan and I may say, although a Canadian myself and having good reason to be able to lay claim to as much Canadianism and of the blood of an English ancestry as the honourable gentleman himself. At the same time, I am quite sure that there are people from other countries of Europe who have, and can look back with as much pride on the heritage that is theirs, as the result of the history of the lands from which they came, as we can ourselves. Because we have certain characteristics of which we are justly proud there is no reason why we could not, in the assimilation process that is going on within our province, receive from these various nationalities the characteristics which we may need and, in the building up of a new nationhood, of a new Canada, these elements of these people might be intermingled with our own to make up the new people that "Canadian" in the future will mean.

He also made the remark, just after he had made that statement that he had been driving through the northern part of the province, that there was a danger of us losing our soul and even our country and that a creed should be recited before or when the flag was raised and that especially the people, or the children of foreign parentage should recite that creed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot concur with that idea and I believe this: That if the speaker knew a little more about the loyalty that does exist, of the true Canadian patriotism that does exist in the minds of the children attending the public schools, that that statement would not have been made. I can recall that during the war many of these schools — and it would be quite easy to name a good many — where the money raised for Red Cross purposes, where subscriptions were taken up for various enterprises for carrying on the war, received as good a support in many of these districts as in many of our so-called pure Canadian districts, and that, if even today he were to journey out he would find that when the flag was being raised there would be children surrounding that flag pole and singing the National Anthem and feeling —

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the honourable gentleman is discussing an amendment which has to do with co-operation between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province. I say that he is entirely out of order when he starts discussing matters which he is now discussing. You cannot expect the Federal Government to take notice of a resolution, amended or otherwise, if we are not going to confine ourselves to the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in your ruling did you not say it would be difficult to define what was applicable to the amendment and applicable to the motion? I think we have entered into a discussion on the whole question of immigration.

Mr. Dunn: There is no need of your ruling on that point, Mr. Speaker, because I have said what I had intended to say; that children attending the public schools gave evidence of their sentiments of loyalty. What I wanted to draw your attention to now was that if the honourable member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) were to go to the so-called foreign districts in the northern part of the province —

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, what has that got to do with the amendment?

Mr. Dunn: What did the statement have to do with the motion?

Premier Anderson: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are not discussing what happened on the debate on the motion. I would ask you to rule that the honourable member abide by the rules of debate.

Mr. Dunn: Since 1905, 489,000 people —

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have your ruling on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The debate must be confined to the subject of the amendment.

Mr. Dunn: The point I am trying to make is that there should be co-operation between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, and I am dealing with the system of immigration that we have had and intend to have carried out, as an arrangement between these two governments. It would appear to me in this connection that these 489,000 people coming to our shores from other lands, that many of these people — I would say all — who have come from Continental Europe have not come as a result of assisted immigration. In saying that 489,000 people have come from other lands, the impression that we might gather is that these people were all from Continental Europe, from central and southern Europe. But I would suggest that the United States is spoken of in this land as a foreign land and that, in the 489,000 people coming to this country from other lands, the immigration from the United States is properly included.

Then, in looking at the number of people who come to our land, we very often have to listen to the statement that there are more people leaving Canada for the United States than there are coming into the Dominion of Canada. This, Mr. Speaker, is usually said to suit the convenience of the person who wishes to make the point that conditions are better, that there is a greater prosperity in the United States than there is in the Dominion, and that this country with 120,000,000 of people for a population, in an area no larger than the Dominion of Canada and with resources that we claim are no greater, are supporting a population of 120,000,000, and that with this great population they attract settlers from the Dominion of Canada to the United States. But if that condition were so then that is not an argument against an increase of population in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, I think that quite properly the amendment does not refer to the proposed Mennonite and German Lutheran immigration into this country, because it does not contain an approval of the immigration of these people to the Dominion of Canada, and that it is not proper for us at a time when we are discussing co-operation between the governments in respect of immigration to discuss various questions that will come up to be settled between the two governments when there is co-operation. I noticed that some time ago, when the Mennonites were asking to come to our country that they were refused admittance, and a statement was read to or was given to the Immigration Commission that some of the Mennonites were not favourable to these people coming to Saskatchewan at that time. I notice in the *Leader* of this morning, March 14, 1930, this statement:

"Mennonites of America Go Good For Russians. Berlin, March 13th. The Federal commissioner of immigration informed the Reichstag's ways and means committee today that an agreement had been concluded with the Mennonites in America by which the latter had agreed to repay in full the expenditures for the emigrating Russian Mennonites to Canada and South America. The agreement included those still remaining in German camps.

He estimated that the cost would be something under 6,000,000 marks (about \$1,500,000.)"

I believe that at the time it was suggested these people come to Canada, and certain of them to the Province of Saskatchewan, that there was a great deal of humanitarianism in the plea, and at the same time, we should not lose sight of the fact that there were a number of German Lutherans among these people. And, coming from a part of the province where there are a great many German Lutherans, where there are a great many people coming —

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, German Lutheran immigration is not brought into the question of either close co-operation with or consultation by the Federal Government.

Mr. Dunn: I would submit that immigration is before the House and that this is certainly a factor in respect of immigration.

Mr. Gardiner: Either way!

Mr. Dunn: Yes, put it either way. I have listened to the statements yesterday afternoon that the people of the province should be taken into consideration and in that respect I would like to take into consideration the opinion of some of the people of the province and to read to the House a letter appearing in the *Morning Leader* of Tuesday, February 25th, and signed by the Reverend G. F. Wetzstein and the Reverend J. Fritz, directors of the Lutheran Immigration Board of Canada:

"To the Editor:

Sir,—The Honourable Mr. Buckle, Minister of Agriculture, in his address to the Legislative Assembly on Thursday, February 20th, in speaking on the immigration of Mennonites and Lutherans for which permission had been asked by the respective immigration boards, made the following statement according to The Leader of Friday, February 21st:

"Turning aside from the subject—"

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this article which the honourable member is reading — I think all of it — purely relates to Lutheran refugees, and in connection with the proposed Lutheran immigration, and I submit it has nothing to do with the amendment, or with the motion for that matter, and I submit he is entirely out of order.

Mr. Dunn: I would submit that this is in connection with immigration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Could you not summarise?

Premier Anderson: Wetzstein is coming to see us tomorrow.

Mr. Dunn: (continuing to read) —

"Turning aside from the subject of agriculture, Mr. Buckle took issue with Dr. J. M. Uhrich of Rosthern on his attack on the Government's attitude towards the proposed Mennonite and Lutheran immigration and defended its policy in this regard, stating that no society of friends would accept the responsibility of maintaining these people if they happened to become a charge on the province. Therefore, the Government had refused to admit them.

On behalf of the proposed Lutheran refugees for whom admission was sought, we, the undersigned directors of the Lutheran Immigration Board of Canada, hereby submit to the general public the following transactions with the Premier and the Cabinet members of the present Government:

On November 18, 1929, a delegation of the Lutheran immigration board waited on the Government with the request for the admission of Lutheran refugees from Russia. After a lengthy discussion of the whole matter and upon request of the Cabinet members present, the following memoranda was presented to the Premier on November 19, 1929:

'Pursuant to conversation of the delegation of the Lutheran immigration board of Canada, with you and your colleagues of the Saskatchewan Government this morning, we, the undersigned, on behalf of and for the Lutheran Immigration Board respectfully submit the following:

'We humbly petition the Government of Saskatchewan to grant permission of entry into the Province to two hundred (200) German Lutheran families now before the gates of Moscow in Soviet Russia.

'The two hundred (200) families above referred to are all *bona fide* agriculturists whose ancestors have followed agricultural pursuits for close to 200 years in Russia.

'As a result of the agrarian policy of the Soviet Government, these people have been deprived of their entire holdings in Russia and because they, on the one hand refused to become Communists, and on the other hand were not ready to sacrifice their economic and religious freedom, they trekked to Moscow for the purpose of obtaining passports and emigrating to Canada.

'Upon arrival in Moscow they were herded together into temporary lodgings, their money which they had realized from the sale of their farm equipment was confiscated, and they were categorically informed that passports would not be granted, and that unless they at once established themselves satisfactorily would be deported to Siberia. This, in effect, means that they will be packed into box cars and sent five to seven hundred miles into the interior of Siberia with the result that many of them would die en route and the remainder face starvation upon arrival.

'The actual number of Lutheran people at Moscow as supplied through the German embassy in Moscow, is four hundred and eighty-seven (487) adults, two hundred and nine (209) children and thirty-six (36) infants.

'We feel that unless we put forth every effort to rescue these people we will be very severely criticised by the Lutheran people in Western Canada of whom a considerable number are long residents of Saskatchewan and who to a very large extent originally came from Russia to Canada.

'It is a well known fact in Canada that the Lutheran people have proven themselves to be desirable immigrants, successful farmers, law-abiding citizens and of a type very readily assimilated.'

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: We do not want the time of this House taken up by the reading of long correspondence in the newspapers. The amendment has to do with "co-operation between the Federal and Provincial Governments." This letter deals with a subject altogether apart from the amendment.

Mr. Gardiner: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker: If the honourable gentleman would not take up so much time arising to points of order we would get along a lot faster. This debate is on immigration and on the method by which we can bring immigrants into the country and every method that can be adopted to bring about that co-operation between the Federal and Provincial Governments, and if he would allow the honourable member to proceed—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But not to read statements of interminable length!

Mr. Dunn: (continuing to read)—

"The German Government being advised by its Embassy in Moscow of the terrible plight of these people took immediate steps to give assistance and has agreed to permit them to proceed to Germany, provided, however, the Canadian Government would grant them permission to enter Canada, it being understood that Germany would keep and care for those people who cannot comply with Canadian Government, medical and other regulations. The German Government further agrees to give these people a passport acceptable to the Canadian Government and valid for deportation purposes for a period of five years

"The Lutheran Immigration Board will not settle these families in groups but undertakes to satisfactorily place them as individual families within the confines of the many Lutheran parishes throughout the Province of Saskatchewan; it will provide suitable housing accommodation and work with Lutheran farmers on the land this winter and permanently settle them as soon as possible, and is ready to furnish the Government of Saskatchewan on demand the names and locations of the families placed, attaching a detailed report with reference to the conditions under which settlement was effected.

"The Lutheran Immigration Board further guarantees that none of these people will become a charge on any municipality or on the Province of Saskatchewan, and backs this guarantee with its entire resources, its prestige and past record in the handling of its people.

"The Lutheran Immigration Board stands ready to devote its entire reserve amounting to eighteen thousand (\$18,000) dollars in cash to carry out this undertaking and to further raise such additional funds within the Lutheran church of the United States as may be necessary for the proper care, placement, and settlement of these people. The raising of this additional fund will be undertaken immediately after favourable consideration of the petition has been granted.

"The Lutheran Immigration Board has operated in Western Canada as an independent charitable immigration organisation since March, 1923, during which time its work of handling approximately 16,000 Lutherans has been under the very close observation of the Dominion Government, and we submit that no other organisation in Canada has performed its work more satisfactorily and efficiently and that this claim will be readily vouched for by the Department of Immigration at Ottawa.

"Very respectfully submitted on behalf of the Lutheran Immigration Board, at Regina, Saskatchewan, this nineteenth (19th) day of November, A.D. 1929."

The delegation consisted of the following persons: Professor Harms, Director of the Lutheran College at Saskatoon, President of the Lutheran Immigration Board of Canada; Rev. E. Schmok, Manager of the Lutheran Immigration Board of Canada; Rev. P. Kohlmeier, Winnipeg; Rev. Herzer, Winnipeg, Immigrant Missionaries; Mr. T. Kreutzer, President Regina Retail Merchants' Association; Prof. Schneider, Director Luther College, Regina; Prof. H. Schmidt, Professor Luther College, Regina; Rev. Wetzstein, Pastor Grace Lutheran Church, Regina; Rev. Meyer, Pastor First English Lutheran Church, Regina; Rev. J. Fritz, Pastor Trinity Lutheran Church, Regina; Rev. Reitz, Field Secretary, Regina, representing a Lutheran membership of nearly 40,000 Lutherans in Western Canada.

Thanking you for your kindness,

Very respectfully,

REV. G. F. WETZSTEIN,
1033 Victoria Avenue.

REV. J. FRITZ,
1948 Ottawa Street.

Directors of the Lutheran Immigration Board of Canada.

Regina, February 24, 1930."

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member must hereafter confine himself to that which is relevant.

Mr. Dunn: That is all right, Mr. Speaker. I have just finished reading the letter. I would only add that the consultation and co-operation that is being asked for has been practised in this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the statement that we are suffering from the degree of industrialists who are coming in under the present system of immigration and who later flock into the cities increasing unemployment — and for that reason immigration should cease, or be materially reduced. When we look at our railways, our highways, our telephones and so on, it seems to me that we can get many more people who are agriculturists into our country. At the same time I agree with the mover of the amendment (*Mr. McIntosh*) that we ought not to be stampeded into sudden changes of policy. We should adopt a sane immigration system and not change with conditions which we all know are temporary.

I notice that the majority of our immigrants since the war have been from the countries comprising the northern part of the continent of Europe. The reason for this is due to the fact that since the war there has been a large increase in the amount of national shipping from northern Europe and the consequent closer inter-communication, and also to the fact that the Canadian National Railway system has established and maintained offices in these countries. In this connection, I am going to quote you a little extract from a book by Robert England in which he states:

"The increase from Northern Europe is, to some extent, due to the increase of national shipping from the Northern Continental countries, France, Belgium,

Holland, Germany, and Scandinavia. The Canadian National Railways furthermore established offices in these countries in 1924. The Mediterranean immigration has been reduced to a very low figure compared with pre-war years and the Jewish movement much reduced, though it still averages over 3,000 annually. As to Central Europe, the numbers are about the same as in pre-war days."

Now, Mr. Speaker, knowing something of these people, and knowing conditions in communities where more especially the Mennonites and other people from northern Europe are settled, I would say this: Many of those people came here unassisted in any way, shape or form, other than receiving a homestead when they got here. If you go into those communities, you will find those people in better financial shape than the people in other communities under present circumstances, and that in spite of the fact that many of these people have settled in portions of the province known to be rough break demanding hard manual labour to improve the land. These people have prospered, and are excellent citizens, and though I might suggest we should be careful to see that only people who are in good shape physically are selected—they should pass a thorough medical examination—we should encourage people of that type to come here to settle the waste lands of our province. Where it has been possible in the past for those people to make good and to become good citizens, I suggest that those 200 families could have been absorbed and assimilated without any trouble whatsoever. I think it is good business to bring in that type of people and it is my conviction that we need co-operation between the Federal and Provincial Governments with that end in view.

I am glad to second the amendment moved by the honourable member for Kinistino.

THE HONOURABLE A. C. STEWART, LL.B., K.C.

(*Minister of Highways*)

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1930.

(*In part*)

Mr. Speaker,—It seems to me that we have, to a certain extent, departed considerably from the subject of the amendment and from the original motion also. However, certain statements have been made on the other side of the House that should not go uncontradicted. The impression I gained from those statements was this, that certain members on the other side were endeavouring to misconstrue, in the debate, certain statements made by the member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) about the foreign-born, and that, if they had an opportunity of using them in the future, they would use them! I did not want to take that impression from it, but I was led to do so by the mover of the amendment (*Mr. McIntosh*) and he certainly gave the impression that his statements were for "home consumption." Some of the members over there who have spoken so feelingly in connection with the foreign-born people are speaking for "home consumption." I can imagine quite readily, the member who introduced this amendment, rushing back to Kinistino and in his flowery manner telling them in his constituency that he saved the situation for the foreign-born people of the province. You will have some of these other individuals copying down these statements and then they will repeat them all over the province.

Mr. Hogan: Why mention it here?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, why did you mention it? We have them at Yorkton. We have about twelve or thirteen different nationalities in that constituency; we find that they are good citizens and bad citizens. We do not contend up there, and this Government does not contend, that any one nationality has all the virtues, nor that any one has all the vices. We are quite satisfied and the people in that constituency are quite satisfied. We in the Province of Saskatchewan will be quite satisfied if politics, wrapped up in nationalistic sentiments, are dropped in elections. To my mind that has been one of the serious obstacles and one of the serious reasons that accounts for the situation that the honourable member for Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*) stated existed in connection with the foreign-born peoples in Saskatchewan as contrasted with the situation in Alberta and in Manitoba. He stated that in those provinces, these vitriolic attacks were not made. I would just say this: Possibly the attitude of the governments in the past in those two provinces was a different attitude to that of the previous Administration in this province, towards those same people. We find that the attitude of that previous Administration (although they recognised them constitutionally) towards some of our foreign-born citizens in the province was not an attitude that encouraged them or enabled them to be elected to the Legislature although we have had a representative here and there who sought a nomination among some of our foreign-born. We have never had from the Ukrainian people, for instance, one representative in this House although they have elected members in Alberta and Manitoba.

Mr. Dunn: That is for home consumption!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are speaking now as a Government and I am making this not for "home consumption" but as a statement that covers the situation all over the Province of Saskatchewan and it applies as well to the English-speaking peoples of Yorkton as to the English-speaking peoples of Pheasant Hills, and to the Ukrainian and German peoples, too. I am as satisfied that the member from Melville (*Mr. Dunn*) was making the statement he made for "home consumption" as he was satisfied he was making it for "home consumption." Further, I would just say this (and this

may be for "home consumption" if you like): We have in the Yorkton district people of every nationality that are to be found elsewhere in the Province of Saskatchewan. We have a second generation growing up, and you can scarcely distinguish these people from the English-speaking or English-born, from England, as a matter of fact. We have barristers, we have school teachers, we have men entering every profession, the sons of foreign-born people; and we have men of Ukrainian ancestry who are farmers, and they are outstanding farmers. I do not say they are all perfect; there is still the odd flaw here and there, but the vast majority of the Ukrainian people there are getting along, and I do not think we have much to worry about in the people of the province. No matter what you think about the foreign-born element, the fact is that they are here and we as a Government and the members over there as the Opposition should take the opportunity to encourage them so that they may work together harmoniously with the other peoples of the province instead of taking the opportunity of discussing (and enlarging upon it, too) some particular expression that a man has used which he should not have used, for I think that only stirs up and accentuates the troubles that have been pending. If we take the other view and try to forget a few of these things, and we hold contrary views as to what is the best method to be adopted, we should express our view. I deprecate very strongly the attempts that have been made by the so-called Liberal party to raise the national or racial cry among these people. This happened in seat after seat. If they were electioneering in a certain district where there was one nationality, they would play on that nationality in that regard. That was the method used by the old "machine," attacking a candidate among this nationality by a campaign of misrepresentation and picturing him as an enemy opposed—

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not speaking to the amendment at all. He is talking politics.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that the amendment was politics.

Mr. Hogan: I urge for a ruling.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If my honourable friend from Vonda will take his mind off politics and listen to what I have to say, I will be frank and say that the amendment is entirely politics and that the Opposition has been suffering with a disease of amendments. We cannot bring in a motion of any sort but the Leader or some other member of the Opposition immediately launches an amendment, and the amendment in this case proposes to change and avoid the word "consult" by the word "co-operate." Possibly they have found that the word "co-operate" is a good word, and they are beginning to understand the term. But in this particular instance they are using it in the wrong place, because the Dominion Government has already consulted us on immigration. They have not consulted to the extent that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, claims, but they have consulted; and you are, in effect, saying, "You should not have done it." You have brought in an amendment which would strike out the last part of the motion which has to do with the attitude this Government has taken in connection with the Mennonites. The view was taken that this was not the time to bring in 5,000 outside people into the Province of Saskatchewan, and, as I said before in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Attorney General, in conversation with the spokesman of a delegation, stated that if 7,000 Highland Scotsmen wanted to come in he would not agree to it. It was not a case of nationality, and the Opposition, to my mind, are not helping by trying again to play on national sentiment.

This Government refused admission to Saskatchewan of these destitute people, because we felt the situation demanded it, and there has been no criticism of that by the members of the Opposition. No member over there, including the Leader of the Opposition, has stated what he would have done. They have not endeavoured to act with, or co-operate with, the Government in that connection. There has been no concrete suggestion and nothing in praise of the Government's attitude toward the Mennonite question; and if they want that struck out of the motion they should have shown good ground. Probably they do not want to do anything that commends the present Government.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would say that attempts have been made, as I was telling the honourable member for Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*), to stir up national strife in elections. That has occurred time after time. I will say here that the previous Administration did not have an immigration policy at all. I do not want you to take my word for that. I would like you to take the former Minister's word, the honourable

member for Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*). In reply to a letter, which he or his Deputy Minister received, it is stated, on November 21, 1928:

"Dear Madam,—

I am directed by the Hon. George Spence, Minister in charge of this Department, to reply to your communication of the 17th, and to the list of questions enclosed therewith.

Practically all of your questions may be answered by the following statement:

All immigration to Saskatchewan is within the control of the Federal Government. As part of the agreement, which was made at the time the province was erected, the Federal authorities retained the natural resources of the province and, in lieu of these resources, the Federal Government undertook, among several other items, the responsibility of immigration into the province. Consequently this province has no immigration policy in so far as the admission to the province of immigrants is concerned.

In the light of the above statement, the following may be recorded as answered to your questions:

1. The Province of Saskatchewan has no Immigration Policy.
2. The province could probably make a selection of immigrants which it might prefer to receive, but, of course, once an immigrant is admitted to Canada, there is no barrier against him entering any province, or in fact leaving the province and re-entering it at will.
3. There is no positive understanding between the Dominion and Provincial authorities as to the number of nationalities of migrants entering the province."

The Province of Saskatchewan has no immigration policy! That is in 1928, and in reply to the letter of a lady representing the National Council of Women. We contend they did not have a policy. I have contended, and that letter shows, they had no policy.

We have endeavoured to formulate a policy which we hope we will be able to place before the next session, as a result of the labours of this Commission which is investigating matters pertaining to immigration. We have already taken one forward step, and that is the prohibiting, temporarily, of any immigration into the province until the unemployment and the farming troubles of this province are more or less placed in better shape. We have taken that one step (regardless of the political results) which we believe to be in the interests of the people and particularly the farming populace of the province. We have taken that stand and have taken it regardless of political influences.

Now, what is the attitude of the Opposition? They won't condemn, or even suggest an alternative. They know this, that the feeling outside—

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we have not had an opportunity to do that yet. We have been discussing the amendment to the motion, and after the amendment is put we may start all over again..

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I might tell the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, that they did have a chance to discuss it and the honourable member for Kinistino made no particular comment in introducing the amendment but, on the other hand kept carefully away from it, as one trying to catch flaws who did not know where to pick. Instead, he got up and dealt with questions that have no bearing on this matter inside or outside of this House. He had not a word to say that this Government had or had not adopted the right attitude. They know that the Government adopted the right attitude as the people of the province know we adopted the right attitude and, further, members of the Opposition know that our attitude was fairly well followed by the provinces on either side of us. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say, that being the case, if the members of the Opposition feel, as I have stated, that the Government was right in their attitude on that Mennonite migration, then they should vote down their own amendment and they should vote for the motion. If, on the other hand, they disagree with the Government's policy in connection with the Mennonite migration then they should vote for the amendment and vote down the motion. I say that the issue is clear. I will say here that the members of the Opposition have been assiduously voting together regardless of what is the issue and what the merits of the case demand and they will have—

(Interruptions by Opposition members.)

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Step up if you want to ask a question! They will have to answer to their own constituencies, including the honourable member for Vonda; they will have to answer to their own constituencies and we intend to see they do answer and to put it to an issue as to whether we adopted the proper attitude or not.

I intend to vote against the amendment and to support the motion.

SPEECHES ON
THE SECOND READING OF
BILL TO RATIFY AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
DOMINION OF CANADA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PROVINCE OF
SASKATCHEWAN RESPECTING THE TRANSFER TO THE PROVINCE
OF ITS NATURAL RESOURCES.

THE HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D.Paed.
(*Premier and Minister of Education*)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1930.

The Honourable Mr. Anderson, in moving the Second Reading of Bill No. 86—An Act to ratify a certain Agreement between the Government of the Dominion of Canada, represented therein by the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and the Honourable Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, of the first part, and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, represented therein by the Honourable James Thomas Milton Anderson, Premier and Minister of Education of the Province, and the Honourable Murdoch Alexander MacPherson, Attorney General, of the second part, said:

Mr. Speaker,—I want it distinctly understood that, as the proposer of this Bill, I am not going to try to ignore in any way attempts that have been made by previous Governments or by individuals in the interests of this province in connection with this problem. I think it is a very happy thing that this question, which has been a subject of political discussion for a quarter of a century, should be settled once and for all, and that all members of the House, on both sides, should get together in a spirit of co-operation with the idea of developing these resources which are ours.

I might just briefly point out that the land area of this province is 155,763,840 acres and the areas alienated constitute 69,957,583 acres, leaving the number of acres still under the control of the Dominion at 85,806,257. Those are figures supplied by the Federal Government and are as at March 31, 1929.

In order to give some idea of the alienations since 1905, I might point out that these alienations have taken place in various ways. I have here a summary showing letters patent covering Dominion lands in Saskatchewan from September 1, 1905. I shall not read all the items but shall be glad to refer to any specific item that any of the members of the House may wish to hear. In the matter of homestead alienations the amount is 25,282,000 acres.

Mr. Davis: What was that figure?

Premier Anderson: 25,282,000 acres.

Mr. Davis: And these are the figures that the Department at Ottawa has given?

Premier Anderson: Yes. Pre-emptions 3,000,000. Sales 602,000 acres. I might say to my honourable friend from Prince Albert that I have the data on the alienations from year to year.

Mr. Davis: Has the Prime Minister any knowledge that a higher figure than that has been given?

Premier Anderson: Yes, I have seen the figure 26,000,000 somewhere.

Mr. Spence: Do those "sales" refer to school lands?

Premier Anderson: No. School lands comprise 839,629 acres. Special grants 601,731 acres. I have no particulars of them. Soldier grants 184,000 acres. I will just read the round figures: Manitoba Southwestern Colonisation Railway Company, 13,000 acres. These two latter figures indicate that alienations have taken place in this province in order to encourage projects in Alberta and Manitoba. Canadian Northern Railway Company, 3,506,000 acres; Canadian Pacific Railway, 588,000 acres; Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company, 1,190,000 acres; Saskatchewan and Western Railway, 98,000 acres; Manitoba and Southeastern Railway, 767,000 acres. Area granted to Hudson's Bay Company, 1,036,000 acres — the total alienations by patent and grant being 39,459,242 acres. Then, lands entered or sold but not patented, also land under letters patent, March 1, 1929—the total here is 7,281,572 acres; all totalling some 46,000,000 acres. The other figures to make up the 65,000,000 acres of total alienations being the number of acres alienated prior to 1905, amount to the difference which would be some 20,000,000 acres approximately.

It would be interesting also to know just how much actual cash has been received from land transactions by the Dominion Government since 1905. I have the figures here from the fiscal year 1905, winding up with the year 1929 making a total of \$25,220,000, collected by the Dominion Government as a result of land transactions from September 1, 1905, to March 1, 1929.

Now, there has been a difference of opinion as to how much Saskatchewan is entitled to by way of compensation for alienations. I believe the majority of our people feel that we should have compensation for alienations made, approximately 20,000,000 acres, from 1870 to 1905 and this agreement provides that the Federal Government will co-operate with the Provincial Government in taking certain stated questions to the Supreme Court of Canada dealing with alienations during that period prior to 1905, and from the Supreme Court, if necessary, to the Privy Council. These questions have been decided upon by counsel retained by the Government of the Dominion of Canada and by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. I have not the questions here but if any of the members wish to have them—I may say they were published in the press a short time ago—we shall be glad to provide them. The Dominion Government agreed, in the contract we have before us, to an accounting since 1905, or from 1870, if the courts so rule. It is agreed that the present cash subsidy of \$750,000 a year, with increases, according to increase of population, to \$1,250,000 per year will be continued for all time; that we shall get control of all unalienated resources; and that we shall have an accounting for all alienations since 1905, with the other proviso for the period prior to 1905, as I have explained.

There has been considerable discussion as to the difference between this agreement and the agreement arranged between Alberta and the Federal Government. I might point out to you one difference and that is to be found in the preamble on page 2, the paragraph near the bottom of the page, which is entirely new as compared with the Alberta Act. I shall not read it now, but it starts out,

"And whereas the Government of the Province contends that, before the Province was constituted and entered into Confederation as aforesaid, the Parliament of Canada was not competent to enact that the natural resources within the area now included within the boundaries of the Province should vest in the Crown and be administered by the Government of Canada for the purposes of Canada . . ."

and so on.

Then another change is found in section 23, dealing with questions that are to be placed before the Supreme Court. I may say that when the delegation representing the province was at Ottawa it was decided that the Agreement would not be formally executed until these questions were agreed upon; and that procedure has been followed.

Then we have, in section 27, something that is not included in the Alberta Agreement—the reservation of our rights, notwithstanding anything that may be done, notwithstanding the execution of this Agreement or any statutes confirming the same, to call into question the legislative competence of the Parliament of Canada to enact certain sections of the Saskatchewan Act and the Dominion Lands Acts. It is interesting to note that when Saskatchewan received these conditions our sister province realised that we were receiving more than they were, and we have seen from the press that the Legislature in Alberta has adjourned discussion of the Agreement between

the Government of Alberta and the Government of Canada with a view to having the Agreement between the Dominion Government and the Government of Alberta made the same as that of Saskatchewan. I believe, further, that it has been agreed upon, and I think it is perfectly right that it should be so.

In addition to this Agreement we have two letters which are official documents and will be placed in the hands of the Commission when appointed to deal with our accounting.

In section 1, on page 3, we were not quite satisfied with the last half of the first paragraph, and I have this letter signed by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada, which I think I should read to you:

"March 6, 1930, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir:

Referring to our conferences on the subject of the agreement for the transfer to the Province of its natural resources, I agree that it would be useful, as you suggest, to make quite clear what the position of the Government of Canada is on two of the points which have been under consideration.

Our view with regard to the concluding clause of paragraph 1 of the agreement is that it relates to the specific payments received before and after the coming into force of the agreement, and that the clause has no effect whatever upon the rights or duties of the Commissioners appointed under paragraph 24 to consider the position with regard to payments received by Canada before the coming into force of the agreement. In our view the position of the Commissioners in relation to such payments is wholly covered by the provisions of paragraph 24, and any effect upon it of the concluding clause of paragraph 1 is expressly excluded by the inclusion in that clause of the words "except as herein otherwise specially provided."

In our view, moreover, the provisions with regard to the consideration by the Commissioners of the relative rights and obligations of Canada and the Province in respect of the period subsequent to September 1st, 1905, are not to be in any way affected by any judgment that may be obtained pursuant to paragraph 22 upon the question of such rights and obligations prior to the constitution of the Province.

Yours sincerely

W. L. MACKENZIE KING."

Now, in connection with national parks, which are covered by section 14, we found that the Federal Government had given to the Government of Alberta a letter of interpretation. We were not satisfied with the letter obtained on behalf of the Province of Alberta and the Honourable Mr. Stewart signed for us this letter of March 6, 1930:

"Dear Dr. Anderson:

Following the discussion this morning, I think it would be useful if I indicated to you what the policy of the Department of the Interior is with respect to the administration of national parks and why it is suggested that the provisions of the agreement on the subject of parks should be framed in the way proposed.

There is no intention on the Department's part to exclude the operation within the parks of the general body of provincial laws. On the contrary, the intention is that, for practically all purposes the provincial laws should apply within the parks as fully as throughout the Province generally. In assuming responsibility for the administration of the parks, Canada is, however, at the same time assuming a considerable financial burden. There have in the past been conflicts of jurisdiction on minor points connected with the park administration which have interfered with their effective control and it is regarded as important that occasion for conflicts of this kind should if possible be avoided in the future. For that reason, it is considered that the agreement by which the parks are vested in Canada should provide that the final decision as to the applicability or otherwise of provincial laws within them should rest with the Dominion Parliament. This is not, however, with a view of separating the parks from the rest of the Province, except insofar as it is necessary for their efficient administration to differentiate the laws applicable within and without their boundaries. The purpose of the provision is only to prevent conflict and to confer upon the Dominion a discretion

to determine what provincial laws, if any, cannot consistently with the efficient administration of the parks be permitted to remain in force within them.

With regard to the working of mines within the parks, the settled departmental policy is not to permit any exploitation of the minerals except for specifically park purposes. It is not considered desirable that commercial mining operations should be carried on in the parks and if, in the future, important mineral deposits were found within the park boundaries the Department would desire to exclude the mineralized area from the park and return it accordingly to provincial administration. The location of a mineralized area might, however, conceivably be such as to make this course impossible and it was in contemplation of this possibility that on December 14, 1929, I wrote to Mr. Brownlee, the Premier of Alberta, the letter of which I enclose a copy. The undertaking contained in that letter would equally apply to mines in the Saskatchewan parks.

What I have said on the two subjects dealt with above was in effect said to the representatives of Manitoba and Alberta in connection with negotiations for the return to those Provinces of their natural resources and it expresses the view of the Government of which I am a member.

Yours faithfully,

CHARLES STEWART."

Now there are some, Mr. Speaker, who may say that it would have been better to have entered into an agreement, or executed the agreement, after a court decision had been handed down regarding the period prior to 1905. But we, as a province, are faced with this situation: We want control of our natural resources that have not been alienated, and we have to lay the foundation for the administration of these resources. Our future development depends on that foundation and that foundation might just as well be laid now as later; and we believe that this development should be undertaken without delay.

There are some who will say the administration is going to cost more than the subsidy of \$750,000. I have shown you that the Dominion Government secured last year from land transactions in this province \$1,077,391.08, the previous year \$1,037,000.67, and the previous year \$986,000. There may be considerable expense in connection with administration in the initial stages. That is to be expected, no matter when we take over the natural resources. We are promised definitely an accounting since 1905. We know the Province of Manitoba secured approximately \$5,000,000. The least we could expect from a reasonable accounting would be at least that and quite probably a good deal more than Manitoba secured. So, though we know that there may be considerable expense for the time being, when we have this accounting we shall have a considerable sum. When we get what we expect, further compensation for the period prior to 1905, then we shall be in a happy position indeed.

In connection with school lands, the School Lands Trust Fund, amounting to some \$16,000,000, will be administered by the province, and the sale of school lands in future will be conducted by the province. I may say that prospective sales have been discontinued because of the fact that the province is, this year, undertaking this responsibility. Now, it is very interesting to know that for the past twenty years the minimum price placed by the Federal Government on school lands in this province was \$7 per acre; in other words, the Federal Government valued our Saskatchewan lands, twenty years ago, at \$7 per acre. We have had alienated, aside from the acreage set aside for homestead purposes, some 20,000,000 acres since 1905. Placing the valuation of the Federal Government for school lands on these 20,000,000 acres, we have a staggeringly large sum. I have a letter from the Department of the Interior at Ottawa stating that \$7 was the price placed on the school lands. The average price during the last few years would be \$12 or \$14 per acre. I think last year it was about \$13 per acre, on school lands.

Now, I have nothing further to say at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and consequently I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. T. C. DAVIS, K.C., M.L.A.

(*Prince Albert*)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to discuss for a few moments the Bill now before the House, I will promise the House that I shall be just as brief as the Premier has been in introducing and discussing this Bill. I think we are all agreed on this fact that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has been introduced into the Saskatchewan Legislature, and I trust that the members will give mature and full consideration to the principle of this Bill. The session is getting late and everybody is anxious to get away but, I think, of all Bills before the House, this Bill warrants as much consideration and care as any other introduced into this Legislature up to this time.

Now, first of all, in connection with these negotiations, while not desiring to inject politics into the matter at all, I want to take this opportunity of commending the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, on the attitude he has taken and the genuine effort he has made to get this problem settled in the interests both of the Dominion of Canada and of the Province of Saskatchewan. I think members of the Government will agree with me when I say that he has done everything in his power to bring about a settlement. I want, also, Mr. Speaker, to commend the Leader of this Government (*Premier Anderson*) in that he did not attempt to take unto himself all the credit which may accrue to anyone by virtue of anything that has been done toward arriving at this particular agreement, or any other agreement that may be entered into for the return of our resources. These negotiations have gone on and there are a number of men who, in the past, have made some contribution, and it is merely by a turn of chance that the members of this Government were in office today and that the members of this Opposition are not in on these negotiations and their culmination. I was particularly pleased to see that the Premier gave credit to those who have served the province in this connection in the past, and I want to thank my honourable friend most sincerely for taking that stand.

I was interested in his remarks when he stated that there had been an adjournment of the Legislature in Alberta for the purpose of getting the Alberta agreement into line with the Saskatchewan agreement, and I presume that he did that for the purpose of indicating that there was to be an effort made to have the agreements of the two provinces kept as like as possible so that, in the event of anything arising in the future, the two provinces would be in the same position. I think that the decision of the Prime Minister (*Rt. Hon. Mr. King*) is wise in making the agreement entered into with Alberta similar to the one entered into with Saskatchewan. This is the second occasion, by the way, in which Alberta has gained some little advantage from the negotiations conducted by her sister province, Saskatchewan—the third time, the Leader of the Opposition informs me. At all events, I know (from my personal knowledge) that the Province of Alberta had entered into an agreement whereby there was to be a grant in lieu of subsidy provided in the Alberta Act for a period of three years and, at the end of that time, this subsidy was to be discontinued, completed and at an end. However, by virtue of the action of the Government of Alberta of that day, when it became clear that Saskatchewan was going to get something better, negotiations were re-opened with the Federal Government with the result that that agreement was altered and certain additional rights and privileges conferred on the Province of Alberta. Consequently, for the second time, the province to the west of us has benefited from the actions and negotiations of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, outside the member for Ile a la Crosse (*Mr. Marion*) and the member for Cumberland (*Mr. Hall*), the member for Prince Albert is more vitally interested in this matter than any other member of the House — perhaps I should include also, the member for Tisdale (*Hon. Mr. Buckle*) — because the bulk of our resources are in the northern portion of Saskatchewan. Since I have been a member

of this Legislature (and I have now sat here for five sessions) I have upon many occasions stressed the great possibilities which the future holds for the northern part of the province. On every occasion I have indicated that the wealth in the north is of two types: first, the mineral wealth and, second, the wealth in the forests and streams of the north country. The wealth of these things, Mr. Speaker, is largely potential — potential so far as the minerals are concerned, because no great discoveries actually have been made as yet, although some very promising "strikes" have been made. I am not going to cite the opportunities and possibilities which lie in that north country, but ultimately and inevitably great development will take place there; and there is no reason why the development should not be as great as in other provinces of Canada. The rock formation is the same in northern Saskatchewan as in those provinces to the east where mining development has taken place, and we have a greater area here, but the difficulty is that we cannot have real development in that north country until we have the transportation facilities. It so happens that the rivers in that country run from west to east and practically all the great resources of the area lie across the height of land. Thus all the waters that drain this vast area with its untold wealth run into the Churchill river and thence to the Hudson Bay. This fact has retarded development to a remarkable extent, Mr. Speaker, more perhaps than many people realise. For instance it has retarded the exploitation of the forest and timber resources of that north country, because the rivers would float the logs away from civilisation instead of towards it. So we have no means at present of transporting this timber and these other resources and we are told that we are not going to get a railway until a "strike" is made, which means that we are not going to have any great development in that north country until some important "strike" in the mineral field is made. As the honourable member for Cumberland (*Mr. Hall*) told us the other day, until a block of 20,000,000 tons of ore is mapped out, we will not get a railway into that territory and the development of the country all hangs on that — a railway over the height of land. This railway is not going to be built, as I said, until these strikes are made which will bring up the total amount of ore proved out to 20,000,000 tons.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied (and I have been all over our northern country for many years) that the day will come (though it has not yet) when these strikes will be made and a railway built into that territory — but the development, as I say, will be largely retarded until that day does arrive.

Insofar as our water powers are concerned, everybody knows we have great possibilities in the rivers of the northern part of our province and, co-incident with the negotiations resulting in this agreement (that is, this same year) the first development of the kind has been constructed at Island Falls on the Churchill river. We know also that there are other large water powers in the north not capable of development at the present time because they are too far away from the settled portion of the province. But, Mr. Speaker, with the improvements being effected in the transmission of power over great distances, some day, unquestionably, these water powers will be great and wonderful resources for the people of Saskatchewan. My main argument in that connection so far as the resources of northern Saskatchewan are concerned is that their development lies in the future and not in the immediate present.

Coming to the agreement itself, it is proposed to transfer at once (I understand the agreement comes into effect when approved by this Legislature, and by the Parliament of Canada and then by the Parliament of England) and when I say "at once" I mean at the time the Act comes into force and operation. By this agreement it is proposed to hand over at once the balance of the unalienated resources of the Province of Saskatchewan, and most of the members will agree that the bulk of these will be in the northern part of the province. It may be there is a considerable area of land in the southern portion of the province not yet sold, and there is the coal there, but I think all will agree that by far the greatest part of these resources will be in the northern portion of the province. It is only natural that from 1870 to date, of the resources in the southern part disposed of by the Federal Government, the cream has been alienated and, by a gradual sifting down, little is now left — while we have great potential resources in the north, nothing of which is in actual development at the present time. During the time the Federal Government has been alienating these resources (and there is always the argument whether this was in the interests of Saskatchewan or in the interests of the Dominion of Canada as a whole) they have been receiving from revenue account sums far in excess of any expenditures incurred in the way of administration. That was in the early years, but I think, as the years rolled on, they came to realise in terms of cash that sums received on revenue account from these resources got less and less and the administrative expenses got more and

more. Living as I do in Prince Albert which city is a large and important Dominion lands centre, I have had an opportunity of observing that the cost of administration has been going up year by year while the amount received on revenue account has been going down year by year. Consequently, I have been trying to see if I could ascertain (and it is difficult to ascertain, and I had hoped the minister would have given us more figures today) how much this transfer will cost this province, and I have come to the conclusion that it will cost the province a sum pretty well equal to the subsidy in lieu of lands to administer its resources.

Now, my honourable friend the First Minister informed the House today that the revenues received by the Dominion Government from these lands and resources during recent years has amounted to around \$1,000,000 a year. I made some inquiries in that connection and the first figures I got were practically identical with the figures which the Leader of the Government gave us today but, in digging more deeply into the matter, I find that the great bulk of this alleged revenue represents receipts from the sale of school lands, the great bulk of which goes into the School Lands Trust Fund, which, being a trust fund, the province cannot utilise for current administration purposes. The money derived from this source will have to be set aside in this trust fund, and the interest set aside for school purposes.

I have tried to get the figures (but, as I say, it is difficult for me to get the exact figures, not having the facilities my honourable friend has) but I estimate that it will cost in the neighbourhood of \$750,000 to administer those resources from the minute we get them — that is, annually. The Forestry alone, including the Air Service, which is necessary if our forests are to be protected adequately, will run in the neighbourhood of \$250,000, Mr. Speaker, and the total will be in the neighbourhood of three-quarters of a million, or a sum practically equivalent to the present subsidy from the Dominion Government in lieu of lands.

On the other hand, even if there is some development in the immediate future (and it is possible that money will have to be expended to aid that development) I do not think you will get more than quarter of that sum by way of revenue for, after all, the revenue will be very slight for a considerable time and will come mostly from homesteads, grazing leases and so on. That being the case, I would have thought that the very first thing for the Government to ascertain would be how much it is going to cost the province to administer these resources and how much we are likely to receive by way of revenue to meet that cost. Unfortunately, the minister has not given us those figures and I hope that, before the Bill passes through Committee of the Whole we shall find out as nearly as possible how much this is going to cost the province.

If the Federal Government came to us today and said, "Here is the balance of your resources and the continuance of your subsidy in perpetuity," I do not think there is a man in the Legislature who would say "Go ahead and close the deal!" I do not think there is a man in all the province who would say "Go ahead and close the deal" on such terms. I think we are all agreed that if the resources are going to be turned over to the province there should be some compensation for the lands and resources already alienated. In years gone by, the Federal Government has alienated the cream of the resources, and now that the cost of administration is higher than ever before and receipts lower than ever before, I think everyone will agree that we should get some assistance towards meeting the costs of administering the balance of the resources which are being handed back. I think we are all satisfied (at all events, I am) to have back the balance of our resources; but I am not anxious to consummate the deal merely to have the resources back and the deal closed. I do not think that is in the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan. Even if we had to wait for a few years more, I am sure it would not injure the interests of the people of the province. The only possible injury would be that development might be a little retarded, for I think, all things considered, that they will be developed more quickly if control is vested in the province. That is the only injury likely to result from a year-or-two's delay. I think we are all agreed on the principle that it is the best thing for the province to have its resources handed back. I think we are only going to disagree (and I am not so sure we do disagree) as to the best time to have those resources handed back to us.

Now, I want to discuss a few matters in connection with the settlement. A Commission is going to be set up (so we have been told by the First Minister) to determine the compensation for the alienations which have taken place since 1905 to the present time, and no decision of any court can alter the agreement reached in this regard. The Commission will sit on that and make its finding and then report to

the Governments concerned. Then it will sit on the question of compensation for alienations between 1870 and 1905; but this will depend solely on the outcome of the reference to the courts as to whether or not the province is entitled to compensation for the lands alienated between 1870 and 1905. If the courts find the province is entitled to such compensation, then the Commission will take into consideration the whole thing from 1870 to the present time. If the courts find otherwise — that the province is not entitled to such compensation, namely between 1870 and 1905, it will consider only alienations from 1905 to the present time.

There is one thing in this connection that struck me which might have been done and that is in connection with pre-emption lands. When the province was formed in 1905, it was estimated that there were 25,000,000 acres of arable land in this province. This was valued at one dollar and fifty cents an acre, or \$37,500,000 in all, and, computing interest on this amount at three per cent., they arrived at our subsidy in lieu of lands. This is how our subsidy in lieu of lands was arrived at and this was embodied in the Saskatchewan Act, and it was all based on this estimate of 25,000,000 acres. Actually, however, the Federal Government has used somewhere between 27 and 28 million acres — that is several million acres of land more than was taken into consideration in arriving at the subsidy. In addition to this, the Dominion Government has done that which it was not entitled to do; namely, it has sold additional lands by way of pre-emptions to the extent of several million acres. From these pre-emptions they have realised fairly close to \$10,000,000 and I think it is beyond any argument whatever that this belongs of right to the Province of Saskatchewan, over and above any other compensation claimed. That, I think, does not need to be referred to the Commission for decision. I contend the province is entitled, as of right, to this \$10,000,000.

I indicated, a moment ago, that I was not quite in accord with the agreement, not as regards the terms but as regards the time when we should take over these resources, and I am inclined to believe that we are going at this the wrong way round, and that we are a little premature — premature at the present time in that, personally, I feel we should have our reference to the courts first to ascertain whether or not we are going to get compensation for the lands alienated from 1870 down to 1905. I think that is the first thing that should be done. The next step that should then be taken is to have the Commission sit to find out what compensation we should receive. That is what the Province of Manitoba did. They found out what actually they were going to receive before they passed their agreement. When that is done we could then decide whether it is in the best interests of the province to take back those resources from the Dominion Government now or later. It may be that (to use a common term) we are buying a "pig in a poke" in clinching this bargain at the present time. We know what we are going to get — the balance of the alienated resources and the subsidy in perpetuity — but we do not know what we are going to get by way of compensation for the resources already alienated, and I think we should have all these facts before us before we conclude this agreement.

I am not alone in this contention. There are other parties in agreement with me, in this province, on this matter. I have here the resolution passed at the last convention of the United Farmers. It reads as follows:

"Be it resolved that we re-affirm our resolution of the previous year as to inherent provincial ownership from 1870. That we again affirm our adherence to the advisability of having the question referred without delay to the Privy Council to get a clear-cut pronouncement on the legal principles involved; which method must ultimately be adopted to make possible an adequate and just solution of this complicated question. That to whatever extent the method of conference and bargain is adopted by our province, we re-affirm our adherence to the basis of a full accounting by the Dominion for all lands alienated; or privileges granted by infringements of our provincial rights in the Saskatchewan Act of 1905;

"That we urge the necessity and importance of fully canvassing the new basis and its far-reaching implications of an economic nature, and deprecate emphatically any tendency toward a hasty solution; and

"That we urge the necessity of provincial sovereignty under the B. N. A. Act as indicated by such constitutional views as have been advanced on this question since 1919 and further that we ask the Provincial Government to refrain from having any agreement with the Federal Government ratified by the Legislature until a final decision of the Supreme Court of Canada or the Privy Council has settled for all time the question of our inherent rights from 1870 to 1905 and from 1905 till the present.

"And further, be it resolved, that our board of directors, or executive, be asked to refuse to endorse any settlement until such has been agreed to by Bram Thompson, K.C., and Norman McLeod, and that in any case no settlement be finally ratified by the Legislature of Saskatchewan until the decision of the Privy Council."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to deal with this question solely on its merits. I have attempted to keep, and I think I have succeeded in keeping, politics out of it altogether. I have tried to set forth what, in my opinion, is in the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan and I am here (as I am convinced we all are) to get what we believe to be the best deal for the people of Saskatchewan. I am giving my views on this important matter, as others in this Legislature will in turn give their views, so that the Legislature shall have those different views before it when it comes to make its decision; and I submit, Mr. Speaker, the House should have the information I have spoken of before the members are asked to reach a final decision on so important a matter.

The First Minister has referred to the agreement with Manitoba and said that Manitoba had got more by way of compensation than they expected and that we would at least get no less; but I believe (and I stand subject to correction), that the additional sums granted to Manitoba were for the purpose of equalising the subsidy for past years in order to bring the receipts in this province from subsidy more in line with the subsidy of the Province of Saskatchewan, the Dominion Government realising that there would be less objection likely to arise in future if they were equalised. As I have said, we have not before us any figures to show the current cost of administration in relation to the revenue, nor anything on which to base the allowance that should be made to us by way of compensation to assist in administering the resources when they are taken over.

I shall not take up much more of the time of the House. The views I have expressed are my own and are not inspired by any political considerations and I have an open mind and shall retain an open mind until I have all the facts before me. Then, when the time comes for me to vote, if I am called upon to do so, I shall vote as my conscience dictates and as I think in the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan. If, having these facts before me, I think it in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan that we should take over these resources forthwith, then I shall vote that we should proceed to ratify this agreement at the present time.

To sum up: It is the aim of the Province of Saskatchewan to get back the balance of its resources and the transfer back of all its lands; but I do not believe this is the opportune time to take back those resources, and I do not believe they should be taken back before the question of compensation is settled. Then, if the Government is going to get nothing by way of compensation to help meet the cost of administration which, as I have said, will, for a considerable time to come, be much greater than any revenue the province is likely to derive from these resources, then I say, the matter is one that merits the most careful consideration of the House and members on both sides should be placed in possession of all the facts in order that they may act in the best interests of the province; and I do not think there is any doubt but that members on both sides are desirous only of serving the best interests of the province.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to await further discussion and further information before I make up my mind. I have avoided injecting politics into this discussion and I hope others in the House who follow me will do so, too, just as was done by my honourable friend the First Minister in moving the second reading of this Bill.

THE HONOURABLE M. A. MACPHERSON, B.A., LL.B., K.C.

(Attorney General)

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In proceeding to discuss the resolution which is before the House, that the agreement between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion of Canada be ratified and that the Bill be now read a second time, I realise, as has been stated already in this debate, that this is a measure of transcending importance to the Province of Saskatchewan which we have before us, and I am submitting, Sir, to you and to the Assembly that one of the reasons why it is of such great importance is because, by its ratification by this Assembly, it will give Saskatchewan the real status of a province for the first time in history.

I desire to approach the subject in the highest and, I trust, the proper spirit and I wish to approach it as one who signed the actual agreement that this Bill is to ratify. I would point out, as has been done already, that for twenty-five years in this province there has been one vexed question and that question has been the question of the Natural Resources. Now this Legislature has before it a measure which, we hope, will settle it for all time. When we remember that twenty-five years, while not a long period, is a comparatively long time in the public life of the individual or in the public life of a country, we will realise we have a very serious duty to perform in securing the natural resources and the public domain for the Province of Saskatchewan. I will say this further, Mr. Speaker, as a citizen of Saskatchewan, as a member of this Assembly for the past four years, as a responsible Minister of the Crown, as one who signed the agreement and as one who twice went to Ottawa and conferred with the Government there in the preparing of the agreement, that we have in this agreement everything and all we can hope to get from any Dominion Government. That is my conviction and if it were not my conviction I would not be wholeheartedly supporting this Bill tonight. I want to call your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House to the fact that Alberta and Saskatchewan are sister provinces. These two provinces came into being at the same time and their constitutions are the same. These two provinces have now the same agreement with the Dominion Government. That was not the case until the past week so far as Alberta was concerned. As was mentioned by the honourable member for Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*) in the press today there was notification of the fact that the agreement had been ratified in the Province of Alberta yesterday. I think, Mr. Speaker, having regard to the fact that there has been considerable debate on this motion which is before the House, we might very well read this full dispatch, in so far as it deals with a similar measure in Alberta, to the House, because I think, Mr. Speaker, that it confirms the attitude of the Government. It confirms also the attitude of the people of the province and is a further reason why we in this Assembly tonight should support this motion and why the Bill should go into committee:

"Edmonton, April 3, 1930. Alberta's natural resources Bill, including the amendments in conformance with the Saskatchewan Bill, is now ready to be given the assent of the Lieutenant Governor and to be signed by federal and provincial officials.

The amendments were passed in the Legislature Wednesday and by virtue of these, Alberta has now all the benefits coming to Saskatchewan under the agreement signed by that province and by the federal government.

The amendments provide for a reference to the courts in regard to any claim for provincial compensation for lands alienated prior to 1905, when the province was formed, and the reference may also include decision on the question of whether lands were to be administered for the benefit of residents subsequently in the country, and whether or not the Dominion was under any obligation to render an account for lands alienated prior to 1905."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this measure is of great importance to us in Saskatchewan for various reasons. It is admitted by all in this Assembly that agriculture is the primary basic industry of this province. But there is one thing we must not forget and that is that we have other possibilities of development industrially in this province as well as along agricultural lines. I do not think we in the House have a full realisation of the situation that exists in Saskatchewan. I do not think we realise the fact that in the northern part of this province there is a veritable treasure house, neither we nor the people of the province fully realise that; and that in the southern part of the province, in the coal deposits of the Estevan area, we have another veritable treasure house. These are part of our natural resources. These will give us something of diversified industry and in giving us that, when properly intensified, it will mean that agriculture will flourish to a greater degree and that all those other industries will flourish to a greater degree. And having regard to the knowledge that we obtained in this House this year, I was somewhat surprised to hear honourable gentlemen on the other side asking for information relative to the natural resources of the province. I was frankly surprised to hear my honourable friend from Prince Albert (*Mr. Davis*) say that we were getting something in the nature of a "pig in a poke" in connection with our Natural Resources.

Mr. Davis: That is not what I said. I did not say the resources were a "pig in a poke." I said the manner of getting them was a "pig in a poke."

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member used the term —

Mr. Davis: Yes, I applied it in the way I said.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: I do not wish to misinterpret what my honourable friend says but I think that if there is one honourable gentleman who should realise the great possibilities in the north, he should. He represents the seat of Prince Albert in the north; he is proud of the fact that he is a "native son"; he has been a Minister of the Crown, and he knows what the possibilities in the north are, and I submit when he gets up for the purpose of asking for information he might well have taken the House into his confidence and given the House some of the knowledge he has in relation to the great opportunities of the north. We heard during the Budget Debate from the honourable member for Cumberland (*Mr. Hall*) something as to the possibilities of this part of the north, Cumberland, we heard from the honourable member for Estevan (*Mr. Garner*) with regard to the possibilities of the south, and we heard from the Minister in charge of the Department of Labour and Industries (*Hon. Mr. Merkley*).

Mr. Spence: We did not hear much information from him!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: You got a considerable amount of information. There was various information relative to the natural resources of the province submitted and so far as I am concerned I do not look upon our natural resources in this regard, as anything like a "pig in a poke," and I have every confidence in the north and south of this province.

Mr. Davis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say the natural resources were a "pig in a poke." I said the way you entered into it, the method of bargaining, was like buying "a pig in a poke."

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, of course, my honourable friend would now put another meaning on what he said.

Mr. Davis: That was my whole argument.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, taking his whole argument at its face value, he was not playing fair when he did not give the information concerning the possibilities of the north.

Mr. Davis: That was not the information I was asking for. I was asking for the cost of administration.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Yes, and you were asking what we were likely to get by way of resources.

Mr. Davis: Yes, by way of revenue!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: My honourable friend from Prince Albert asked the legal question as to whether ratification of this agreement this year was necessary. Now, I am going to say this in that regard: The agreement might possibly be ratified next session, in my opinion; so far as this province is concerned that might be done, but I want to recall certain facts relative to the agreement. This House will recall that, prior to the ministers going to Ottawa on March 1st, there were telegrams from the Prime Minister of Canada requesting, practically insisting, that the ministers should go down there to confer with the ministers at Ottawa relative to this question. We went down in perfect good faith. We conferred with them and out of that conference there came this agreement. What we promised the Dominion Government was this — and what the Dominion Government promised us was that we, for our part, would see to the ratification of this agreement at this session, and Mr. King indicated he would do the same at Ottawa.

Now, I submit to you, in view of that statement there is only one thing we can do as honourable men, and that is to see that our promise to the Prime Minister of Canada and the Government of Canada is kept in that regard.

Another statement that was made by the honourable gentleman was with reference to the length of this document. Well, I ask any honourable gentleman whether he has ever had occasion to buy an old car or an old wagon and get a bill of sale for it? I suggest to you, Sir, and to the members of the House that, when you take the length of the average bill of sale which is in use in Saskatchewan then this agreement is not so much longer and this agreement which is before the House is of much greater importance than any bill of sale.

My honourable friend from Notukeu (*Mr. Grant*) and my honourable friend from Touchwood (*Mr. Parker*) were very curious as to what the law would be with regard to these natural resources in the Province of Saskatchewan if the transfer actually took place. I think it is regrettable that my honourable friends did not look at Bill No. 87, which is now on their desks, and they will see that it is an Act to provide for the province's Natural Resources temporarily.

Mr. Spence: We read that long ago.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: My honourable friend says he read it! Well, I did not think he had, and I do not think the other gentlemen ever read it. The information which that Bill would give them is that there is a Dominion Lands Act, a Lands Survey Act, and a Dominion Water Power Act, and that these Acts will remain in force so far as necessary for administration by the province until the province actually deals with these matters further by means of separate statutes in this House. That is to say, the answer is very obvious that there will be no change of policy in the matter of homesteading, no change of policy in the matter of grazing leases, no changes in policy so far as school lands or leases of school lands until this Legislature passes legislation dealing with the various matters to which I have referred. It is the intention of the Government of this province then during the interim, or during the summer, to arrange that the three western provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba should get together in an effort to have uniform legislation in the three provinces of western Canada and next session there should be introduced into this House a Provincial Lands Act, a Forest Act, a Water Powers Act, and so on. There will be no change in that regard, and I am sure my honourable friend from Notukeu, realising that, will feel that he, at any event, has been answered insofar as his objections to this legislation are concerned.

Some honourable member suggested something as to the matter of staff. One of the things we took up at Ottawa was the question of the transfer of any Dominion civil servants to the Provincial Civil Service that were required and of the arrangements in connection with the superannuation fund, such as the length of service of these Dominion civil servants, and certain sums of money that should be transferred to their credit in the superannuation scheme of this province.

Mr. Speaker, so far as this department is concerned, I do not think there is any department of Government (when the resources come to the province) in which it is more necessary that there should be a Deputy Minister who is capable and efficient and with sufficient vision to attend to the development of the resources and to give this department a greater share of his attention than it is receiving or than it ever received from the Dominion of Canada. So far as this Government is concerned,

when a Deputy Minister is needed, it will make every effort, either in the Dominion or Provincial Civil Service or elsewhere, to seek what it thinks is the best man it can find to take charge of a very, very important department of Government in this country.

Mr. Spence: Will it take over the present Deputy Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: The Deputy Minister of the Interior?

Mr. Spence: The Deputy or the Assistant Deputy?

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, so far as the Department of the Interior at Ottawa is concerned, the department handling Dominion lands is simply a branch of the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior has become a very large branch altogether apart from Dominion Lands, so no good purpose would be served in taking the Deputy Minister from Ottawa because the Deputy Minister has an important function there.

Mr. Spence: The Assistant Deputy is the man I refer to.

Mr. Davis: He is the best man at Ottawa.

Premier Anderson: What is his name?

Mr. Spence: Gibson, I think.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: He may be the right man for the Province of Saskatchewan. In any event, so far as we are concerned if it is found he is the best man to do this job and develop these resources, he is the man we want in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*), read certain resolutions to the House and he was criticised by certain honourable gentlemen, and he was criticised for the fact that he did so. These resolutions show that during the past four or five years during which period these quoted resolutions were passed, it was the unanimous opinion of this House that the natural resources should be returned "*forthwith*" to Saskatchewan.

Now, I am going to refer to some other resolutions. This, for example, is a resolution adopted by the Legislature in 1920:

"That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Government of Saskatchewan should continue to urge upon the Government of Canada the necessity of arranging for the transfer to the province of the public domain within its limits without further delay."

"Without further delay", Mr. Speaker! That resolution was moved by Mr. Dunning and seconded by Mr. Turgeon. In the session of 1919-20 there was a resolution practically word for word moved by Mr. Gardiner and seconded by Mr. McDonald asking that the natural resources be transferred to the province "without further delay"; in 1919, moved by Mr. MacMillan, seconded by Mr. Robinson; in 1918, moved by Mr. Paulson and seconded by Mr. Hermanson; in 1917, moved by Mr. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. Beaudreau; in 1916, moved by Mr. Robinson, seconded by Mr. Gardiner, and all urged the return of the resources "without further delay". That is, Mr. Speaker, during the period from 1916 down to date, at every session of the Legislature, a resolution has been introduced providing for the transfer to the province of its natural resources "without further delay", and on each and every occasion that resolution has been carried unanimously.

Now, what does that indicate? It indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the elected representatives of the people of this province, in succeeding Legislatures in this province, unanimously, and irrespective of where they sat with respect to your chair, Mr. Speaker, decided that there should be returned to the province, "without further delay", these natural resources.

What is the fact here today? The Province of Saskatchewan is tonight in an unique position in the whole British Empire. It is a very unique position in the whole civilised British Empire. You can go to any Dominion of the British Empire, whether it is Australia, or New Zealand or South Africa, whether it is the West Indies, or elsewhere in Canada, where there is a civil Government anywhere in that

far-flung British Empire, you can go where you will and you will find there is only one province that has not got its lands or its forests and that province is the Province of Saskatchewan. We are the only province, for the Province of Alberta, according to the despatch which I read, passed their Bill through third reading last night, and it will have Royal Assent today. The Province of Manitoba has done likewise some time ago, and in the whole civilised British Empire the only province which will not have its resources, which has not its lands, is the Province of Saskatchewan, whose Legislature we are in tonight.

Now, the motion before the House tonight is this: That an agreement be ratified whereby the Province of Saskatchewan is to get these resources and its lands, and I suggest that it would be a very serious thing indeed for this Legislature to stay its hand, when, as long as this state of affairs exists under which the natural resources will not be given to the province, the Province of Saskatchewan will remain in that unenviable position in which it is at the present time.

Mr. Spence: That was not suggested, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: What was not suggested?

Mr. Spence: That it remain the way it is!

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: Well, my honourable friend says it was not suggested. He knows what I am talking about. I am saying that honourable gentleman suggested there might be some delay and I am submitting that no delay should be considered! I am suggesting this, that in my opinion we have here for ratification the very best agreement which can possibly be obtained from the federal authority. I am suggesting further that if the agreement is not considered the best agreement then bad faith would be implied in regard to the Prime Minister of Canada, which should not be implied.

Some remarks made tonight or today have reflected on the credit of the Prime Minister of Canada. It has been said that we did not get as much as we could have got from the Prime Minister. We believe he was acting in good faith in respect of this agreement and this Government was acting in good faith in respect of this agreement and I suggest that the duty of this Legislature is clear tonight — to give second reading to this Bill and thus endorse the principle of the Bill whose purpose is to transfer these resources to the province and to ratify this agreement so that Saskatchewan may enter into real partnership in the Dominion of Canada.

I intend to support the motion.

MR. J. G. GARDINER, B.A., LL.D., M.L.A.

(*North Qu'Appelle*)

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—We have had under consideration since the beginning of the session, more or less (largely less) the question of our Natural Resources. It was one of the matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and it was one of the matters which *The Star* referred to previously to the opening of the session as the most important question to come before the Legislature when it met. Yet we have just now, within twenty-four hours of the time at which the Government hopes to close this session, been asked to come to a decision on this great question of our natural resources.

I quite agree with some of the remarks made by members of the Government and others from the other side of the House to the effect that there has been a great deal of discussion in this House on our natural resources on previous occasions. As indicated by the Honourable Minister of Public Works and the Honourable the Attorney General, I had in this House on three previous occasions the honour and privilege of moving the resolution having to do with the return of our natural resources. The first occasion, I think, was in 1916 and the last time I moved or seconded the resolution was in 1920. Probably in at least ten, if not more, of the last nineteen sessions, that is since 1913, I have had the opportunity of speaking to resolutions having to do with the return of our natural resources, and in speaking I have expressed certain opinions in the matter. I may say, speaking in that connection, that the information given to the House on those previous occasions from both sides of the House (a great deal of it from men not now in the Legislature) was the kind of information which was of value then but can scarcely be said to be of any great value at the present moment. For example, in 1905, when this first became an important question in what is now Saskatchewan, we were discussing at the time the province was about to take form as a province, whether or not the new province should take over its natural resources. The question was discussed by all who took part in the election campaign — the first election campaign (and I had the honour to take part in that campaign) and the question was as we were entering upon our existence as a province, whether or not it was in the best interests of the new province to have the lands administered from Ottawa or from the city of Regina. In all probability, the question that weighed most in the minds of the majority at that time was that the policy of immigration and land settlement should continue uninterrupted from 1905 and that the most satisfactory and efficient way in which to settle the vast spaces of Saskatchewan was to leave control of the lands in the hands of the Federal authority.

That is a question that need not be discussed today, but, as I have said, the decision then was that the Dominion should administer the lands for the purpose of immigration and settlement and that decision was approved by the Dominion Parliament.

In the years between 1905 and 1912, there was considerable discussion on this question from one side of this House and from the other. I think the first resolution was introduced in this House in the fall of 1910 or early in 1911. But even as early as 1908, there was a considerable portion of the people who supported a different position to that taken in 1905 and who did take the view that the return of the natural resources might be in the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, the terms under which their return would have been acceptable to this Legislature then were terms very different from those which we would be satisfied to accept in 1930. The reason for that should be obvious. No pre-emption policy had been set up prior to 1908, and a great area of lands had not been alienated prior to that year. Consequently, we should have accepted terms then very different from the terms we would accept today. I think that goes without saying. In 1912 we would have accepted terms which would have differed from those we would have

accepted earlier, in that we would have required more from the Dominion Government by way of cash grant and subsidy — that is, more than we would have been satisfied with in 1908. As years went by, the unalienated lands decreased in value while the terms of the Provincial Government of the day gradually increased to the extent that there had to be some accounting for all the lands alienated before the Provincial Government would agree to any terms involving the turning back of its natural resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by 1918, each province had become very much more interested in the matter than in previous years. They became interested to the extent of passing resolutions on nearly every possible occasion indicating very clearly to the people of Canada the position that the western provinces took in this matter, namely, that these lands belonged of right to the province. But the older provinces of Canada — the provinces to the east, claimed that they had a prior interest in the lands of the western provinces contending that they had purchased those lands, paying £300,000 for them to the Hudson's Bay Company, but they were quite prepared to return the unalienated resources as at that time and discontinue the subsidy given in lieu of the lands.

Well, when that proposal was made to the western provinces, the three Provincial Governments naturally refused to accept it. The first offer was made by the Government of Sir Robert Borden, the Union Government, in 1918, and the offer was renewed by Hon. Mr. Meighen when he was Leader of the Dominion Government. Then in 1922, when the present Prime Minister of Canada became head of the Dominion Government, he made a similar offer in a letter to Hon. Mr. Martin, then Premier of Saskatchewan. That letter was replied to by Hon. Mr. Dunning as indicated in the press. I do not need to repeat the contents here except to say that the Government of the day in Saskatchewan was not prepared to accept back the resources of the province and the unalienated lands and forego the subsidy provided under the agreement of 1905. I think that attitude was supported from both sides of the House and I think we had the support also of all persons in Saskatchewan who understood the resources question.

Shortly after that, the three Prairie Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta separated company so far as making sojourns to Ottawa together was concerned, and there was a real reason for that. It was thought one or other of them were more anxious to get back their resources on certain terms than the others were, and this was borne out when, in 1923, the Province of Alberta entered into an agreement (already mentioned in this debate) whereby Alberta was prepared to take back their natural resources and to take with their resources a subsidy for three years and, at the end of those three years, to forego any further subsidy from the Dominion Government. In other words, Alberta was prepared to take over its resources receiving a continuation of the subsidy for three years and from that time on to carry the burden of its natural resources without any assistance whatever from the Federal Treasury. When similar terms were offered to the other prairie provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan both refused to accept. Well, the agreement with Alberta went on its course. I understand the agreement actually had been signed by Alberta and the ratifying Bill had gone at least as far as this agreement has gone at the present moment — possibly further. If I remember rightly, it passed Second Reading, went into Committee and through Committee of the Whole to the Third Reading stage. Then it was thrown back and was not concurred in by the Legislature of Alberta.

Now, Sir, the attitude which Saskatchewan took at that time had something to do with the attitude which the Alberta Legislature finally took to certain clauses in their Bill; they thought perhaps that certain additions might be made to certain of the clauses more favourable to Alberta, and that had something to do with their change of attitude. They thought Saskatchewan was going to get better terms. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Bill ratifying the Agreement passed Second Reading, Committee and reached Third Reading and then was thrown out, and the matter stayed there until some two years later. Then in 1926, we had another Conference of Provincial Premiers with the Federal Authorities at Ottawa, and that was the first year I had the honour of being Premier of this province and of appearing there as the representative of Saskatchewan. We were there not so much to discuss the question of the natural resources of the western provinces but mainly to discuss the question of Maritime Rights, and we were there for three or four days discussing matters affecting the Maritime Provinces. I can still remember the very fine things said with regard to Saskatchewan when we took this stand in connection with the matter of railway taxation:

We had just recently entered into an agreement with the railway companies as to a basis of taxation which we considered equitable in relation to the other provinces

of western Canada. But, when we got down to Ottawa we found \$100,000 (as I remember it) that under the treatment given to other provinces, might have been claimed by Saskatchewan. But, in addition, we found that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island — the old provinces down by the sea — had not been treated nearly so fairly as the Province of Saskatchewan and we stood up in that conference and said this: "The Province of Saskatchewan has entered into an agreement which apparently has been more kind to the Railway Companies than the agreements of other provinces, but we are prepared to stay by the agreement with the railway companies and permit of the division of that money among those three old provinces down by the sea!" That was done and from the moment we began to admit Maritime claims and assist them, there was a sympathetic frame of mind in all the representatives gathered there; and we were able to get the Maritime Provinces to look on our problems with a more sympathetic mind. In that way, when we did go to the Conference of 1927 in quest of our natural resources, in spite of the fact that we were a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan while Nova Scotia was Conservative, New Brunswick was Conservative and Prince Edward Island was Liberal, the best friends we had in that conference were our friends from the Maritime Provinces down by the sea. When the question of the natural resources came up in that conference, and we presented our case for the Province of Saskatchewan, these men admitted that we were asking what we might reasonably ask for. We expressed our renewed objection to the position they had taken with regard to western lands, and they agreed to forego the position they had taken in 1918. They admitted the lands were ours of right, and they indicated a desire then and there that the Federal Government should negotiate with the Governments of the Western Provinces and enter into a settlement with them in the same manner as they had been trying to settle the problems of the Maritime Provinces and, whatever that settlement was, the Maritime Governments would agree that the Federal Government had been trying to do the best it could to settle these problems with the Maritime Provinces and the Western Provinces.

That is the situation. I have with me the notes I had at that conference and from those notes I am going to read without entering into any lengthy arguments:

"Saskatchewan contends that the lands and resources of the province belong, by right, to the province. The fact that they were not turned over to the province in 1905 has placed us in a position of inferiority in Confederation as compared with all other provinces excepting Alberta and Manitoba. The fact that we are in that position of inferiority would suggest that we have never been given full autonomy. We would suggest that Canadian unity can only be established and maintained on a basis of equality.

"In 1905, the Federal authorities contended that they had the right to retain our lands and resources and, further, that they were going to use our lands to promote an immigration policy in the interests of all Canada. In lieu of these lands a subsidy was set up by the Federal Parliament. The method by which the subsidy was determined was very simple.

"It was estimated that 25,000,000 acres of land in Saskatchewan would be used for immigration purposes as homesteads. This land was valued at \$1.50 an acre or \$37,500,000. Interest was allowed annually at the rate of three per cent., amounting to \$1,125,000. It was estimated that, by the time we had a population of 800,000, about two-thirds of the land would be used, hence \$750,000 should be the subsidy."

This whole policy, Mr. Speaker, was set up upon two foundations: the number of people coming into the province, and the amount of land to be used in order to settle these people in the province:

"It was also estimated that by the time the entire land area available consisting of 25,000,000 acres, had been homesteaded, we would have a population of 1,200,000 and that then we should be entitled to the subsidy of \$1,125,000 in perpetuity.

"What has been the result? Over 27,616,000 acres

I understand it is now corrected from 25,000,000 and some odd thousand to 27,616,000 acres

"Over 27,616,000 acres of land for the provision of homesteads has been used to promote an immigration policy in the interests of all Canada; 3,566,000 acres has been sold as pre-emptions at \$3.00 an acre which brings to the credit of the Federal Treasury, \$10,698,000. This has been worth five per cent. to the Federal Treasury, or \$534,900 a year, or about half the total subsidy which Saskatchewan can ever earn under the arrangement.

"This policy was adopted in 1908 a considerable time after the lands of Saskatchewan were retained as a part of an immigration policy involving free homesteads. The effect of adopting this second policy without the consent of the province has been to take out of the lands of Saskatchewan in interests alone, half the entire subsidy which we can ever earn, and thereby places us in a position where no other part of Canada has contributed towards the subsidy which we receive in lieu of lands."

I think that statement is true, down to the present time. There has been sufficient income taken out of Saskatchewan, that should be in the Treasury of Saskatchewan, to have paid our entire subsidy from our own lands which have been sold in connection with pre-emptions by the Federal Government. Then I go on:

"Even if there has been an agreement which we do not admit, between the province, which had a right to the lands, and the Dominion, to supply 25,000,000 acres to be administered by the Federal authorities to promote immigration, we submit that, so far as the province is concerned, more than the 25,000,000 acres has been supplied. The Federal Treasury receives the direct benefit through taxation which the increased production makes possible. After having received this benefit and the administration of the lands, an additional 3,566,000 acres are so disposed of as to make those lands pay the entire subsidy which it was intended the Dominion Treasury should pay through taxation levied on all Canada.

"For these reasons we submit that all lands and resources as yet unalienated should be returned forthwith to the province and that the proposal that our subsidy should increase to \$1,125,000 when we reach a population of 1,200,000 should remain in effect. Meantime, the Province of Saskatchewan should receive \$750,000 and, when a population of 1,200,000 is reached, we should receive \$1,250,000 in perpetuity in lieu of lands alienated for homesteading purposes. We claim the amount realised from pre-emptions as a matter of right.

"If our right to the lands were admitted by the Federal authorities, it would be necessary to make certain financial adjustments arising from certain undertakings carried through in good faith which have been in the national interest. If our right is not admitted, it may become necessary to establish that right by the proper course of procedure. We could then carry on negotiations for a settlement of the whole matter."

Well, now, it will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that everything that is contained I think in the present agreement which has been negotiated by the present Government, was claimed by the old Government back in 1927. And in 1927, there had been under consideration, as between the Dominion Government and the Province of Alberta, a new agreement. That agreement, it is true, had not reached the form in which the present agreement is but a new proposal had been made to the Province of Alberta and that proposal was this: That the Federal Government was prepared at that time — towards the end of 1926 or early in 1927 — was prepared to turn over the natural resources to the Province of Alberta and to pay in perpetuity the present subsidy, which is somewhat less than ours. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, and as far as I am informed the Province of Alberta would have been prepared to accept that offer if the Province of Saskatchewan had been prepared to accept a similar offer. But we intimated at that time that we were not prepared to accept that offer. It was further intimated that we would be prepared to accept the return of the natural resources of this province with the admission that we were entitled to the subsidy as arranged in 1905 in perpetuity. And, Mr. Speaker, we have very good reasons for taking that stand and the reasons are to be found in this, that all we had to do was to wait until the time came when we had 1,200,000 people in this province and, when that time did come, we would then receive \$1,125,000 in perpetuity. The opinion of the Government of that day was this: That the Province of Saskatchewan would be better off in the end to wait for two or three or, possibly, five years, or even, if necessity demanded, a few years longer than that in order to be assured of the \$1,125,000 rather than to accept a lesser amount at the present time. Well, now, that was the position which matters were in when we went to Ottawa in the spring of 1929 and we there made further proposals to the Government. I have these proposals here in the notes which I used at the time of that conference in connection with the matter. I am not going to read them to the House because they are, in effect, the things I have already taken up as having been introduced at the Inter-Provincial Conference, but there is one matter, the matter of pre-emptions which is of some importance and I would only say in this connection that we took this position. I will read what I have:

"The Dominion of Canada has, since 1905, sold some 3,000,000 acres of land in Saskatchewan by way of pre-emptions at \$3.00 per acre."

This is the approximate figure of such sales at January 1, 1928. That is the approximate figure as it was given to us. I understand that there is a slight change in it and that it is some 3,208,000 acres as they give the figure now.

"Further land may have been disposed of by way of pre-emption. The province claims, among other things, payment of all money realised from the sale of such land and the transfer to it of such lands under contract of sale together with such contracts."

There is only one other matter in this connection with which I care to deal at this time and which is of importance in that it adds something to it; and it is this:

"With respect to school lands, the province claims the payment to it of all sums realised from the sale of such lands, the transfer to it of all such lands under sale together with contracts of sale concerning the same, and school lands still unsold."

And we went on to say this:

"Such transfer to be without restriction and such lands to be held and administered by the province under the laws of the province."

We had in mind some restrictions which had been placed in the agreement with the province of Alberta. We took the position in the negotiations over natural resources in this province that we should have all the school lands and that we should have them untrammelled by any restrictions of any kind imposed by the Federal authorities.

Now, I want to make it perfectly plain to the House that that was the position taken in connection with these two matters, because there is some slight difference between the agreement as entered into and the position we took at Ottawa at that time, and the difference is to be found in so far as the school lands are concerned, in Section 7 of the agreement. That section, I think, Mr. Speaker, was brought up on the last trip of the present Government to Ottawa, judging from the statements which were made.

My only objection to Section 7 was this: I do not believe that the people of other parts of Canada outside of the province of Saskatchewan should be particularly interested in what we do now with the School Lands Fund. The School Lands Fund, we contended, belonged to us by right, that the Federal Government handled these in trust for the province from 1870 down to 1905, and having handled those lands in trust down to 1905 that anything which they did during that period in the interests of the province of Saskatchewan we can really claim no remuneration for financially, providing it was altogether in the interests of the territory that some day was going to become part of Saskatchewan. We were agreed that the School Lands Fund as set up in 1872 under the Lands Act, was a proper fund to set up and that it has been administered in the interests of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I think we also agreed that if our first contention was correct, that the lands of this province belonged to this province as a matter of right — these school lands also belong to us as a matter of right. I do not believe it is the wish either of the people of the province or the Legislature of this province to change that fund in any particular. I think if the fund were turned over without any strings on it that both this Legislature and the people of this province would insist upon the school lands fund being administered just as it has been in the interests of all schools in the province of Saskatchewan that are set up under the laws of Saskatchewan and that receive grants in the ordinary way from the Treasury of this province. If our constitution is sound, we are committed to do that no matter what is said with regard to the School Fund in this particular measure. I do submit, however, that the province of Saskatchewan should not have to submit, no matter what government is in power in Saskatchewan — and this is the position we took in 1929 — that the Government of Saskatchewan should not have to submit to being told by any Federal Government what we should do in the province of Saskatchewan with something that belongs to us. The constitution of our province is fairly clear with regard to the matter, no matter where the funds come from for education in the province, however they were raised; any money that comes into the Treasury of Saskatchewan for educational purposes under our constitution, is required to be paid out for educational purposes without any discrimination against any schools which are set up under our law. This is one of the criticisms which I would make if I were going to criticise this agreement. The Federal Government is interfering with our rights as a province in Section 7.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I am not altogether in agreement with. I have some doubts in connection with the agreement, that it is the wise course for us

to go to the Privy Council with the matters that may be said to be in dispute between this Government and the Government at Ottawa. I am going to explain to the House why I have those doubts. I have doubt in the first place, because I am not a lawyer; I am not an authority on questions of this kind. I have not made a full study of constitutional matters and, not having done so, I am not going to presume to give advice to this House or to the province in a constitutional matter. But I want to say this: I have the advice, this House has the advice, Saskatchewan has the advice and all Canada has the advice contained in the conclusions and the views of all authorities on questions of this kind arrived at after careful consideration of those questions; and that is the one thing which more than any other raises doubts in my mind. The province of Manitoba has considered the matter of whether or not it would be wise for them to go to the Privy Council. Their position is somewhat different from ours and so I cannot arrive at conclusions which might be definite from the decision of Manitoba. That province was brought into being by war conditions — a rebellion was on in Manitoba at the time — and special regulations were passed and these, being ratified by the Imperial Parliament, there can be no question that anything that was done in that legislation was done by the final body which legislates on such matters in the British Empire. Therefore, I can quite understand that there might be problems in the province of Saskatchewan that did not exist in Manitoba. But I have the province of Alberta to consider, and I presume that Alberta has taken the trouble to investigate the legal claims which its representatives brought forward on different occasions and in 1923, and again possibly in 1926 and certainly in 1929, they were prepared to sign an agreement leaving an appeal to the Privy Council out. Now, I am not fully informed as to what their real reason for that was; possibly they had legal doubts as to what decision Alberta would get on that particular question.

Then, if there are reasonable doubts and if there is reason to believe that we can secure by negotiations everything that could be got by appealing to the Privy Council, it should be done by negotiation (which often gets you further than law suits) with the Federal authorities. I do not know whether or not the Government has determined that. But, if we can get all we are likely to get by negotiation with the Federal authority, I am going to explain why I would prefer that course. There is always an element of doubt in legal cases as our friends opposite have come to realise by this time, and we have reasonable grounds for believing that there might be some doubts in this matter.

As I understand it, we have arranged for a Commission to determine the sum which this province is entitled to in addition to the subsidy in perpetuity. May I point out that, before we put our name to anything, we should know what we are going to get? I cannot see a single thing we are going to get in the agreement, that we were not going to get in the agreement of 1905 — not a single thing you can put your finger on, but the subsidy in perpetuity when we have a population of 1,200,000 — with the exception that we have had turned over to us the right to administer the unalienated lands of the province.

The Attorney General, a moment ago, was saying to the honourable member for Prince Albert and other members on this side of the House that they have been told of all the resources in the northern part of the province and that they have been told of all the resources in the southern part of the province; well, there is no one in this House more proud of the resources of Saskatchewan than I am, and I venture to say most of us very often read reviews of our natural resources given at this and previous sessions of the Legislature. We listened to a long address from the present Minister of Railways, Labour and Industries (*Hon. Mr. Merkley*) a few days ago in which he reviewed the resources of the province and we all agreed with him because many of us on this side said the same things when we were on that side.

But there is one point that should not be forgotten. The greatest development in the north today is the Flin Flon mining operation. Now, what was the arrangement the Flin Flon people entered into with the province of Manitoba and also with the Federal Government at the instance of Manitoba before they established their plant up there and embarked on the heavy expenditure of several millions? Was it not that no royalties would be charged for a period of twenty years? That means, Mr. Speaker, that revenues are not going into the Manitoba treasury from that great mining development for a period of twenty years from the time that arrangement was entered into, which means to a large degree that, so far as the revenue from resources is concerned, very little indeed will ever go into the treasury of the province of Manitoba. They also asked for the same arrangement with us in regard to their holdings in this province, but we refused to give them that. I do not know if they would have continued with their operations if Manitoba had done the same — their

holdings are right on the boundary, but apparently they were satisfied with the arrangement made although it applied only in Manitoba.

Now, if we are going to be confronted with the same kind of thing (and I do not doubt that we shall have to make some such concession if we are to assist in the development of an industry based on our mineral resources) then the revenues from this source will be negligible for the next five or ten years. That is one consideration in connection with this matter that should be given some attention. We have been asking for information in regard to the revenues and expenditures in connection with the administration of our natural resources and the only information we have been able to get is that, in the last year, the Dominion Government took in a little over a million dollars in the province of Saskatchewan and I think the statement that actually was made was that most of that had been taken in from the sale of School Lands.

Premier Anderson: None of it! I should have explained that.

Mr. Gardiner: I am glad to know that. However, that was the information given yesterday. I have here a statement giving the expenditures on administration, dated 1925, but taking in all the years down to the end of the fiscal year 1924. This is a statement relating to Dominion lands, including special expenditure, North-West Territories abstract from Prince Albert for the fiscal years 1867 to 1924, supplemented by statements from the Auditor General's report for the last year and in bringing the whole statement down to 1924, I am going to give the House our computation of what that expenditure was. It was, figuring at the time the revenues were coming in, \$70,097,955, that is, beginning with the year 1867 and coming right down to the end of the 1923-24 fiscal year, a total of \$70,097,955. There was an item, "Decrease of Public Debt," of \$4,281,000. Then there was an expenditure on account of consolidated fund of \$53,000,000 and an expenditure chargeable to capital account of \$10,425,395 and in the North-West Territories outside a sum to be declared to separate these, some \$3,000,000.

It will be found, if these figures are correct, that there is a sum on one side of the ledger that just about balances that on the other side, and the period included in that statement takes in all the period of very active immigration, when people were coming to this country in great numbers, taking up homesteads and pre-emptions, and putting considerable money in the Dominion Treasury. Therefore, I think it will be a fair conclusion to arrive at that, at the present time, there is a fairly even balance between the revenues and the expenditures in connection with the natural resources of this province. Therefore, in my judgment, the consideration at this time should be the cost of administration of the relatively small proportion of the resources left to us and the amount of revenue likely to come into the Treasury as a result of the administration of these resources in the province. I think members on both sides of the House are justified in asking the Minister for further information concerning the revenue and the cost of administration in connection with the resources, and I sincerely hope he is going to furnish it.

I have only one thing more to say in connection with the agreement. We, on this side of the House together with a few on the other side, have been curious to know what information the Government had in order to arrive at certain conclusions. We are curious to know how they reached those conclusions; why they decided to go to the Privy Council, and what they hope to gain from the Privy Council. I think the Minister said the other day that he had a draft of the proposals which were to be placed before the Privy Council, but I do not know why that draft is not being placed before the House. I think he should, when he rises in his place to wind up this debate, take the House into his confidence and tell us what the submissions to the Privy Council are going to be, and why the Government considers it necessary, with all the powers contained in this agreement, to go to the Privy Council at all.

I admit it would be a wise provision to make in the agreement, that there should be the right to go to the Privy Council if deemed necessary, but I do not think it a wise thing to go direct to the Privy Council. I think we in Saskatchewan can rest our case on the friendly feelings and the desire for unity actuating the people of Canada and the people of Saskatchewan better than we can on mere legal claims. I have been in a sufficient number of conferences with people outside of the province of Saskatchewan to believe that we can rely upon those people outside Saskatchewan to give this province sympathetic consideration and that they will see to it, whether under the present Government or some other Government, that the Province of Saskatchewan receives treatment at least equal to that of any other province in Canada.

Believing that, I contend we should rest our case on further negotiations with the Federal authorities rather than on an appeal to the Privy Council because, after

all, in public as well as in private matters, an appeal to the courts always leaves behind it some grounds of dissatisfaction. I believe we have a moral right; I believe we have a constitutional right based on what was given to the other provinces of Canada, to the fund built up on pre-emption sales in Saskatchewan and if we have the right to the pre-emption fund then we should take steps to see to it that the Federal Government turn those funds over to the Treasury of the province, at some future date if not in the present. So I think there should be further negotiations with the Federal authorities and for that reason I am not in a position tonight to say (though I feel strongly in the matter), that I am going to oppose this agreement because, though it is in the agreement, this Government is not compelled to take the matter to the Privy Council. They have the right to do so, but I would suggest this to them, that they examine into every phase of the matter, if they have not already done so, and arrive at a conclusion as to what is to be gained by going to the Privy Council before putting this province to the expense of such an appeal.

I would suggest in that connection that this House, probably tonight, should pass on the principle of this Bill. I am quite aware that some people here believe that a condition has arisen in this House which is giving our friends opposite some concern . . .

Premier Anderson: Not at all!

Mr. Gardiner: I only mention it as the idea has gone out. But I would say this, that it has not been my desire since these negotiations started (and I think my friends opposite will admit it), and I do not believe it is the desire of our friends to make a political issue of this natural resources agreement. I understand that one or two of those sitting opposite feel strongly enough in the matter not to vote with the Government, and I do not believe it is their desire either to make a political issue of this matter. I am going to suggest this:

While member after member on one or other side of the House has declared himself in favour of further information and something more reliable (if I may use the word) before they are asked to decide on this particular question, it is not absolutely necessary, under the forms of Government under which we work, that a question be finally decided on Second Reading of a Bill. There is a place, under our institutions of government, where we can get detailed information more effectively than in Second Reading, and that is in Committee of the Whole. There we can ask questions, we have rights of discussion back and forth, and the practice allows a member who has already spoken to get up in his place and give any information he has and any he would like the House to have. On an occasion so important as this is, we should not bring our personal views forward on Second Reading but wait until the Committee stage and then try to make our judgment unanimous. I am going to suggest, therefore, to gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the reasonable thing for us to do at this stage is to give the Bill Second Reading, because after all, it is possible to get a great deal more information in Committee. It is true, there is no opportunity in the Committee stage of defeating the Bill, but there is the opportunity of changing certain sections of the Bill, if ye so desire.

Hon. Mr. MacPherson: You cannot change the agreement though!

Mr. Gardiner: No! We cannot change the agreement, but we can get the information that we think we should have — as to the cost of administration to the province, or as to whether the agreement compels the Government to go to the Privy Council immediately. I say that can be dealt with more properly than at the present moment.

Then I have another reason for feeling kindly towards this agreement and that is to be found in the remarks of the honourable member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) this afternoon. The honourable member stated that one of the three reasons why he was going to support this Bill was because of the opportunity we had at the present time to have the natural resources returned to the province of Saskatchewan, a thing for which we had been fighting for twenty-five years. It is true that every word uttered on both sides of this House in that connection is true. Members on both sides, year after year, have stood for the broad principle of having the resources returned to the province and returned immediately. That is true, but it is also true that members on both sides desire some further information from the Government as to what is in their minds before the final consummation of the agreement.

Speakers from that side, the honourable member for Francis (*Mr. Horner*) and others, were all agreed on this — and none more than the Attorney General himself —

that we have in the agreement we have today, the best agreement we can receive from any Federal Government. That, Mr. Speaker, is further than I would have gone myself, though there is a Liberal Government at Ottawa and at some time in the future there may be a Conservative Government there. I would not have gone so far as to say this is the best — except to say that it is certainly the best agreement because it is the first one. But I would not go so far as to say this is the best agreement we could ever hope to get, and the reason for that is as I explained a moment ago with reference to the doubts which I have. But the Attorney General may have the information that will clear my doubts away, and, if he has, I would like the opportunity, in the Committee stage, of being convinced by him that this is the best agreement we are ever likely to get from any Government at Ottawa.

I would like to say this that I am quite in agreement with the honourable member for Francis when he says that the present Prime Minister of Canada is prepared at this juncture to turn over the natural resources to the province and that he is, to say the least of it, prepared to do so on very favourable terms and I presume he looked at it from the standpoint of the whole Dominion as I look at it from the standpoint of the province of Saskatchewan.

There are certain things, however, I would like to say in regard to this Bill. If this offer is turned down in the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan at this time, we shall have considerable difficulty in going down to that part of Canada east of the Great Lakes of convincing them that we did not have a very favourable offer from the Government of Canada in the draft embodied in this Bill. I would, therefore, urge that, at this stage, we permit the Bill to go through Second Reading and so permit of it being discussed further in Committee of the Whole. Then when we come to Third Reading, if any member of the House (including myself) feels that we have not had sufficient reasons, that not sufficient information has been given to us that we think we should be in possession of, whether legal or otherwise, we shall have the opportunity of taking the same action as we have of right at Second Reading. In that way, we shall avoid the interjection of anything political into discussion of this matter until the Bill has reached its third stage when, as I say, we can deal with it as effectively as at Second Reading. I doubt very much if in the next ten, fifteen, or twenty years we could get as favourable an agreement from any Government at Ottawa if we were to go so far tonight as to turn down this agreement.

I would hope that the Prime Minister will give us all the information in his possession when he is speaking and that, in the Committee stage, we shall get any additional information we may desire and that the discussions that then take place will remove any doubts and will convince us that all our rights have been safeguarded in the agreement or in letters received from the Federal Government. Then we will be able to pass out the word confidently and unanimously when the whole discussion is concluded, not only to the people of Saskatchewan but to the other provinces of Canada and even to the Imperial Parliament. And that is important, because I do not believe the Imperial Parliament would pass a Bill of this kind, forwarded to it from any part of Canada or of the Empire, if they were convinced there was any great division of opinion in that part of the Dominion which was most affected. They would at least delay it.

There is one further piece of information I would ask for, which has not been asked by any member on this side and which has not been told to the House. That is information having to do with administration during the period when the transfer is being made. I am informed that the transfer will take a considerable time to complete. Possibly we have been too much concerned about the immediate cost of administration but I think we are justified in giving this matter some consideration, in view of our experience in the past when we set up a new Land Titles Office in Saskatchewan. I think we took about a year in a new province to get a new one into operation and, if it takes a year to set up a new Land Titles Office in one small corner of the province, it will take considerably longer to set up a complete new department and to make a transfer as between the two Governments, Federal and Provincial, in connection with the resources.

There is one thing I would like to know: What arrangement is being entered into with the Federal Government in connection with that transfer period? If that transfer period is to be a year in length or two years in length, I would like to know who is going to pay the bill! Are we going to start in immediately to set up offices of administration in Saskatchewan and, at the same time, be paying operating costs on an office of administration in Ottawa? This is not merely a matter of detail. It is a matter of considerable importance to members of this House who are being called

upon to vote. If we are going to do this, will the arrangement cover the whole period during which this whole question is being discussed in the Dominion Parliament, during the time the Bill is before the Imperial Parliament and the period during which the matter is before the Privy Council — if it is finally decided to go there? During that whole period will costs be being built up until the conclusion is reached and before we know what the final result will be? When we get that information, we shall be in a better position to judge what our present course of action should be.

I am going to suggest that we allow this Bill to go to Committee, that it be considered properly in Committee (as it will) and that, if any member desires to take action, it be taken under our rights at a later stage.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

SPEECHES ON
THE SECOND READING OF
AN ACT TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ACT (NO. 1)

THE HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D.Paed.
(Premier and Minister of Education)

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—It is customary to discuss the principle of the Bill at this stage, that is: second reading, and, therefore, it is my intention to discuss briefly the principles involved in this Bill to amend The School Act (No. 1).

One year ago, from the seat of the Leader of the Opposition, I introduced a Bill very similar to the Bill before the House. The Bill was rejected, after considerable debate, by members on the Government side of the House, and I appear before the House, again, one year later, with a Bill involving the very same principle. Those who were in the House at that time will recall that anything I had to say on the matter at that time was said without any feeling of bitterness, with no indication of intolerance, with no feeling or desire to persecute or offend. That is the very same feeling that moves me today in saying what I have to say in connection with the principle of this Bill.

I take the stand, and the Government takes the stand that, in a province such as ours with its great cosmopolitan population consisting of representatives of many races and of many religious beliefs, it is very essential that there should be some common meeting place, some common training ground, in order that the children of these various peoples be prepared, in a common way, on common grounds, for carrying out the duties of citizenship which they will be called upon to face when they reach manhood and when they reach womanhood. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that we have such a common meeting place—such a common training ground in that institution known as the Public School.

Because of the cosmopolitan nature of our population, because of the necessity of training these children, whose parents are representative of many races and many creeds, for one common purpose, it is essential, Mr. Speaker, that there should not be any influences in connection with that training in the public schools that will tend to influence the religious faith or belief of the children in attendance at the public schools. In other words the principle is that in our state-controlled public schools there should be no sectarian influences. That is the principle of this Bill.

It may be asked, "What is the public school?" Although "public school" is not defined in the preamble or in the interpretation clause of The School Act, yet in section 13 under the heading, "Formation of Public School Districts" subsection (1), it reads—"Any portion of the Province may be organized into a public school district provided it contains a certain area, and so many children are involved."

Now, it has been claimed by those who are opposing, with greater or less violence, this Bill that is before the House, that there is an attempt to interfere with certain language privileges granted under section 178 of The School Act. Let me say that there is nothing in the Bill that will affect section 178 of The School Act. It is section 179 which has to do with religious instruction in our schools, and there is nothing in this Bill that will affect that particular section. Under the present law, religious instruction

may be given for one-half hour commencing at 3.30 o'clock. Under our present law and regulations the school board in any school district may, by taking a shorter noon hour, close school at 3.30 o'clock after which they may take religious instruction as they wish, or any other subject as a matter of fact they may desire and for as long as is desired.

Now, there is nothing in this Act affecting minority or separate schools under sections 39 and 44 of The School Act. So this amendment to The School Act does not affect religious instructions as allowed under the present law; it does not affect separate or minority schools and does not affect existing regulations as regards language. It merely affects that one institution, the public school, and it is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that the idea that exists in the minds of some people in our province that there is something in connection with the administration of the public school which is wrong. There is one public school and should be one public school and one only in this Province. It may be asked, why this legislation? Does sectarian influence prevail to any extent in our public schools?

My answer is, Mr. Speaker, that, notwithstanding the statements made by those who are opposed to this Bill that it is a small matter and it is not a serious situation; notwithstanding the addresses delivered in this House, copies of which were broadcast throughout the province in the last few months, notwithstanding all this, I say the matter is one that should receive the most serious consideration of the honorable members in this House. Let me say that, of forty-five school inspectors who were asked as to their opinions in connection with sectarianism in the public schools, forty-two were in favor of prohibiting teachers in religious garb or religious emblems in our public schools. Two of them say "if objected to by the parents or ratepayers"; two of them say "would not object if one hundred per cent of one sect favour it" and one said "the matter was settled on June 6th." There were thirty-six schools reported with seventy-three rooms having teachers in religious garb. A number of the inspectors said that during the past year the employment of some sectarian teachers of this class was discontinued.

Now, as to the number of schools containing religious emblems: 117 schools with 161 rooms were definitely reported by the inspectors.

During the past few days I have received, as a number of the honorable members have received, telegrams from various parts of this province. There is a feeling of alarm among some of our people in connection with this legislation, alarm which is thoroughly unwarranted and which would appear to be unduly encouraged from some source. I have here some thirty-seven telegrams from various parts of this province. Most of these telegrams indicate that they represent the opinion of so many people, the total being around five thousand. In other words, here is the feeling of some five thousand of our citizens in this province, who are asking, requesting, or in many cases, demanding ("demand" is the word used) that this legislation be withdrawn. Now, what is their attitude? We have these five thousand people whose opinions are expressed through the medium of these telegrams, who are asking us in this province to recognize two kinds of public schools, one the sectarian public school and the other the non-sectarian public school. We have nothing affecting the separate school law in this provision in this Bill. We are not contesting the rights of minorities in that connection. But we have requests from people who are enjoying minority rights for the enjoyment of majority rights as well! That is the sum and substance of it!

In addition to these telegrams I have received quite a number of resolutions. These resolutions are in most cases worded in exactly the same language. It would appear that some one—some central force or source has provided resolutions to be signed on the dotted line and sent in to the Government, indicating that these resolutions are not in every case voluntary expressions of the will of the people.

Now, I am going to read to the House the answer I have sent to these telegrams:

"Dear Sir:—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of February 19th and wish to point out to you that the proposed changes in The School Act have no reference to any particular religious sect but are intended to apply to all alike. The idea is to have our Public Schools absolutely free from sectarian influences. This legislation does not refer to separate schools either Protestant or Roman Catholic. I am sure when you understand the principle underlying this legislation you will agree that it is fair and in the interests of peace and harmony. You must also know that under our British system of Government while the rights of minorities are recognized yet the majority must rule. Furthermore you must also see that we should have one law regulating and governing our public schools.

I have received a dozen or more telegrams from different points in the Province and I notice they are all worded in exactly the same terms. This would indicate that some central force is directing the actions of the trustee boards in sending in these telegrams. This is a very good reason why the legislation should be passed. There must be an entire separation of Church and State insofar as the Public Schools are concerned."

Now, someone has said (I think it was said in the debate a year ago) that legislation such as is proposed would tend to increase the number of separate schools. I cannot see the force of such reasoning. I do know that separate schools have been organized because minorities have not been satisfied with the sectarian influences predominating in their public schools and forcing those, where in sufficient numbers they are able to do so, to withdraw and establish separate schools. Other minorities may have withdrawn from the public school because they wished to have their children trained under sectarian influences. If this legislation is enacted in this province there will be some separate schools which will disorganize and will go back into the public schools, so I cannot see the force of the argument that it will increase the number of separate schools.

Now, the press in various parts of the province has been noting the legislation before the House. Here I have an editorial from the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*. It says: "There can be no objection to the principle of the Bill"; and that: "Public schools in Saskatchewan are non-sectarian."—"Should be non-sectarian," the editor should have said.

"Their purpose is to provide secular education. It can very reasonably be argued that the display of church emblems in public school buildings, and the use of a religious costume by teachers in public schools, is contrary to this principle. There is provision in the law for the creation of separate schools by religious minorities.

The objection which might be offered to the Bill is that it is inexpedient to settle by a provincial statute an issue which has arisen only in a few districts of the province, and which might be settled conveniently by local compromise. There can be no doubt that the raising of this issue has created, or at any rate deepened, hostility and suspicion between Protestants and Roman Catholics. This is the unfortunate aspect of the whole matter.

It must be the hope of all people of goodwill in the province that the Anderson School Bill, if it goes into effect as appears certain, will be carried out with the least possible disturbance of good feeling in the districts affected. It is also to be hoped that the passage of this Bill will end a debate which has bedevilled Saskatchewan politics for several years."

Mr. Davis (Prince Albert): Hear, hear!

Premier Anderson: And the *Regina Leader* of January 28, 1930, in referring to criticism directed against the Government because of this proposed legislation by those in the East, who might better be attending to their own provincial business, the *Regina Leader*, on one of those rare occasions on which it comes to the rescue of the Government, has an editorial emphasizing that it is a sound principle, says:

"Provincial autonomy in school matters is a principle that has been firmly established in Canada. It applies to all the provinces. Each province elects its own government and this government is responsible for the educational policy to be carried out in the territory under its jurisdiction. Any school problems that are before the people of Saskatchewan at the present time will have to be dealt with by the people of Saskatchewan."

We agree with the *Regina Leader* for once.

Mr. Davis: Twice! The other night you did, too.

Premier Anderson: It is also interesting to find that we have in support of this Bill no less a person than Mr. Vallance, the member for South Battleford in the Federal House. I have also here the "*Kerrobert Citizen*" in which a report appears covering the attitude of Mr. Carmichael, a member of Parliament. In connection with this legislation Mr. Vallance says:

"As far as the public school is concerned, there should be absolutely no religious instruction by any religious denomination. The fact that we levy no taxes for the maintenance of a church is proof that we have no state church, leaving each and every citizen of Canada to worship God in his own manner."

Now, I have very little further to say, Mr. Speaker, because I do not think there is any necessity in going into detail regarding specific instances of sectarian influences in our public schools. We have heard quite a lot of that in recent times and it is not going to serve any good purpose for any member on either side of the House to spend considerable time in discussing situations about which the people already know.

I want to make it very clear that, so far as the Government is concerned and so far as the Minister of Education is concerned, our aim in connection with this legislation is not to create discord, not to promote ill feeling but rather looking forward to peace and harmony where the opposite exists today.

Now, there are some who may argue, "Here are districts in which the people are 100 per cent. of one faith. Let us give them special consideration." I think that that would be entirely wrong in principle. The public school should be regarded as a public school and there should be nothing done in the conduct of that public school that will cause any one of a different faith from the majority in that district to send his children to another school. And we are going to have trouble in the years that lie ahead unless we take a decided and definite stand at the present time. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that although there may be an occasional instance of misunderstanding and perhaps dissatisfaction, it will be of a temporary nature only and as time goes on and the people realize the fairness of the proposal which has in view the protecting of our public schools from sectarian influences, they will thank us for passing this legislation.

I was at the Provincial Trustees' Convention the other day and at the conclusion of the meeting, which I addressed, several of the trustees came up to speak to me and one of them said to me, "I am a French Catholic school trustee from Carleton and I want to tell you that I am satisfied with what you have said here tonight. I did not expect you to say what you did tonight." And I told him that likely he had been listening to some of our enemies or reading *La Patriote*, the paper published in the French language in Prince Albert. Yesterday morning I was in my office when two men, who were born in Hungary, came protesting against influences that were causing trouble in their separate school district. I could give you instance after instance such as these indicating a desire on the part of many of the people who are represented in some of these telegrams to have this legislation passed. Let me repeat again, Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous human problem in this province caused by the nature of our population—to the cosmopolitan nature of which I have referred. My honourable friends opposite know that there are conditions existing in various parts of this province that, if they are allowed to continue, may cause only trouble and sorrow in the future. Now is the time when we must lay the foundation for that future period of peace, quiet, harmony, helpfulness, square dealing and co-operation which will not come if we allow our public schools to be affected by sectarian influences.

I have brought this Bill in as a Government Bill representing the voice of the Government, feeling that we have a duty to perform because of the conditions which are so well known. There is no desire on the part of any member of the Government, and I am sure there is no desire on the part of any member of this House, to be a party to introducing something that will be contrary to what we cherish as British ideals of justice and equity. I say there is no desire on the part of any member of this House to disregard any rule such as that, and I would ask the members on the opposite side of this House to carefully consider this legislation before opposing it. I feel that the people of this province are very carefully watching the legislators of this province at the present time. The people of this province are justified in wanting to know exactly where every one of the members of this House stand on this vital question than which there is none of greater importance in the life of our province today.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. J. G. GARDINER, B.A., LL.D., M.L.A.

(*North Qu'Appelle*)

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27 AND 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker.—The question which has been introduced into the House by the motion for Second Reading of School Bill No. 1, is as important a question as we are likely to consider during the present session. It is not a new question in the public life of the Dominion of Canada. It is a question which has been discussed more or less ever since Confederation — and even before Confederation in certain parts of Canada.

On this particular occasion it is not my intention to attempt to discuss this question in defence of any particular section of the people of our province. I do not think any such discussion is necessary, either inside or outside the House. It is merely my intention to make some suggestions as to the course we should take in order to arrive at definite conclusions (if we can), with regard to the situation which has been created in the province as a result of legislation which has been on our Statute Books for many years. As a result of the administration of that legislation, we, in this province, have been confronted during recent months and, I might say, during recent years, with a discussion of this question which has stirred the feelings of our people of all denominations lately and which has emphasised racial divisions as well.

I need hardly say that I am in agreement with members on both sides of the House when I say that any question or discussion which introduces into a province like Saskatchewan the question of racial divisions or religious divisions is not a discussion that is going to benefit the people of the province of Saskatchewan or of the Dominion of Canada. Those discussions usually have come as a result of misunderstandings. Sometimes such misunderstandings have grown up naturally as between peoples of different races or religious creeds, and sometimes those misunderstandings are the result of certain deliberate actions by those who desire to have discussions of this kind take place for certain reasons. At this time, it seems to me it is not necessary to go, at any great length, into the reasons for the recent discussions. There are certain phases of the question itself, however, which I believe, should be discussed on this occasion and should be discussed very fully, Mr. Speaker.

I can well remember that, one year ago, this Bill, almost in its present form (and that "almost" contains a good deal) was introduced into this House with very little explanation and with very little in the way of discussion insofar as members of the then Opposition were concerned. I have no doubt it was good politics on their part to say very little on that occasion but, I submit, their discussion of this question from the very beginning has been a political discussion.

Premier Anderson: Nonsense!

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, the usual answer from the Premier when we are discussing questions of this kind has been the answer he has given. It seems to be the only answer he has got. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the only consideration he gives when discussing this question (or not discussing it) is the possible effect it is going to have on the political fortunes of his party.

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, why we have two Bills dealing with amendments to The School Act on the Order Paper at the same time, and why we were told in the Address from the Throne that we were likely to have more than one Bill this session dealing with amendments to The School Act? It has been customary in the past in this and other Legislatures to introduce (if the Government had it in their minds), amendments to any single piece of existing legislation in one Bill, and there are very good reasons why this practice usually is followed. It usually is followed in the first place, because of the inconvenience and misunderstandings that might arise if more than one amending Bill is introduced in one session of the Legislature to any single

piece of existing legislation. We have, on more than one previous occasion, before the session closed withdrawn Bills introduced earlier in order to avoid what we now have, and to incorporate all amendments to any single Act in one Bill. School trustees, officials of municipalities, and lawyers all over the province, for convenience' sake, are desirous of having all amendments contained in one piece of legislation in order that no misunderstandings shall arise as the years go by when they are looking up the law. For some reason, however, we have two Bills amending The School Act — Bill No. 1 and Bill No. 2. I think possibly the last remark of the honourable gentleman (*Premier Anderson*), before he sat down was the real reason why we have two Bills amending The School Act in this session.

Before going on to deal with the reason stated by him — and he could do that better than I can myself, because he knows the real reason — I would say this: There can be only three reasons for introducing this legislation in this way. One is, that the Government might be afraid that if they introduced it in any other way, they might be defeated on the floor of the House and in view of the small majority they have at this time, that might weigh very strongly with them.

Then there is a second reason. There might be fear that one or other of the proposed amendments in one or other of the Bills might be *ultra vires* of the Legislature and so lead to the throwing out of the whole Bill. But, Mr. Speaker, let me call your attention to the fact that, with two Bills before the House, members of this House are prevented from discussing properly the question which is now before the House. I submit it is absolutely impossible for the members on either side to discuss the question without, at the same time, discussing the effect of certain amendments contained in School Bill No. 2. For that reason, as has been done before on other occasions, I would suggest that these two Bills be put together into one Bill so that the amendments can be discussed at one time and so that we can discuss the bearing of one amendment upon the other. If that is not done, I think that fact alone should constitute sufficient reason to vote against the amendment to The School Act now proposed by the minister in Bill No. 1.

There might be a third reason why the amendments are introduced in this way and I think, after all, this is the real reason. I think that more than ever after listening to the closing remarks of the Premier, in which he made a statement to this effect — that the time had come for this House to be lined up once and for all on the two sides of the question introduced in this Bill No. 1. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell him right now, that so far as I, personally, am concerned, he need not worry about how I am going to line up. The people of this province know what my views on this question are. I may not have been as politically wise as my honourable friend in stating my views on this question. I have stated them from platforms throughout the province; I have told the people where I stood on this and every other matter affecting the province of Saskatchewan. It has been different with my honourable friend. We have tried to get statements of policy, but we have been blocked in this discussion, as in others, in trying to get any pronouncement of policy on any question.

Premier Anderson: Too bad!

Mr. Gardiner: It may be too bad for you before I am through. To be fair to the minister, however, I would say that the attitude he is taking in this matter at the present time is the same attitude as he has taken since he entered this House. It is not, however, the same attitude as he has taken all the time he has been in Saskatchewan, although perhaps that has been his attitude for most of the time. In order to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that this has not always been the view of the honourable minister and that there was a time when there did not appear to be so many grievances in the mind of the present Leader of the Government in connection with educational matters in Saskatchewan, I am going to read statements from him during the time he was an inspector of schools in this province and made by him in his reports to the Department of Education. What I am going to read refers to conditions of some time ago, of course, and is not to be construed as critical of the present minister for being unfair to the people among whom he worked, but to show that the views he now expresses were not always the views held by him with regard to our educational system. The report from which I am going to read was made in 1915, and I may say it is similar to many I could read referring to 1911 and subsequent years down to 1917:

"More qualified teachers of Canadian birth were in charge of the 'foreign' schools than in any previous year. This was largely due to an increased desire

on the part of the parents to have their children taught English as soon as possible. Not enough teachers of the proper stamp are available, however, for these schools and it is very necessary that a special course be given in our Normal Schools to prepare teachers for these districts. Such a teacher must be strong physically, as well as intellectually, and must possess a prairie-wide sympathy for these newcomers. No greater work lies at the door of the teaching profession in this western land and we must have more teachers of the right kind to do this kind of work, upon which the future strength and happiness of our province and Dominion depends. The children in too many of these districts are not getting a chance. Parents are ignorant and illiterate in too many cases and see no value in education. A century-old lack of respect for womanhood prevents the girls from getting a chance among some nationalities. The consequence is they have to labour on the farms and get little or no schooling. Then at a tender age they too often marry. This must be stopped . . ."

I presume that applies to the whole statement:

" . . . and our public schools must remedy the evil. We must have home-makers' clubs organised among these people. They are waiting for us to come to their assistance. How much longer are we going to delay?"

I would say that the last appeal was the kind of appeal we would expect if he found a condition such as my honourable friend reports he found then.

That was in 1915. Now, let us pass on to 1921, which was the last full year he was an inspector in this province. I am going to read to you a report of what he saw at that time:

"This concluded the third year of my work as director of educational activities among the newer citizens of our province and, generally speaking, I consider that considerable progress has been made in our efforts to encourage the fostering of a true Canadian spirit among our immigrant population."

That, I presume, is the introduction to the report: "Attitude of the Foreign-Born" is a heading in the same report of that year:

"Much of my time has been spent in personal visits to non-English settlements, where I have met many trustees and ratepayers on a friendly basis and discussed ways and means by which their schools might be made more efficient and more effective. On these visits I have usually been accompanied by the local school inspector and I cannot speak too highly of the excellent co-operation of our men on the field, who have at all times made me welcome. These personal meetings with the people are in my opinion most important and accomplish much more than can be done by writing letters.

"At all times pains were taken to instruct the ratepayers in self-government in school matters and any local troubles or difficulties were usually smoothed out and a new start made. It is the sincere and earnest desire of the vast majority of newcomers to become good citizens, and in general they are interested in having their children receive a good education. There are some exceptions, of course, where individuals from nationalistic or other motives try to discourage our efforts but they are 'playing a losing game' and need not be too seriously considered. The hearts of the great bulk of the 'common people' are right and all they ask for is a 'square deal' and a chance to make good in the land of their adoption."

Again a very proper statement for an inspector of schools to make on the condition he found in the schools for the six years, namely up to 1921. May I read on:

"In these days when we hear so much about immigration policies there is a tendency to denounce as undesirable the 'man with the sheepskin coat' and the 'woman with the shawl' who speaks little or no English and whose diet is somewhat different from ours. Yet we know that the coat does not make the man nor the shawl the woman, and a breath smelling of garlic may not come from a hardened criminal."

I have been wondering whether or not the honourable gentleman had that sentence in mind when he agreed with all Bishop Lloyd said:

"Many of these people are quite different nationally and socially from the Anglo-Saxon but to be absolutely fair we should rather consider the most important 'product' of our past immigration policies — the children of these people. Are they going to grow up to be good Canadian citizens I believe so, if we do our part. Even at this early stage we have Canadian-born representatives of the

Hungarian, the Ruthenian, the Doukhobor, the German, the Russian, etc., who have passed through our elementary and secondary schools and have recently graduated from our provincial university. There are, of course, still many backward conditions, but the pursuance of our present policy of concentrating upon securing more efficient public schools among these people should soon provide a permanent remedy."

Again a part of the report of 1921.

What I want to submit to you, Mr. Speaker is this: From this report and from others that came in prior to this one, I could read many statements as strongly expressed to the effect that there was marked progress discernible among those people who had come to our shores from foreign lands. Perhaps I should read some of those statements because they illustrate the point even better than those I have already read. This one is from the report of 1914, just a year previous to the first one I read:

"There were eleven unqualified Ruthenian or Polish students in my schools during the year and in only one or two cases was very poor work. . . . It is with pleasure that I report an increased interest in education on the part of many of our foreign-born citizens."

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: This is very interesting and good advertising for us but what has this to do with the principle of this Bill — the elimination of sectarianism from our public schools?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall come to the principle of the Bill before we have gone much further.

Premier Anderson: I think, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be instructed to follow the principle of the Bill. I have no desire to shut out discussion, but I think he should confine himself to the principle of the Bill. We thank him for all this.

Mr. Gardiner: I think I am fully within my rights in giving the reasons why I think the Bill was introduced into the House and, in stating those reasons to indicate why I shall vote against the Bill if I see fit.

Premier Anderson: I take exception to that. My honourable friend has been in this House a longer time than I have, and he now claims he has a perfect right to tell why a member has brought in a Bill. I contend he has no right to deal with that at all, but that, at this stage, he has only the right to discuss the principle of the Bill before the House.

Mr. Gardiner: On the point of Order, Mr. Speaker; I am not now dealing with the question: The principle of this Bill is the principle of The School Act of this province and the principle of Bill No. 2 is the principle of The School Act of this province. By introducing his amendment the Premier has thrown open the whole Act and the discussion we have now entered upon may cover the whole School Act of the province and may also indicate where it differs from the Alberta Act or from the School Acts of all other provinces.

Premier Anderson: Might I ask the honourable member to state the principle. . . .

Mr. Gardiner: I will if you sit down.

Premier Anderson: I am not going to sit down. On the point of order: The Leader of the Opposition says he can discuss the whole School Act. . . .

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Premier Anderson: A few of his supporters say "Hear! Hear!" That is for you to decide, Mr. Speaker. But there is more than one principle involved in The School Act and there is only one principle underlying this Bill. That is the position I am going to take on this point of order.

Mr. Gardiner: The honourable gentleman is now arguing the very point I just made. I stated at the very beginning of the discussion now being carried on (and again I am dealing with the point of order) that, by bringing in two Bills the Leader of the Government is separating sections dealing with the same principle. We have

in Bill No. 2 the elements of the same principle as in Bill No. 1. I stated that we are now discussing one of two Bills both introducing the same principles and the Leader of the Government is seeking to divide the House on this one point.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, when you bring in your ruling (and you are not likely to do so this afternoon), I would like you to bring in another as to whether or not any member of this Government has the right to bring in two or even three Bills amending an existing Act. This has been done before by honourable gentlemen opposite when they were members of the Government. He will know before we are through with this thing that we intend to bring in just as many amendments as we see fit.

Mr. Gardiner: There is no point of order on the last question raised. There is no need to bring in a ruling on that at all. I am quite willing to admit he has a perfect right to bring in as many Bills as he likes. . . .

Premier Anderson: What is wrong then?

Mr. Gardiner: Let me finish. But I am quite within my rights to discuss why this should not be brought in in this way at this time.

Premier Anderson: We will state our reasons for separate Bills before this discussion is over.

Mr. Speaker: I will reserve my decision. Six o'clock!

(Mr. Gardiner moved adjournment of the debate and Premier Anderson then moved adjournment of the House).

Debate continued, Friday, February 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker: With reference to the point of order raised by the Honourable the Premier in yesterday's debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 1, an Act to amend The School Act (No. 1), as to the relevancy of the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I now rule that when a Bill to amend any Act comes up for Second Reading that the principle of the original Act may properly be discussed in connection with the Second Reading of the Bill, providing, of course, that the member speaking can satisfy the House that his remarks are strictly relevant to the amending Bill; in other words, that the principle involved in the amendments proposed in the Bill do affect certain other principles in the original Act.

I would, therefore, rule that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition might proceed with his remarks if he can explicitly state and prove that they are strictly in accordance with this principle.

It must not be overlooked, however, that the question before the Assembly is "that Bill No. 1, an Act to amend The School Act (No. 1) be now read the Second time," and that the only amendment to same which can now be considered is as to the time for this Second Reading or to the effect that the principle of the Bill might adversely affect or contradict some principle of the original Act; that is, that no amendments of any clauses in the amending Bill can be made at this stage; such amendments would have to be made in Committee.

In connection with this matter, I would quote the following from Bourinot, Fourth Edition, Page 340:

"The freedom of debate requires that every member should have full liberty to state, for the information of the House, whatever he honestly thinks may aid it in forming a judgment upon any question under its consideration. But it is nevertheless the duty of the Speaker of the House (or Chairman of Committee), to interfere when he finds that the member's remarks are not relevant to the question before the House. On such occasions, he may very properly suppose 'that the member will bring his observations to bear upon the motion before the House' or 'that he will conclude with something that will bring him within order'. And he may find it necessary to caution a member that 'he is approaching the limits of propriety which confine hon. members in speaking to that which is relevant to the subject in hand', and to express the hope 'that he will be careful to confine himself to that which is relevant'. In other words, he must direct his speech to the question before the House or Committee, or to the motion

or amendment he intends to move, or to the point of order raised. If the Speaker or Chairman believes that his remarks are not relevant to the question the member so transgressing will be called to order. The precise relevancy of an argument is not always perceptible, but the Speaker must be satisfied that it is relevant, otherwise he reminds the member that he must speak to the question. It follows therefore that the debate must not stray from the question before the House to matters which have been decided during the current session, nor anticipate a matter already appointed for the consideration of the House.

In the British House of Commons the authority of the Speaker in cases where members have persisted in irrelevant remarks, has been recently enlarged so that a member who persists in irrelevance may be 'named', as disregarding the authority of the Chair.

The Canadian Commons rules 13, (5), 18 and 19 specifically insist upon the relevancy of speeches in debate both in the House and in Committees and upon points of order. A remark which has been ruled to be out of order cannot be subjected to debate."

I would also quote, from the same edition of Bourinot, at Page 509, the following:

"The principle of a Bill is usually debated at its Second Reading." The Commons have no rule on the subject, but the practice of the House is always to discuss the principle of the Bill at this stage. Any member may propose as an amendment a resolution declaratory or some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the Bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution or otherwise opposed to its progress, or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence, or the opinion of judges.

I would also refer you to Beauchesne, Second Edition, Section 755:

"It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the Bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges.

And the reference given here is to May's, on Page 357, and to Bourinot, the section which I have read.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I wish, in resuming my remarks in connection with the Bill now before the House, to voice my appreciation of the ruling which you have just given. I think that the ruling given places any speaker in this debate, or any other debate, in a position to discuss the reason for the introduction of a Bill which is going to bring about the amendment of legislation already on the Statute Books. As a matter of fact, the proposer of the motion has already given his reasons for having done so. Again, Sir, it should permit of a speaker dealing with the effect of that particular amendment upon the Act which it is proposed to amend and, in the third place, it should permit of a speaker discussing before this House the results which are likely to come from the Act being so amended. I submit that the procedure which I followed yesterday was not a departure from those matters of discussion.

I had, up to the point when the House adjourned yesterday, called to the attention of the House the fact that we have before the House at the present two pieces of legislation, one called School Bill No. 1 and another known as School Bill No. 2, both of which affect one principle which underlies The School Act, and for that reason it might have been better in the interests both of discussion and their after-effects, to have had them both placed in one Bill. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very difficult for either myself or anyone else, in discussing this in the House at the present time, to refrain from following an argument which will apply just as strongly to Bill No. 2, when it comes up, and if I had been speaking on a matter of privilege I think, that I would be quite justified in calling your attention to the rule of the House dealing with economy in time. We would have saved time and would have attained the desired result, had both these matters been brought before the House at one time in one Bill. Since that has not been done, it will be necessary in the discussion for myself as well as for other members, to express ourselves in accordance with the

principles of the Act which this Bill seeks to amend and, when the motion is made again for bringing in Bill No. 2, to go over old ground because the principle as outlined by the Minister himself as being the object of this Bill, is to remove sectarianism from the schools.

Premier Anderson: Public schools!

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, from the public schools of the province. I maintain that question is affected by both of the Bills at present on the Order Paper.

In dealing with the matter, I was trying to present to the House yesterday, the lack of reason for bringing this Bill before the House. I was trying to point out that progress was being made in the province of Saskatchewan along the lines which the Bill intended to accomplish before this amending Bill was introduced into the House and that, if it were permitted to go on as it was proceeding before, we would arrive at the results we desired by the other method.

I was reading, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, from a report of the Leader of the Government at the time when he was a school inspector and dated during the year 1914. I now propose to read a few more sections from those reports to indicate to you and to this House that considerable progress was being made along the lines which the minister had urged progress while he was speaking yesterday. In 1913 the Leader of the Government in his report to the department made this statement:

"I expect next year to be able to report a decided improvement in the work being done among our new arrivals from other lands. They are fast beginning to recognize that to get results they must have properly trained and qualified teachers in their schools."

That was in the year 1913. This is what he reported in 1914, Mr. Speaker:

"It is with pleasure I report an increased interest in education on the part of many of our foreign born citizens."

And then in 1915 again, this statement is made:

"The work done by the teachers during the year was of a much higher order than during previous years. Greater interest was shown generally and fully 80 percent of the teachers had been in the inspectorate the previous year."

Then coming along to 1916 there is a somewhat lengthy comment under the heading of "General Conditions":

"The vast majority of the non-English pupils speak English and are doing very fair work. Irregular attendance is the greatest preventive of progress. There are, however, a few districts where qualified teachers have not been secured and consequently very little progress has been made."

Well, coming along then to 1916, dealing with private schools, "Few of these are to be found in this inspectorate". And then he deals with them:

"Few of these are to be found in this inspectorate . . . In only five public schools was a second language taught, three Ruthenian and two in German districts."

It will be remembered Mr. Speaker, that under the law at that time it was possible to teach in Saskatchewan schools any language for an hour a day. I submit that even yet in the province of Alberta it is a condition that prevails according to the law. But, since 1919 it has not been possible in this province to teach in any language in the elementary schools except in the English language and, under certain restrictions, in the French language.

Now with regard to the progress of the pupils in 1916, he says:

"The majority of the people in the 'foreign' districts around here realise that the pupils must have English at all costs."

The people realise, Mr. Speaker, that the pupils must have English at all costs!

And in 1917, he goes on:

"As was the case in 1916 . . . in all our efforts we have received the staunch support of your departmental officials".

Premier Anderson: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see where the Leader of the Opposition is adhering to a discussion of the principle of this Bill. It is not a question of the teaching of this language or of that language. He is saying some very flattering things about myself but I contend it is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. Gardiner: I think the honourable gentleman is just a little bit afraid that the statements will not be nearly as flattering before I get through.

Premier Anderson: I have never yet evinced any fear of what the honourable gentleman might say or read about me. And not now!

Mr. Gardiner: I am not going to be very long. I am intending to follow up this line of argument to show that, at this time, in those particular sections of the province where many of the people live among whom you would expect to find difficulties in connection with the sectarianism in the schools, there has not been any sectarianism and surely I can proceed along the lines I am following.

Mr. Speaker: It is difficult at times to see the relevancy of the argument.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, we will get along to it and see it as we go along:

"In all our efforts we have received the staunch support of your departmental officials . . . As was the case in 1916, over 80 per cent of my teachers were in the inspectorate during the previous year. Their interest, as stated, was most marked."

Then in 1921:

"One of the most gratifying and encouraging phases of the whole situation is the sympathetic and helpful attitude of our English-speaking people towards those whose language, habits and customs are often so different from their own. There is on all sides a manifest desire to arrive at a better understanding in the interests of a unified and solidified Canadian citizenship. It is true that there are settlements where dissension and misunderstanding still exist. There will always be."

Now that is the important statement, Mr. Speaker: "It is true there are settlements where dissension and misunderstanding still exist. There will always be!" This is his statement and a statement that I can absolutely concur in. "There will always be!" There will always be in our school districts more or less dissension and misunderstanding in certain matters.

"But I have found this is by no means general. Personal visits have been made to such districts where possible and usually by placing a strong type of teacher in charge of the school, harmony is restored and all begin to work together for the common weal."

That, Mr. Speaker, is a fair description, or a fair outline, of the conditions existing in the schools, more particularly in the north-east portion of Saskatchewan during the year 1921.

There is a story here that I would like to read, because it illustrates the point:

"My experience in X . . . district will perhaps illustrate this point. The majority of the settlers there were of foreign nationality and the minority English. The trustees were 'foreign' and knew very little English and an unqualified teacher of their own nationality had been engaged. Answering a complaint of the minority I visited the district and held a ratepayers' meeting. . . ."

Under the ordinary instructions which the Minister or the Deputy Minister gives, the present Leader of the Government, as a school inspector was sent to that district to visit the district.

". . . After hearing several expressions of opinion, and being accused by an English ratepayer of 'catering to the Bohunks', I advised the teacher to leave at once and suggested to the trustees that they resign, which they were quite willing to do. . . ."

Now I would submit this, that during all the discussions that have taken place in connection with this question and conditions said to exist which we are going to attempt to rectify by the Bill now being considered, we have been saying to the people of this province that we have followed exactly the same procedure in connection with the whole matter as was followed when the present Leader of the Government, who

was then an inspector of schools, reported to the department and his recommendation was followed so successfully:

"... The desire of the 'foreigners' to co-operate was shown by the fact that a few days later they elected a new board of trustees — all English speaking. A highly qualified teacher was engaged and the district now has one of the most up-to-date rural schools in the province — and my former accuser is one of the most enthusiastic supporters of our educational policy."

The educational policy of the previous Government of this province! This gentleman, during his term as an inspector of schools, was one of the strongest supporters of the policy of the Government and of the policy which was at that time being followed by the Government. Then to go back a little, he says, "We have received at all times the staunch support of your departmental officials". In other words, at least down to the year 1921 from the year 1913, by meeting these people who were having difficulties to solve in certain districts and discussing with them in a sympathetic manner the difficulties they had confronting them the Department of Education of this province was able to solve those difficulties, was able to remove any evils surrounding the giving of an education to the children of the province.

Now the present Leader of the Government was an employee of the department until the spring of 1924. This last report I have been reading from, would be made early in the year 1922, as covering the work of the year 1921. So that two years after the report was made the present Leader of the Government was still an employee of the Government, spending considerable time in the Normal School at Saskatoon. In the spring of 1924 he became the Leader of the Conservative Party.

Premier Anderson: In March.

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, 1924. Then on May 6, 1924, I read this from the *Melfort Journal*, in which was published in detail an address delivered in the Town of Melfort dealing with the situation in this province, when, after he had outlined to the people the conditions in the districts where he at one time had been a school teacher, he made some statements. Amongst those statements was the following:

"The English language was in general use in the district and there was no foreign problem to deal with then. But conditions in other parts are deplorable, and it was up to the Conservatives to remedy them".

This, Mr. Speaker, is just two years later:

"Schools were being closed down for lack of funds and there must be something wrong when a Government allows that. In one particular locality of thin population there was a reign of terrorism going on, blackmailing and buildings being burned down, and rural municipalities' books were in the hands of the auditors and a solicitor had been threatened violence if he did not leave the town."

Then coming on to February 6, 1925, the present Leader of the Government is reported again, speaking at Rouleau:

"In some districts the pupils are being taught to ignore our Sovereign and to refuse to sing the National Anthem."

And then harking away back to the reports which were made in 1913, 1914 and 1916, the present Leader of the Government is reported in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* of March 9, 1925, as urging "that steps be taken to prevent early marriages in foreign districts."

What I wish to submit to you is that in all the years that the present Leader of the Government was employed in the Department of Education, he was able to detect in connection with all these matters having to do with things like race, things like religion, matters of stirring-up differences, a progress along certain lines that led to a result he desired to have brought about. But when he became Leader of the Opposition he then was harking back to the reports he made in 1913 and 1914, when this question was under discussion and before the efforts were made, the final result of which was the drafting of the legislation of 1919 and the enforcement of that legislation and the administration of the department under that law which brought about the conditions he saw in the province in the year 1921.

Now there have been others talking in the province as well as the Leader of the Government; others, naturally in the party to which he belongs, taking their lead from the Leader of the Government. They too, began to discuss the difficulties we had in the schools of the province. Might I submit this to you, that from the time I came into this House in 1915 until 1925, when the present Leader of the

Government came into the House, there was very little discussion of this particular question upon the floor of the House, and more particularly after the discussion of 1918, when the law was changed by the then Minister of Education. There seemed to be an effort on the part of all the members of the House — I would not say that with regard to all present members at that time outside the House — but as a result of the efforts of members who were elected, whether in the Opposition or on the Government side of the House, I would say there seemed to be an honest desire on the part of every member to try and keep our school system, as far as possible, away from partisan discussion. I cannot say away from all political discussion because, when we discuss anything which has to do with legislation, it is discussed from a political point of view, considering the definition of that word in its truest sense.

Premier Anderson: I am going to rise to a point of order again, Mr. Speaker. I think we will probably have to get the opinion of the members of this House as to whether or not my honourable friend is within the scope of the rule. You have given him considerable latitude and he has taken advantage of it, but how our attitude in the House since 1925 has anything to do with the principle of this Bill, which is as clear as day, I cannot see. The principle of the Bill is that our public schools be non-sectarian. That is the principle of the Bill. Now, as to my attitude in 1911, or prior to or since that time, or the attitude of any person or of any member of this House, what that has to do with it is more than I can see. Now my honourable friend is starting to try to say that the Opposition in the last four years took a certain attitude. Supposing they did; they have nothing to apologise for!

Government Members: Hear! hear!

Mr. Gardiner: The honourable gentleman is debating the very point I was discussing.

Premier Anderson: I am through. I await your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. Gardiner: Well, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the question might I say this: There is only one reason for this particular Bill being in the House and that is because of the agitation which has taken place in the province and we can only establish need or lack of need by presenting to the House the conditions we say did exist. Surely I can argue that question! I shall try to the utmost of my ability to keep within the rules of the House and after I have cleared up the point I am now making which I do because of the remarks which were made the other day in presenting the Bill — then I think you will agree with me that I have only one desire and that is to get a settlement of this vexed question, which is concerning the people of the province. I am through reading from reports, so far at least as the reports of the Leader of the Government are concerned. . .

Premier Anderson: Are those from the Liberal Handbook?

Mr. Gardiner: No! From *The Regina Star*. The reports which I now have in my hand are reports of addresses delivered by honourable gentlemen opposite, some of them by the Leader of the Government, some of them by his chief partner in creating the condition which makes necessary further remarks concerning the legislation we are now considering — during the time of the last campaign and prior to it. On October 15, 1928, the present Minister of Public Works (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*) made this statement, which I am sure had to do with the principle of this particular piece of legislation, in a speech at Davidson:

“The immigration policy of the Canadian Government was influenced by the Catholic Bishops of Quebec”.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, what has the immigration policy to do with the Bill now being discussed?

Mr. Gardiner: The immigration policy has this to do with it, that the honourable gentleman said that conditions existed which did require this law because of the immigration policy.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, I press the point of order. The debate is entirely out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. Gardiner: I shall have to read from another section which comes more closely to it. A few days later he said:

"The issue in the present campaign were not made by the Liberal Party but by the Church of Rome."

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Government has just said the principle of the Bill is the existence or non-existence of sectarianism in our schools.

Premier Anderson: Sectarianism does not mean the Church of Rome.

Mr. Davis: What does it mean?

Mr. Gardiner: We will get along to that. The Church of Rome is one part, the Protestant Church is another part, and the Greek Church another part and some other churches play their part also in sectarianism. We will eventually get down to it.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I again take the point of order that the matter has nothing to do with the principle of the Bill and I press the point of order, and I ask you to rule the honourable gentleman is out of order.

Premier Anderson: On this point of order, Mr. Speaker: The expression used is "sectarianism". The expression in the Bill is "religious sect or denomination". No particular denomination is named.

Mr. Gardiner: Everyone knows that both the word "Protestant" and the words "Roman Catholic" are mentioned in The School Act in the particular section sought to be amended. Surely then we can discuss those terms. I will continue reading from the address of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. "Within five years or ten. . . ."

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I press the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The debate is entirely out of order.

Mr. Gardiner: I would ask the honourable gentleman to allow me to continue reading. "Within five years or ten. . . ."

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Have I heard your ruling on the point raised, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would call the attention of honourable members to Standing Order 40, in Beausiesne's House of Commons rules, which says:

"A member addressing the House, if called to order by the Speaker or on a point raised by another member, shall sit down while the point is being stated, after which he may explain. Mr. Speaker may permit debate on the point of order before giving his decision, but such debate must be strictly relevant to the point of order raised."

Then it goes on further:

"Mr. Speaker, after having called the attention of the House to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech."

And again I would refer you to Bourinot, Fourth Edition, at page 341:

"If the speaker believes his remarks are not relevant to the question, the member so transgressing will be called to order. The precise relevancy of an argument is not always perceptible, but the Speaker must be satisfied that it is relevant. . . ."

Candidly, I cannot see the relevancy of your remarks.

Mr. Gardiner: May I Mr. Speaker, read the next sentence before you put your ruling into effect:

"Within five years or ten at the most, under present political conditions, Roman Catholics will be in the majority in Saskatchewan and the French will control Quebec, Saskatchewan and all of Canada".

I submit, Sir, that that sentence is relevant. If we are going to have that condition in Saskatchewan because of what we were doing or are going to do, it is going to affect The School Act of Saskatchewan very considerably.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order: It is not what we were doing but what we are going to do in Saskatchewan that is the question.

Mr. Davis: But what you are going to do involves what you did do.

Mr. Gardiner: That is all I intended to read. Now we will get down to the Act itself. I have here Bill No. 1 and in Bill No. 1, I read clause 1 which is to amend section 222 of the original Act:

"No emblem of any religious faith, denomination, order, sect, society or association, shall be displayed in or on any public school premises during school hours, nor shall any person teach or be permitted to teach in any public school while wearing the garb of any such religious faith, denomination, order, sect, society or association."

Well, now, it was stated yesterday by the minister in introducing the Bill and also by myself in reply, later, that there is a slight difference between that clause and the clause introduced a year ago. I draw the attention of the House to that fact because the difference removed one of the strong arguments put up by members of the Government of that day and by some who sat on this side of the House. You will note that the clause a year ago read in this way:

"No emblem of any religious denomination, order, sect, society or association, shall be displayed in or on any public school in the province, etc."

Now, in this proposed amendment which is on the Order Paper today, it says no emblem shall be displayed "during school hours"; but in the amendment of a year ago there was no such restriction as to time, and no emblem could be displayed at any time of the day or night. What I wish to say in that connection is this, that the argument presented a year ago to the effect that this particular amendment would render it impossible for any religious body to hold services in a school house on a Sunday or weekday, is removed from the discussion at this time. The amendment of a year ago made it impossible to hold such services in a public school at any time, but the Government of today proposes to make it possible for these services to be held in the school houses through the length and breadth of the province.

So far as the other part of the amendment is concerned, it brings us into conflict with the spirit and the intention of The School Act as it has existed for many years not only because of what is contained in this amending Bill but also because of what is contained in a section of School Bill No. 2. I am only going to read one section of Bill No. 2 to show the difficulty of dealing with the one without being permitted to discuss the other: Clause 6 of School Bill No. 2 reads as follows:

"Section 39 (of the original Act) is amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

'(2) In determining whether the applicants for the erection of a separate school district are in fact a minority in the district, the ratepayers who are neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic shall not be counted'."

I suppose I can read that, and you will notice it has both terms in it, both "Protestant" and "Roman Catholic" — and it is their own Bill too! Now subclause (3) of that same section is this:

"(3) After the erection of a separate school district a ratepayer who is neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic may, by notice in writing filed with the assessor of the municipality in which he resides, elect which school district he will support, and such election shall determine his rights and privileges as a ratepayer thereof."

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that both those sections whether the one in Bill No. 1 or that in Bill No. 2, deal with the same principle in the Act, that is, the principle which has to do with sectarian influence or the teaching of religion in the school. To deal with that phase of the question properly it is necessary to go back over the history of the school situation in the past and, in doing that I will point out the decisions of the Legislature in years gone by and the change that will take place if both these amendments are passed by this House. That, Sir, takes us back to 1884. . .

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, you are out of order.

Mr. Gardiner: Can I not discuss the School Law of this province?

Premier Anderson: The province did not start until 1905!

Mr. Gardiner: But it is on these early Acts that the present law is based! As I said, it is necessary to go back to 1884 and, going back to the Act of 1884, we have the provisions for the setting up of school districts in Saskatchewan. Perhaps I had better go beyond 1884. Let us go back to 1875 when The North-West Territories Act came into being.

Premier Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The honourable gentleman claims he can discuss The School Act as it existed before the province was formed. What we are operating under is The School Act of this province as at present. He should confine himself to that. We are not discussing any other Acts.

Mr. Gardiner: Surely I can discuss the School Acts of Alberta, Ontario, England, the United States or anywhere else on a question of this kind. We will not get very far if we cannot discuss what takes place in other provinces and countries.

Premier Anderson: Go ahead!

Mr. Gardiner: Section 11 of The North-West Territories Act of 1875, set forth:

"When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the North-West Territories, the Lieutenant-Governor, by and with the consent of the Council or Assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the North-West Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

I read that in order to indicate to this House that even as early as 1875, not by the law of the Territories, not by the law of the province (for there was no province at that time) but by the law of the Dominion of Canada, provision was made for the setting up of separate schools, by Protestants or Roman Catholics. I do that for the purpose of proving to you that the ideas of having persons wearing the garb teaching in the schools in the area that now is Saskatchewan and the idea of having emblems in the schools within that area was established before the province itself was formed. As a matter of fact we had in the area schools prior to 1875 in which such conditions existed.

Then in 1884, the first School Act was passed by the Council or Assembly of the Territories, and in that Act a system of schools was set up. I am not going to read the section, but I will indicate what it provided for. It made possible a system practically identical with that of the province of Quebec today. It made possible the setting up within the Territories of a school board composed, if my memory is correct, of six Protestants and six Roman Catholics. At that time, the Roman Catholics were in the majority in the Territories and yet it was established that we should have a school board administering the Act in the Territories and that that board should consist of an equal number of Protestants and Roman Catholics. It was decided, further, that this board should meet in two sections or committees, one composed of Protestants the other of Roman Catholics, and that those committees should take care of the schools of their respective faiths.

Then in 1888, we had further amendments to The School Act bringing us nearer to the conditions prevailing in the province today, and in those provisions we had this section:

"37. In accordance with the provisions of 'The North-West Territories Act', providing for the establishment of separate schools, it shall be lawful for any number of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, the same being a minority of the ratepayers resident within the limits of an organised public school district, to establish a Separate School therein, by proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor, with the same rights, powers, privileges, liabilities and method of government as herein is provided in the case of public school districts."

Then the Act goes on to deal with the petition for this school, and the notices calling the meeting of persons qualified to vote for or against the establishment of the

separate school, these being the ratepayers in the district of the same religious faith as the petitioners. Then section 41 says:

"41. After the establishment of a Separate School District under the provisions of this Ordinance, such Separate School District shall possess and exercise all rights, powers, privileges and be subject to the same liabilities and method of government, as is herein provided in respect of Public School Districts; and all property within such Separate School District belonging to or held by ratepayers of the religious faith indicated in the name of such District, shall be liable only to assessments such as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

Now, Sir, I read that much to establish this fact that, prior to 1888, we had in Saskatchewan a system of schools (at least in the Territories) under which school districts could be established anywhere and call themselves Roman Catholic Public School Districts, and others could be established which called themselves Protestant Public School Districts. In 1888, the law was changed to set forth that when a public school district has been established, people of certain religious faiths could set up within those public school districts, minority schools, and that, when such schools were set up all those of the minority faith must pay their taxes to such minority school and all others must pay their taxes to the public school. The Act of 1888 set up a definite principle. Prior to that time, we had the Quebec system, but after 1888 we had a system differing from that of the province of Ontario in that a separate school could only be established in a public school district already established.

In the Act of 1901, all the previous legislation was consolidated, revised and brought up-to-date, and practically a new School Act was passed by the Assembly of the Territories. In that Act, the Legislature of that day embodied all they thought was necessary to meet the situation or condition in the Territories of that day. Now you ask me what was the underlying principle of that Act in regard to religious instruction. It was this: In the public school districts set up under the Act religion could be taught in the schools from 3.30 p.m. to 4 p.m. and, if any ratepayers were not satisfied with that condition in the school they could establish another school in the same area, with a different school board, and a different set of teachers, and the school board could decide what religion (if any) would be taught from 3.30 to 4 o'clock. The condition was this that anyone whose parents objected could retire from the school at 3.30.

Now the interpretation placed on the Act for many years, in fact from the time of its enactment until very recently, was that every school in Saskatchewan was absolutely free from sectarianism from 9 o'clock in the morning to 3.30 in the afternoon, with no distinction in that regard between the two sets of schools. It was the same for the separate schools as for the public schools. The only element of sectarianism that existed from 9 o'clock until 3.30 was that certain of the school boards undertook to decorate the walls with pictures or emblems in the schools of the districts which were sometimes taken objection to by certain of the residents whose children attended these schools. When such complaints were received, the Department of Education (in Territorial days or in Provincial days) would send out an official to try to persuade the Board concerned to remove the objectionable emblem or the minority of the residents would proceed under the Act to avoid such influences by setting up a separate school in the district.

There was another element of sectarianism which we inherited from Territorial days and that was to be found in the fact that certain persons teaching in the schools who wore certain religious garbs — and these were not always Roman Catholics. For instance, I taught many years ago in a school not far from the city of Regina and many of my pupils wore religious garb, and they were not Roman Catholics. They belonged to the sect of Dunkards. There is a member in the Federal Parliament of that sect and I have seen their religious garb worn by those of his family while sitting in the gallery of the House of Commons at Ottawa. So there are many in the schools wearing garb who are not Roman Catholics. I heard in this House the other day that this gentleman had written to the effect that teachers wearing religious garb should be barred from the schools, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that would eliminate this man's own daughters for they wear a garb. I say not all those teaching in our schools in religious garb belong to the Roman Catholic faith.

It has been customary to allow Sisters to teach school in this province. It has been allowed both by the school boards and by the department, and this is recognised by the very fact that we have allowed those nuns to take their training as teachers in the Normal Schools of the province of Saskatchewan since 1903. I have here a record of the nuns receiving their training in the Normal Schools since that time. In 1903,

there were two nuns receiving training; in 1904, one, and so on down the years and I find here that in all a total of 189 Sisters have taken training in the Normal Schools of Saskatchewan from 1903 down to the present time.

I have submitted these facts, Mr. Speaker, in order to indicate that it has been the practice not only since the Liberal Government came into power in the province of Saskatchewan but that it existed in Territorial days, to permit nuns wearing the garb to train in our institutions and teach in our public schools, and at the same time to permit, where no objection is taken, the Crucifix or other emblems of religious faith to be displayed in or on the schools.

I think it would be in order at this time to present to this House the conditions which did exist just prior to the defeat of the late Government, as a result of what was done by the department and by school boards all over the province in connection with this matter. In order to do that I shall have to ask you to bear with me while I deal with certain statistics in connection with this matter.

The separate schools in this province which were in existence in 1905, were: Roman Catholic separate schools, 7; Protestant separate schools, 2, thus making a total of 9 separate schools established under the law which I outlined to the House a few moments ago. In 1928, we had 24 Roman Catholic separate schools and seven Protestant separate schools, making a total of 31. In 1928, we had 4,826 school districts in the province of Saskatchewan of which 31 were Separate School Districts, 24 of which were Roman Catholic and seven of which were Protestant. We had teaching in the schools in 1928, 160 nuns, teaching in both public and separate schools.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the object of this legislation is to make it illegal for Sisters wearing the garb (it has been directed at nuns teaching) to teach in public schools of this province but to permit the right to teach in the separate schools. That is the objective the Leader of the Government has in mind in bringing this legislation into the House. He is going to establish this new principle now that a teacher qualified to teach in one set of schools in Saskatchewan is not qualified to teach in another set of schools in the province. I think that is a conclusion which we are justified in arriving at, from the legislation now before us.

He is going to go further than that. He is going to make it illegal for any emblems of any religious faith to be placed in any of our public schools during school hours; but these emblems are to be permitted in the separate schools at all times. In other words, we are to have one set of laws and one set of regulations applying to one group of schools in Saskatchewan and another set of laws and another set of regulations for another group of schools, all of which are public schools in the sense that they receive support from the public funds subscribed to by the parents of the pupils in the province and also in the sense that they are supported by funds raised through the tax rolls in each of these different districts where they exist. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a new principle to apply to the School Law in Saskatchewan. And I think that, because it is establishing a new principle, I was quite within my rights in going back over the School Law in Saskatchewan in order to establish what the custom had been and that that custom had been established under the law from early days to now.

But there is another change by this legislation. The principle is going to be changed still further by the introduction into this law of the idea that certain people who do not belong to either of those religious faiths are to be disfranchised when the time comes to vote on the question as to whether or not a separate school shall be established. That is, all those not belonging to the Roman Catholic or Protestant faiths are to be left out of count when considering the question whether or not a separate school shall be established in any public school district in the province. Not only that, but even after the separate school is set up, it is going to be possible for those who live in the district to make a decision as to which of these particular schools they are going to pay their school taxes, and I submit that both those matters constitute an introduction into the School Law of a principle entirely new and something that should be given consideration to by the members of this House in arriving at a conclusion as to whether we are going to take these steps or not. Decisions of that kind, or rather, the introduction of a principle of that kind can cut both ways; if it is the intention of the Government of the province to change the whole School Law by establishing new principles, principles based more on the system of schools they have in Ontario today, than the law we have been attempting to set up, then this House should be taken into their confidence. We should know what they are starting out to do. We were told in the debate on the Address that it was the intention of the Government to appoint two school inspectors and that such inspectors

were to be one English-speaking inspector and one French-speaking inspector, who are to look into the conditions and inspect the conditions existing in the different schools in which the two languages are being taught. That plan promises a new departure in the regulations, in the organization and in the law administered by the Department of Education in this province. I would like to ask the Leader of the Government and other members of the Government this: How far are we going to go in order to change the law of this province to set up new conditions under entirely new principles in so far as the School Law is concerned?

Premier Anderson: I think I should be allowed to correct the statement or the interpretation or to explain the conclusion that has been drawn. In speaking on the first debate I said it was our intention to have each of the schools in which French is taught under the law specially inspected during the coming summer and, in order to see that we had an accurate and proper report we could send two inspectors, one an English-speaking inspector who is familiar with the French language, and the other a French-speaking inspector. The one we have in mind is on the Normal school staff, who is French, and who was engaged by the previous Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not introducing any new principle as my honourable friend is trying to make this House believe.

Mr. Gardiner: As to whether that is introducing a new principle or not depends on what the intention of the Government is in dealing with that kind of thing. That is exactly the condition that exists in the province of Ontario today and has existed for many years. In order to govern the bi-lingual schools of Ontario they have appointed one English-speaking inspector and the other French and these two inspectors go out and inspect the bi-lingual schools and Ontario is the only province which does that today. They are bi-lingual school inspectors. The statement made the other day led me to believe that that is the intention here, one French and the other English-speaking, two inspectors of schools to do the same thing here as is being done in Ontario.

Premier Anderson: No, that is not the idea at all!

Mr. Gardiner: Well, we will wait and see! In other matters introduced in the Bill amending the law under discussion a study of them has led me to believe that the same idea is being introduced into our law all the way along; that is, that there is to be a difference in the different schools in the province that are operating under different names under the present Act. If that is the intention I would call this to your notice, that it is very easy to drift along one or other of the lines of activity having to do with matters of that kind and to find ourselves in five, six or ten years very much further away from the point at which we aimed when we started, than we thought we would be. All I would like to do is to ask the Government to state clearly to the House whether they intended to start out on a new policy of school government, which involves two entirely separate systems of schools.

If that is the intention I would call the attention of the House to the statement made by the Leader of the Government that we should have all the children of the province educated on common school grounds. That is being set up as a principle towards which they are working. We have had in the province a certain condition prevailing. We have had the history of education activities from 1870 — but we have conditions prevailing which show in all that time in the whole province twenty-four Roman Catholic separate schools and seven Protestant separate schools. We have a condition — we have rather, legislation and have had administration which had resulted in there being 4,826 school districts in which there are 160 nuns teaching. The total number of teachers in 1928 in Saskatchewan was 8,397. And there has been no change in the School Law since 1905, and no change in this particular part of the law since 1896. Then, under the enrolment of pupils in 1927, there were in the public schools of the province 207,316 pupils; that is in the elementary public schools of the province. Then there were in the Roman Catholic separate schools, 4,125. Listen to these figures again, Mr. Speaker: 207,316 pupils in the public schools and 4,125 in the Roman Catholic separate schools! Then there were 158 in the Protestant separate schools, making a total of 211,599 pupils all told, of which less than two percent are in Roman Catholic and Protestant separate schools. Then a number of private schools have grown up under that system. There is the one for instance at Ile à la Crosse. Most of them are in the northern part of the province—and they are not all Roman Catholic. A number are supported by the Anglican Church.

To summarise the facts with regard to private schools are: The number of private schools in Saskatchewan in 1928 was 46, of which number there were reporting to the

department 44. There are only two that do not report. Teachers in those schools, 97; total number of pupils 2,346, or about one percent of the children attending schools in Saskatchewan, attended private schools.

I give you those figures and I want to point out during all the time this law has been in force there has been produced only twenty-four Roman Catholic separate schools and seven Protestant separate schools; and in the neighborhood of 160 nuns teaching in the separate and public schools of the province. We have in the public schools about 97 per cent of all the pupils attending school, and we have in the separate schools about two percent of the pupils in the province, and in the private schools about one percent of all the children attending school.

Well now, it seems to me that, when that is the condition, there is not so much reason for assuming that there is sectarianism in the schools of this province to a greater degree than there is in any other provinces. In order to prove this I will give you some figures which I gave when I addressed the House on this subject while Leader of the Government a year ago. I have here the figures for all the provinces. In the province of British Columbia there were 838 schools. There are no Roman Catholic schools and there are no Protestant schools. There are eight private schools in that province. Alberta has 17 Roman Catholic separate schools, two Protestant separate schools and 17 private schools and colleges. Saskatchewan has 4,745 schools, 23 Catholic separate schools, eight Protestant separate schools—at that time there was one less Roman Catholic separate school than now — 50 private schools at that time — and there are four less now. Manitoba, 2,167 schools, no separate schools and 26 private schools; Ontario, 6,395 schools with 723 Roman Catholic schools and five Protestant separate schools and they do not know the number of private schools they have in that province. I do not think it is necessary to give any others.

There is one other comparison I wish to make and it has to do with the number of teachers in the different schools of the different provinces. In British Columbia there were 3,531 (with no separate schools) and I understand there are no nuns in the public schools in British Columbia; in Alberta, 5,380 teachers in the public schools of which 27 were nuns and there were 83 nuns teaching in the separate schools; in the province of Manitoba there are 3,700 teachers teaching. There are no separate schools in the province of Manitoba but there are 80 nuns teaching in the public schools. No separate schools in the province of Manitoba but there are 80 nuns teaching in the public schools in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker!

In the province of Ontario there are 16,016 school teachers and the number of nuns is 1,077 and 927 Brothers, of the Roman Catholic church, teaching in the schools, all of whom I think are in the separate schools, at least we have no record of them teaching in the public schools. They are Roman Catholic and entirely separate, and that is the number of Sisters and Brothers in them.

In the province of Saskatchewan there were 8,114 teachers, 87 of which were nuns who taught in the public schools and 66 nuns in the separate schools. In other words you will notice that in the public schools there were 87 nuns teaching a year ago and in the public schools of the province there are 80 nuns teaching at the present time.

I am quoting these figures to show that the present condition which exists in Saskatchewan is one that exists in Alberta or Manitoba or in any province other than British Columbia, in Canada. I am merely quoting them to show that there is a condition prevailing from one end of Canada to the other — with the exception of British Columbia — where nuns and Brothers are teaching in at least the same proportion as they are teaching in the province of Saskatchewan, and that, except in the province of Ontario, they are teaching in the public schools.

Now, I may say there is no law which prevents the nuns from teaching in the schools. There is no law in any province in Canada which prevents nuns teaching in the schools garbed in the uniform of a religious order, and there is no law in any province in Canada which prevents emblems being displayed, with the exception of the provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick and in those provinces only in the public schools. In other words there is no regulation in the province of Ontario that deals with the matter of nuns teaching or the garb being worn by the teacher in the school. I submit, if the Government of this province in the year 1929 has been at fault, then we were in company with every Government of every province in the Dominion — governments of all shades of politics, Progressive, Independent, Farmer, Liberal and Conservative. All governments, all parties in Canada, have permitted the condition to prevail.

The real condition we are confronted with today is a condition that has been created as a result of what I outlined to you at the beginning of my address this afternoon. It has been created because there has grown up in the province of Saskatchewan — and I am not going to try to outline how it has grown up — there has grown up a certain amount of opposition to the practice which has been followed in the past. That opposition may have been responsible for our being on this side of the House and the Conservative party on the other side. I am not prepared to say that it was entirely responsible, but it may have been partly responsible for the condition prevailing in the House now. What I wish to say is that we, as members of the Legislature in this province — now that the election is over — are not concerned so much with what put us on this side and what put you on the other, as we are with settling the questions that confront us as people in Saskatchewan in a manner which will establish the conditions we all desire to see established here. That should be our prime consideration. And might I be permitted to outline what my own view is, with respect to a proper solution for the conditions confronting us.

You ask me, "Why did you not deal with these matters while you were in power?" And I would submit to this House that the questions which were confronting the people of this province during the last three or four years were questions which were dealt with by the Government of the day.

The very first issue of which we heard anything, which was likely to bring about a disturbed condition, was the condition which had to do with a certain text book in this province that has been spoken of earlier in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. We took a certain action. I am quite willing to admit there might have been less discussion; I am willing to admit that, as a member of the Government of this province, I did not know, and I venture to say no other member of the Government knew, that certain lessons were in the book, lessons which were in the French language and which were objectionable to certain people from a religious point of view. None of us were adept French scholars and I submit a need exists for bi-lingualism in the ranks of a Government if we are going to forestall this kind of thing.

Immediately we were made aware, from the complaint of one individual in this province, that this condition existed (I may say the complaint came from a Church body in the province) the Council of that day met and decided that we should search for a text-book that would be satisfactory for the teaching of French and which did not have the objectionable features in it. I am willing to admit again, that possibly greater progress might have been made in arriving at a definite conclusion as to what that book might have been, but I do want to submit to the House (and I am sure that members opposite will be satisfied that what I say is true) that there was no sectarian influence brought to bear upon the Government of that day to keep that book on the list of authorised texts. There was no sectarian influence!

We discussed the matter in Council as we discussed other matters, and we arrived at our conclusions on the information we got from officials of the department. After having arrived at those conclusions, we went in search of a book which would be satisfactory to all the people of the province.

While we were in the midst of that searching which took us into all provinces of Canada, into the United States, over to England and even to France, we came to the conclusion finally, that the only book that would be entirely satisfactory from every point of view to the province of Saskatchewan would be one made specially for the province of Saskatchewan. Any one who has been connected with educational matters can understand why that is the case. These books were to be used to teach children in the primary grades and, as it has been necessary to produce a book for the English-speaking children of the province having in it the beginnings of agriculture, so it would be necessary to produce a French text book having in it the beginnings of agriculture. Well now, that takes, of course, a matter of time, but before we could get that under way, this agitation had risen to such a height that we thought it would be necessary to deal with the matter in another manner. Consequently we de-authorised the book containing the objectionable lessons in July, 1927, and then we found when the schools opened up in August that they were without a book and the teachers did the only natural thing under the circumstances. They continued to use the books thus breaking the law.

Then, because of certain agitations going on, we were confronted with the fact that certain school boards were threatened with court proceedings because they were using the unauthorised text-book which had been used previously. So we took the action

as set forth the other day; that is, on April 3rd, 1928, the following memorandum was sent out to boards of trustees and teachers respecting section 177 of The School Act:

"It will be recalled that the series of French readers in use for a number of years was withdrawn from the authorised list of text books on July 1, 1927. It was confidently expected that a new series could be authorised before the opening of the schools for the fall term, but the selection of a suitable series of readers has been a more difficult matter than had been anticipated."

I might explain in that regard, Mr. Speaker, that we had correspondence with the various provinces of Canada and, as a matter of fact, I had a conference with the Ontario authorities in regard to the French text books they were using in that province. We thought that, because of the small number of scholars who do take the opportunity of studying French in the lower grades, it might be wise to negotiate with the province of Ontario to have a book prepared that would be satisfactory to both provinces. Then it goes on:

"No other series examined so far has been found satisfactory. It is the intention of the Department to have a new series of French readers prepared and published in time for the second term of 1928. In the meantime it is desirable in the interests of education that schools should be enabled to use some set of readers for the teaching of French in accordance with the terms of the section of The School Act referred to above, (that is, Section 177).

"This matter has been brought to the attention of the Educational Council by the Minister and the Educational Council has considered the same and has reported that it is favourable to the use of the series of French readers previously authorised, namely, "Cours Francais de Lectures Graduées" by Roch Magnan, and "Leçons de Langue Francoise", until June 30, 1928, with the exception of Lesson LIII, pages 134, 135, 136 and Lesson LX, pages 151, 152, 153 as contained in "Dégré Inférieur" of the Magnan series, and such other lessons as are likely to be regarded as of a controversial nature.

"The Minister has approved this report and the above text books may be used until June 30, 1928, with the lessons noted above eliminated."

In other words, word was sent to every school in which those books were used that those lessons were not to form a part of the French course in those schools during the time necessary to get another book prepared and ready for use. We could not have one prepared under the plan we were working on by the beginning of 1928, so we decided to purchase from France some of the text books used in the province of Alberta. These books were not altogether satisfactory to Alberta or to this province, but they were books which were considered as satisfactory as any then available, by those looking after the teaching of French in this province. So we purchased a supply of those books and authorised them for use in our schools; and I believe they are the only books in use in Saskatchewan today. That was one of the questions we dealt with.

Another question was the question of emblems displayed in the school. You ask me how that question was dealt with! Well, I have here a memorandum referring to the difficulties of this nature which were encountered and handled by the department from 1915 down to the present time, and I find that there were 22 all told! That is, there were 22 districts where there were difficulties arising out of the matter of teaching religion in the schools. There were 22 districts out of the 4,000 established in the province from those early days — nearly all established under Liberal Government — where we had serious complaints registered in connection with any of those matters. I think I am correct in saying that, in the midst of all this agitation, there were only three districts in which serious trouble arose over what might be termed religious matters, during my administration either of the Premiership or as Minister of Education. These were at Gouverneur, Wakaw and Gravelbourg. There have been other real difficulties. Difficulties have come up arising from complaints that there was too much French in the schools, or too much of some other language, or in connection with the text-books, or that the teacher was teaching in other than the English language. These questions all are interwoven; but I think I am right in saying that in only three districts was the question a religious question such as a crucifix on the walls, or Sisters wearing the garb teaching in the schools.

By way of explanation may I say this: There are a number of districts in the province, outside the three I have mentioned, where they had religious difficulties, but those had all been settled under the law — places like Holdfast, Forget and Quinton, where the difficulty arose because the majority desired to have certain things done, which might be considered sectarian, in the public school, and the minority took advan-

tage of the opportunity under the law to separate themselves and established a Protestant Separate School. Well, we considered those matters settled under the law, but those of which I am now speaking were questions which were not settled under the law because there was no law to settle them. There was no law to settle the matter of crucifixes in the school. There was no law which enabled the minister to deal finally with the question of teachers, wearing the garb, teaching in the schools.

What have we done? We have done what has been done by Governments in this province since the beginning, in Territorial days as in Provincial days. Wherever there was a dispute we got in touch with our inspectoral staff — just as we did in the days when the present Leader of the Government was a school inspector as I indicated in the reports I read at the opening of my address — and we had an inspector go out to the school district at the earliest possible moment. In every one of those cases, outside of those which had been settled under provisions of the law for separate schools, so far as I am aware we were successful in having them settled to the satisfaction of the people in those particular districts.

In the Gouverneur district, we had a little more difficulty than in other cases for reasons I do not intend to mention in the House at this time, as the reasons contain all the controversial points connected with this matter and it is just as well to keep the controversial side out of this discussion. In Gouverneur we had a crucifix case. We had our inspectors down there on two occasions, and we sent other officials down in an effort to settle the dispute. Finally, after a period extending from January 23 (when we first heard of the trouble) until March 16, the case was settled, as we believed, to the satisfaction of the people in the district by having the crucifix taken down, and children returned to the school.

Then at Wakaw we had to deal with the effect of difference of opinion as to whether or not there should be nuns teaching in the public school of the town. The Protestant people raised an objection and the Protestant trustee resigned from the school board. Not only that, but he and his friends started to organise a Protestant separate school in Wakaw. That separate school was organised and a new building completed before I became Minister of Education, and I am only directly concerned because I was Prime Minister at the time. I want, however, to say this (and I think the records will bear me out) I do not believe there was a single separate school organised in the province while I was Minister of Education.

Premier Anderson: Might I say that the separate school at Wakaw was asked for before the minister resigned.

Mr. Gardiner: The separate school was asked for but no action was taken by the department for the setting of it up. The remarks I made are true of every school district with the possible exception of Rosetown; and I think that all the necessary details connected with setting up the separate school at that point had been gone through before I became Minister of Education. I would say this too: There is not a single school district in this province, so far as I know, in which Sisters were put for the first time while I was Minister of Education, and there is not a single school district, so far as I am aware, in which emblems were placed for the first time during the time I was Minister of Education; but I can point to several, yea! to every school district in which there were emblems of a religious faith and say that, where there was a single complaint by any individual living in that district whose children were attending that particular school, from every one of them the emblems were taken out as a result of the activities of the department. I can point to the Wakaw school in which Sisters were put just previous to my going into the department and over whom considerable controversy arose; but, after negotiations with that district, we were successful in having those Sisters removed from the school.

Mr. Given, (Rosetown): How long did it take to get those Sisters removed from the school at Wakaw?

Mr. Gardiner: So far as I know, from the fall of 1928, or just previous to the beginning of the second term in the 1928 school year until the agreement for their removal was reached just around the New Year, 1929. The agreement was that the Sisters would be taken out on June 30, 1929. That is, the school year had been arranged for before the negotiations were entered into, but we were successful in getting them out at the end of the school year.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that several statements made outside the House in connection with the Wakaw school will not bear very close observation or investigation.

Furthermore, to pass legislation in this Legislature covering 4,820 school districts which is intended to deal with the situation in one school district, may lead to very wrong conclusions in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan.

Premier Anderson: What school district?

Mr. Gardiner: The Wakaw school district. What I say now is that legislation affects every school district as well.

Early in 1928, a delegation from Wakaw interviewed me asking me to deal with the situation in Wakaw, where nuns were teaching in the school, by putting on the statute books of the province legislation to make it possible to send their children to the Protestant separate school and to pay their taxes to that Protestant separate school. I said to them: "We already have a law under which you can send your children to the Protestant separate school. There is nothing in the law to prevent any parent sending his children to any school he sees fit, whether private, separate or public, provided that school comes up to the minimum requirements laid down by the law." I venture to state, Mr. Speaker, there is not a broader law in the world than that, dealing with elementary education.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition would wish to leave a wrong impression. It seems to me, when he says that a parent can send his children to any school he chooses, he is omitting to mention the more important matter that the separate school law does not leave the parent any choice as to which school he shall pay his taxes to!

Mr. Gardiner: I am coming to that, if you will let me get at it. What I am getting at is this: There is no law which compels a parent to send his child to any school, public, private or separate so long as the school to which the child may be sent maintains the standards of education set by the law.

Premier Anderson: If they agree to admit him. They might turn him away from the doors.

Mr. Given: What about the Sutherland school?

Mr. Gardiner: You are discussing another question. What I am saying now is, that there is no law which compels a parent to send his children to a particular school. He can send them to any school he likes. He is a free agent.

Premier Anderson: But there is no law which says that they are free agents in regard to the payment of taxes.

Mr. Gardiner: No! But they asked for the right to pay their taxes to the separate school. Now, what is the logical answer to this request?

It is this: It is the old judgment of Judge Farrell, in connection with the Lemberg schools where I myself taught. It is the old question whether we are going to allow the decision to be based on the question of money as well as on religion. The law has already made provision for the establishment of separate schools based on religious divisions and I understand that under the Bill now before us, it is no part of the Government's intention to abolish the separate schools. They are not in opposition to separate schools. These can continue to exist. Rather it is their plan to set up a different law for the public schools while leaving the separate schools untouched. They are going further than that. They are going to say to a certain number of the ratepayers: "When those schools are set up you can decide as to which you are going to pay your taxes." So, in the long run, the question tends to become a question of dollars and cents.

In order to illustrate the point, I am going back to the old case in Lemberg decided in the courts in 1912. In the Lemberg school district at that time, there was a wide difference in rates as between the public school and the separate school and when a decision had to be reached as to where people were going to pay their taxes, if the decision rested on mere dollars and cents, then I submit that those parents of neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant faith, who had no children attending school (and there were three of the highest ratepayers in the town who were not of either faith) would naturally select the lower rate of taxation. At Lemberg, there was one school where the rate was 4½ mills on the dollar, and another where the rate was 17½ mills, the

first the separate school, the second the public school. Then if the decision were to be on the ground of cost those of neither faith and having no children to send to school would have chosen the $4\frac{1}{2}$ mill rate thus reducing the separate school rate still further while at the same time increasing the public school rate above $17\frac{1}{2}$ mills.

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

Resuming his address at 8.07 p.m., Mr. Gardiner said:

Mr. Speaker: When the House adjourned for dinner, I was speaking of the Wakaw case and in that connection was attempting to indicate to the House the effect which legislation dealing with sectarianism in connection with that school might have upon the general school situation throughout the province. I was indicating to the House that in the situation that had developed at Wakaw, the dispute arose over the action of the Public School Board in placing Sisters wearing the garb in the school at Wakaw. The situation was different at Wakaw than at any other place where separate schools had been formed, so far as I could gather from the department. It appears from the discussions at the time that the situation in the district was such that there could be either a Protestant or a Roman Catholic separate school established under the law, which says that, if a minority of the population being of either the Protestant or Roman Catholic faith, is dissatisfied with the condition in the public school district, they could form a separate school.

The situation at Wakaw was this: the Protestant ratepayers were in a minority as compared with those not professing the Protestant faith; and the Roman Catholics were in a minority as compared with those not counted as Catholics. So it appeared that either the Protestant minority or the Roman Catholic minority could have formed a separate school, in the first instance.

In dealing with the matter, when it first came up, the question that arose was whether or not those ratepayers who did not profess either the Protestant or the Catholic faith should be permitted to send their children to the school they preferred, and to pay their taxes to the school they preferred. The Catholics on the school board conducting that particular school wanted Sisters wearing the garb to teach in the school. As I indicated in my remarks before the House rose, we in the department stated our objections to introducing a section in the law which would have the effect of permitting the Sisters to teach in the public school, by stating that the supporters of the public school who objected to the Sisters teaching in the public school might pay their taxes to the separate school although not of the same religious faith as those who separated.

It is important to remember that the intention of the law of the province has always been to ensure that there should be a public school set up and maintained in every district where there is a certain minimum of children of school age. Provision is then made whereby any minority whether Protestant or Catholic, can separate themselves into a separate school building with a separate school board either because religion to which they take exception is being taught in the school or because the school board will not permit the teaching of religion which such minority desires to have taught. If it is for the latter reason, then the only right which the minority has in the separate school which they did not have in the public school is the right given them by the new board to have religion taught after 3.30 p.m. each day. It is on this question of sectarianism which the law provides for a decision to be reached when persons are deciding as to whether a separate school should be established. All those who are opposed to the particular religious view held by those separating, whether they themselves agree religiously or not, are required to support the public school in order to ensure that the public school can function.

If this Legislature is going to set up a different standard of choice then, I submit *Mr. Speaker*, that we should be careful of our actions. The reason we should be careful is that, if our constitution is sound (and its soundness has never been challenged in the courts) the only power which the province has to change the rights of minorities is to increase those rights. I take it that we, in this Legislature, cannot change the law to take away any rights now held by a minority, but that we can change those rights to add to them. If we add to the rights of minorities then we have not the power to take away even those rights which we have added.

Because of these facts, when we set out to amend the school law as now established, we can only do so by adding to the rights of minorities. If we are not doing that then there arises the question as to whether we have the power to so change the law. If we

have the power then to amend the law as now suggested, we must be increasing the rights of minorities. When we have established those rights we have not the power to take them away again. With these facts before us, we should be very careful to investigate where the legislation is going to lead us.

In that connection, in discussing the Wakaw delegation and why we were not able to meet their wishes, I was using the illustration I was very familiar with. That was the situation in my own home town of Lemberg, where we have two schools, a public school and a separate school, and where the taxes at the time I was teaching there were very much less in the separate school than in the public school — as I remember the rates then were $4\frac{1}{2}$ mills in the separate school as compared with $17\frac{1}{2}$ mills in the public school.

In the town we had a certain element neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic but which adhered to the Jewish faith. Three of these men were fairly large merchants in the town — among the largest on the assessment roll. There was a test case taken by one person who had endeavored to become a separate school supporter, but the decision of the court was that the gentleman had not the right to transfer his taxes from the public school to the separate school because he was not a Roman Catholic. My friends opposite say that it would not make any difference in the present law to give persons not belonging to either religious faith the right to select the schools to which their taxes should go, but it was demonstrated at the item that the gentleman was of the Protestant faith and the separate school was of the Catholic faith, and the law in regard to separate schools was that only Roman Catholics could pay their taxes to a Catholic separate school.

The question we were discussing at the time the House rose was giving the right of choice in the matter of taxes to the man who had no children attending school or who did not belong to any of these particular faiths, and I submit that, if that man has the right to select which school his taxes shall be paid to, the ground of his decision is going to be based on the amount he has to pay. If that had been allowed in the Lemberg case, then the tendency, as I pointed out, would have been to increase the rate of the public school and reduce the rate of the separate school through the transference of the support of those who were neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics. I submitted this as an illustration as to why we should not introduce legislation for one school that will assuredly involve every school district in the province. I submit further, that the proper thing to do is to deal with those situations as they arise, just as we dealt with the situation in Wakaw as it arose, and as a result of our action in that case the nuns are not now teaching in the school at Wakaw. That was the way it was left when the new Government took over — I do not know how they are going to deal with it in the future. But that was the way we left it.

Now, Sir, although there have been three or four well-defined cases in recent months in connection with the introduction of what has been termed "sectarianism" in the schools, as I pointed out, there are no schools in the province in which, for the first time, during the period I was Minister of Education, crucifixes were introduced into the schools; and there were none in which, for the first time, Sisters wearing the garb were permitted to teach, so far as I know, (except perhaps Rosetown), but certainly not in a public school.

There were other complaints, such as the matter of the text books which had in them lessons of a religious nature. I have already explained how we dealt with that matter. There is another type of complaint which has been received and that has to do with religious buildings in which schools are conducted. It has been contended for years that schools are being held in buildings owned by churches and that the holding of schools in church buildings tended to introduce sectarianism. But there are a number of cases of schools being held in Saskatchewan in such buildings and that does not apply to buildings of any one particular faith either. There have been schools conducted in buildings of one or other of the religious faiths, though mostly for a short period.

I was much surprised to hear the statement of one minister — I ought to say "clergyman" — who approached me and said something to the effect that there had not been enough criticism of the former Government in the last campaign because of schools being held in church buildings. I was much surprised at that, because I thought that every tittle of criticism that could be raked up in that connection had been raked up both before and after (more particularly after) I became Minister of Education. This minister stated: "I happened to have occasion to go to Young, and I was asked to be directed to the United Church, and I was taken down to the basement

to put my coat away. The seats I saw in the basement were arranged as if for school and I asked if school was conducted there, and I was told it was. I asked if any Catholics attended the school, and was told there were three." That was at Young. That is the other side of the question. That is one of the schools conducted in a church of Protestant faith, in the basement, and apparently no controversy waged or complaint made by parents of the Catholic children attending that school.

I want to make it plain that we, as a department, knew there were Sisters teaching in the public schools; we always knew there were crucifixes in the schools, and we always knew it was the law that religion could be taught during the last half-hour. To that extent there has always been sectarianism in the schools of the province because that was the law both in Territorial and in Provincial days. To that extent, also, the late Government has been charged with creating a condition in the schools which was, in reality, a legacy from Territorial days.

I heard a remark the other day from a prominent gentleman whose opinion would be accepted, (I am not going to mention his name) which led me to conclude that in discussing any public question, thought and consideration should be given to things established in the past in connection with that question. That is the reason why, in the course of this discussion, I have taken the time to go through the law in connection with this question as it has existed since the first legislation relating to education was enacted in the old Territorial days. After all, as those of us who have given any study to this particular matter know, in these old Territorial days in the territory in which we now live, the majority was not of the religious faith to which the majority of today belongs. Yet it was during that time that those practices were set up for which the late Government was blamed: And may I say Mr. Speaker, that those practices were not set up to protect a Roman Catholic minority but to protect those of us who are of the same faith as you are.

I may hold the same opinion as members on the other side as to Sisters wearing the garb teaching in schools which Protestant children attend. I may be of the same opinion as members opposite in regard to the crucifix displayed in the schools, but even if I have that opinion, I should be broad enough in my views to know that there is more than one way of coping with this question. And what I have been trying to show to this House, in reviewing the past history of this question in the province, is that the best method of handling this question is that method which will cause the least disturbance in the school life of Saskatchewan.

I listened to the Premier the other day when he introduced this question and more particularly when he held up the telegrams he had received and said those represented 5,000 people asking that this legislation be not proceeded with. Well, Sir, apparently more got in touch with me than with him. This is my instalment (*holding up a sheaf of mail and telegrams*) that I received as a result of public meetings in opposition to the setting up of this legislation, and there were 3,800 people at those meetings held in protest against what we are going to do now.

That, Mr. Speaker, is not the reason why I am arguing that we should have the nuns removed from all schools in which there is any objection from the ratepayers, whether that school be a public or a separate school; nor why I argue that emblems, more particularly crucifixes, should be removed from the schools if any objection is raised. I would go so far as to say that, no matter what the school, be it separate or public, whether the parents of the children in the school are all Catholic or all Protestant, if there is anything done in the school that handicaps the education of the children in the school, then everything should be done by the Government of the day to have that removed from the school — whether it is a cross in the school, or a Sister in the school. It is the duty of the Government to have the matter interfering with the conduct of the school removed. And that is the duty the Government that has just gone out tried to perform during all the time we were the Government in this province. That all the controversy is over one or two school districts out of the 5,000 in the province, is an indication that we were fairly successful in having done our duty.

I submit, further, that any Government in power in the province of Saskatchewan is going to meet with the condition that the present Premier, in the inspectorial report he made in 1915, said did exist. It will continue to exist. There will always be a certain amount of trouble in connection with matters of this and other kinds having to do with our schools. I am willing to admit that, because I know that there are extremists in every race. I know that there are extremists to be found everywhere and that there are extremists in every religious creed — in the church to which I

belong and in the churches of other members of the House, whether of Roman Catholic or of Protestant persuasion. I believe most of the troubles we have had, no matter from which side they owed their origin, have come from those who are extremists either on the one side or on the other. I am going to state this to those who now sit on the Government benches, that in administering this department of Government, they will be met with requests, not more so from one side than the other, to do certain objectionable things in connection with the school system in the province.

It has been suggested in the Gravelbourg case (to which we have heard reference) that the Government gave consent to a contract between the school board and the Order to which the Sisters belonged in Gravelbourg, to cover a period of twenty years. I am not in the position to present the records to the House and for that reason I can only state now what actually did happen.

In that connection there was an agreement made some years ago between the school board and the people who owned that particular building, for the use of some eight or nine rooms for the conduct of a school. There was nothing in the law, as I understand it, to compel these people to come to the department for consent in order to obtain the building. In other words, we could not enforce the erection of a building so long as the school board was in a position to provide a suitable building. When the first contract ran out, in 1926 (the first year I was Prime Minister in this province) the school board of the Gravelbourg district made an application to the Government for its consent to the renting of the building from the religious order there, for a period of twenty years.

When the matter came up for discussion, the decision which we reached was this: We would not give our consent to a building being rented in Gravelbourg for a period of twenty years. We even went further than that. We took the position that we would give our consent to that building being rented for five years if the school board would agree, at the end of the five years, to the erection of a new building. That was the position we actually took as a Government. Well, that contract was not entered into between the department and Gravelbourg. As a matter of fact, the school board did not require our consent, and it is very difficult to require consent under a law which provides for the issue of debentures on a vote of the ratepayers. The result was, the school board went back and entered into an agreement to rent the building for twenty years — but not with the consent of the Government of that day. Our consent to any agreement would only have been given on the understanding that a building would be erected at the end of a comparatively short period.

I wanted to cite those situations because we in this province and in this House, are in a much better position to give consideration to them than we were a year ago or even six months ago. We are in the position, today, where we can get together upon a question of this kind, and arrive at a decision which would be in the best interests of the people and that should be objectionable to nobody. Our friends on the other side of the House are over there and we are here. They have the responsibility for the legislation they bring before the House. We have the responsibility of reading that legislation and trying to come to a conclusion as to the effect it is going to have on the people of this province and, when I look at these long lists of protests against the legislation, I feel we are starting something in the province of Saskatchewan that may not lead us into any good. We can make a few suggestions to the members of the Government which we think will be in the interests of the people of the province.

Now, having said that, and having gone over these two or three cases (I may say I might have overlooked one or two which might have had an element of religious difficulty, which I used only because they are outstanding cases as involving the points that have been under discussion over a certain number of months . . .

Premier Anderson: Might I ask if there are copies of them on files in the Department, these two or three cases?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, I am not just sure. I had this made up during the time we were interested in the election campaign.

Premier Anderson: Is it from the departmental files?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, it was made up in the department at my request. I think likely there will be a copy on the files of the department. There may or may not be.

The suggestions which I would make would be these, Mr. Speaker: I do not know that we are going to gain anything in settling the difficulties confronting us in connection with this question by prolonging the discussion upon it, or by stating that members on either side of the House have taken an attitude in the past in connection with it which has not promoted the best interests of the province. I think, possibly, we would get further if we were to look into other fields and see whether we could not find some method of dealing with the situation which might have these advantages.

Last night, when I was sitting at the banquet in the Saskatchewan Hotel, where we were doing honour to the President of the University of this province, I was struck with this idea: If we had in the province of Saskatchewan in connection with our schools, even under the law as it is at present, some administration of the law as it is in connection with the University, we might be able to get away from a good deal of this religious controversy. My mind was carried back to the province from which the President of the University came — the province of New Brunswick, and to the province which he served for many years — the province of Nova Scotia. And I was reminded of this fact that there is no Minister of Education in any of the provinces east of Ontario considering it in the sense we have one here.

When I was last down to the Maritime provinces, I took the opportunity to enquire, and I found that there is no Minister of Education in the Government of the province of Nova Scotia, nor in the Government of the province of New Brunswick, and I understand there is no Minister of Education in the Government of the province of Prince Edward Island. They have a gentleman in the Government of the province of Quebec to whom most educational matters are referred but he is not known as the Minister of Education. The practice in all the Maritime provinces is to have matters of education administered by a Superintendent of Education who is not a member of the House nor is he a member of the Government, and in the province of Quebec they have a system similar to that which was established here in 1884, where there is a Board of Education composed of an equal number of Roman Catholics and Protestants who administer education. There, matters of education do not come before the Government as they do in the system we follow here.

During the recent visit I made to the province of New Brunswick I took the trouble to ask them why they had established that method there. Do you know what they told me? They told me that, years ago in this old province, they had a Minister of Education, and the reason they changed to the present system was to avoid the religious discussions that took place in educational matters then. You can find men in both those provinces today, who are engaged in politics, on one side or the other, who will tell you that the present method is the best. The Prime Minister of New Brunswick would tell you that education was supposed to be looked after by the whole cabinet; thus, no one minister can or must take the responsibility for doing anything in connection with education, but that the result is that the Prime Minister is allotted a good deal of the responsibility.

I think the other side will be apparent as well. There are times when individuals on either one side or the other of this controversy may see fit to bring all the influences they can to bear upon those who are administering the affairs of the department, and more particularly a department of this kind. If there is no one man in the Government who has the power to make decisions in connection with matters of that kind and the responsibility rests on a number of shoulders, it may be somewhat more difficult to have influences brought to bear upon the school system than it is when the responsibility rests with one, and more difficult to bring that influence to bear than it is through the medium of a minister.

Now the suggestion I would like to make is that, before we start changing the law merely because we said we would do it, merely because certain people said that they were going to do this thing or that thing (and I can quite understand why they desire to carry that promise out, and I can quite understand why they might, even at this time, even if they were convinced it was not the wise thing to do, feel that having pledged themselves and that they should make an effort to carry their pledge out), there is always the possibility that the public will be better satisfied in the end, even those who demanded that kind of promise will be better satisfied in the end, if the Government takes the necessary time to look into all the systems of education in vogue. After doing so, if they can find some method of dealing with this matter which will stop these religious discussions, then I believe it would be in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada and the interests of this province for all time to come.

I make the further suggestion that the Maritime provinces' scheme, which they say has worked well, might at least be given a trial. But you will say, what in the

meantime are we going to do about the situation? Well, I have a suggestion to make with regard to that as well, Mr. Speaker. I think we might go so far as to give greater powers to the Minister of Education than the Minister of Education has had in years gone by.

The conditions that exist in this province as a result of the discussions which have taken place are conditions that perhaps should be met by extraordinary actions on the part of members of this House and on the part of the Government. I am going to move an amendment to the motion that the Bill be read a second time, and I am going to move it in conformity with the section of Bourinot, page 509, which was read, at the beginning of the debate, today, as follows:

"The principle of a Bill is usually debated at its second reading.

"The Commons have no rule on the subject, but the practice of the House is always to discuss the principle of a Bill at this stage. Any member may propose as an amendment a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the Bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution or otherwise opposed to its progress, or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence, or the opinion of judges."

Premier Anderson: What page of Bourinot is that?

Mr. Gardiner: Page 509. But, Sir, before moving the amendment, for a few moments I will try to review the points I have made in connection with this matter, to indicate to you that I have been trying to place myself in the position where it would be perfectly in order for me to move this resolution at the end of the remarks I had to make.

In reviewing the situation, may I point out to you that, at the beginning I emphasised the fact that we have before us at the present time two Bills (though both are not under discussion at the present time, I admit) both involving the same principle dealing with the teaching of religion in the public school. I have tried to point out that there must be some reason for the Government introducing two Bills in this connection and I tried to indicate that that must be one of three reasons: First, it may be that the Government has some doubt in mind that one or other Bill is *ultra vires* of this Legislature; or second, it may be that the minister may have had in mind that if one were defeated the other would carry; or, thirdly, and more probably, the minister may have had in mind that it was again necessary to divide the House on this first question and that alone — the question as to whether or not we shall have Sisters teaching in the public school or religious emblems displayed in the public school.

I also tried to point out that the last of the three reasons was the real reason, and I tried to give you reasons for the faith that was in me. I tried to trace the law from Territorial days and later, under successive Provincial Governments, from 1905 to the present day, relating to this particular question. I indicated to you in this connection, that we were probably departing from the underlying principles of that law, that the underlying principles were seriously affected by both Bills, that we had no two systems of instruction, no two codes of law in connection with schools, and no two sets of regulations governing schools. I pointed out that there was but one system of administration, but one code, and but one set of regulations — and that it should be kept that way. I tried to point out that we were departing from that system and that in the course it is now proposed to take we are running the risk of setting up two different types of schools in Saskatchewan; and that, in the long run, the end will not be reached that is the desire of the gentlemen opposite — that all our children should be on a common playground and educated in a common school. Rather, Mr. Speaker, we are going in the other direction and in the end there will be more private and separate schools in Saskatchewan than there are today and more teachers teaching who wear the garb. There will be a larger element of sectarianism in the schools than we have today. That is the weakness of the position the Government is taking.

I believe that the system we have had in this province is the fairest and best system to be found in any province of Canada. I may say (and I repeat it) it is the system best suited to our needs. I may say, also, that a gentleman who has taken a very active part in opposing separate schools in this country, first in Manitoba and then as a Minister in the Federal Government, the late Sir Clifford Sifton, took the same view of the matter. A short time before he passed away, I had the privilege of

taking him through the Education Department in this Building and, when we came out of the departmental offices, Sir Clifford said to me: "I took a certain position in regard to schools some time ago, but, after having travelled through all the provinces of the Dominion of Canada and studied their educational systems, I have come to the conclusion that you have, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, the system that best meets the needs of our people in the Dominion of Canada under present conditions."

I also believe we have the best system; but I take the position that it could be improved upon, but that a good deal of peril lies in departing from it in the manner now proposed. The point I tried to make was that we are running chances of adopting the course now proposed, and that those chances are two-edged. We may be laying up store for future trouble. When you admit the element of separation between your treatment of the public school and treatment of the separate school, you are introducing an element which is not going to do away with the problem, and adopting a system which prevails in only one province in Canada — Ontario.

Then I tried to show that, during our administration, we had honestly endeavored to administer and carry into effect the law that was on the Statute Books. We had carried out, in the spirit of the letter, the wishes of those who had framed the law. In other words, we carried out the law in the spirit of what is in the Handbook of the Conservative party for 1928. In that Handbook (I am not going to read the school "plank" as the House is already most familiar with it) it says that the Conservative party is opposed to crucifixes or emblems in the schools where any objection is taken to them; but it does not say anything about the Sisters. Well, now, we have been living up to the spirit of that for 24 years. We have gone into every district where complaints had been made and cleared up the matter.

I then dealt with some of the cases that had given us trouble in recent years and showed that we had settled these to the satisfaction of the people of those particular districts.

I asked this House to take into consideration these facts and, in taking them into consideration, to so sit with us in this Legislature that we might try to work out a plan whereby trouble and misunderstandings which are likely to arise if this legislation goes through may be avoided altogether and there will be no cause in this question for anyone, in our life-time, at election time at least, to criticise any Government that happens to be in power. In that way, by taking education out of politics, we will have performed a real service to our province and its people, and to ourselves as members of this Legislature.

I am prepared to make a proposal in the form of an amendment to the motion that the Bill be read a second time. Before doing that, however, I wish to say that there is one other matter that might be given consideration by members of this House in coming to a conclusion on this question: that is the question of local autonomy — the principle that some measure of control should rest with the local school board. That was discussed very fully last year, and probably will be discussed very fully again before this debate is concluded. The amendment I will move to the motion is this:

"That all the words after "That" in the said motion be struck out and the following substituted therefore:

"the further consideration of the said motion be deferred until the said Bill provides that the clauses thereof should only apply in those districts wherein any minority of the resident ratepayers having children attending the school object to the presence of religious emblems in the school during school hours or the teaching by persons wearing a religious garb in such school and that in the event of complaint by such minority the Minister shall have the power to order the removal of such emblems or the discontinuance from teaching of any teacher wearing a religious garb."

Now, Sir, I submit in conclusion, that this involves the principle of local autonomy on the part of the people living in the districts, and it gives powers to the minister to do what is provided in the original Bill but to do it (in the meantime by consideration of the matters I have placed before the House) in a manner not to give offence to any who think they have rights in the matter. It will give the Government an opportunity of considering (if they have not already considered it) that in the proposed legislation we are setting up an entirely new principle, the effect of which will be very different from what it is intended to be.

In making those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move the motion I have just read, seconded by the honourable member for Pheasant Hills (*Mr. Dunn*).

MR. NAT. GIVEN, M.L.A.

(Rosetown)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker.—Speaking to this Amendment. I might say we have listened to a very great deal of discourse for the past hour or two in connection with the position the Government takes on this Bill. The discourse has referred to why there are really two Bills on the Order Paper referring to The School Act. Going right back to the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, this side of the House has been continually subjected to criticism from the Opposition because it designates itself the Co-operative Government. Again it is being criticised because it is not to the liking of the Opposition that there are two Bills on the Order Paper, both to amend The School Act, and not just one Bill.

It has been pointed out by the honourable Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) that the present Prime Minister (*Hon. Mr. Anderson*) has been a very able school inspector in the northern part of the province, and that he had done wonderful work among the different races of New Canadians that had proved satisfactory to the then old Government. During the time he was a school inspector and going amongst these people, it must therefore be concluded that, when he brings in a Bill of this nature, to a very great extent he satisfied himself that the conditions of which he has spoken are existing and did exist at the time he was a school inspector.

Today, we find this country made up of a very great number of people and types of people, and that is all the more reason why we should endeavour to draw all these folks under one system of education and that can only be done under the public school system. I would like this House to keep in mind that it is not the policy of the Government to discuss the separate school question. I may say that when I was discussing the school question in my constituency during the election campaign, I did not talk about separate schools. Never a word! I confined my remarks to public school matters, and to that alone.

We occasionally find persons who do bring up this question of the separate school, but that is not my idea at all and not the idea behind this Bill. To my mind, we want to keep the public schools of Saskatchewan as clean and clear of sectarianism as we possibly can, so as to get away from any trouble that might arise in these schools.

We are here as a people trying to build up a nation in the province of Saskatchewan. If we have five, six, seven or even eight different kinds of schools how, may I ask, are we going to assimilate the different peoples in the Province of Saskatchewan? Boys and girls who are growing up are looking forward to becoming good citizens, and they are looking to their elders in Saskatchewan; and they, in turn, are looking to the members of this Legislature to enact legislation whereby we can get the sure foundation of a lasting peace and unity in these affairs.

Now, as already stated, the only place they can get this is, to my mind, in the public school, where they can work out their own problems, where they are put on equal footing to go about their daily toil with men and women with no trouble and no dissension whatsoever. As I said before, the Leader of the Opposition has spent considerable time in pointing out to this House the good qualities of our leader as a school inspector, and of many of the pupils in some of these schools as shown by the reports, and telling us that they were making better Canadians out of them; and these, evidently, did achieve good results. The Government of that day evidently had a considerable amount of forethought and they considered that this particular man (*Premier Anderson*) in that particular sphere must have had the ability; and if he had the ability at that time, we on this side have followed along in this spirit and secured his assistance to step out and establish a school system which will work out in the best interests of this Province. The country is a new country and it is changing. The conditions are changing; people are changing and when they change, we must be

prepared to change also to suit, to fit into our educational system some new ability and to make some new amendments to The School Act, whereby they will work out the destiny of the pupils of this country, and for that reason, I cannot see any particular objection to the Bill that has been brought up.

The Leader of the Opposition in the course of his discussion went on to point out that there had been difficulties. He candidly said there were difficulties, and we know that there were difficulties, and these difficulties were more or less growing and they were more or less, or to a certain degree, settled. Nevertheless he acknowledges that the difficulties were there. Now, the idea at the present time of introducing this Bill was to try as far as possible to eliminate those difficulties and that is the reason that it has been prepared to that extent.

No issue has been made at all in connection with the separate schools or the minority rights. None whatever! I might read here a part of a document which has come to me in connection with these minority rights, and this comes from a delegation of somewheres around eighteen or twenty. And here is a section in it:

Note: Quotation missing.

I think that, in itself, will give us some idea where those people stand and this document, I presume, is signed by Catholics and Protestants in that particular school district. I know this, that I have quite a number of Roman Catholic friends who are not in favour of separate schools supported by public funds. I have two people in mind, right in the constituency I represent, who come from the other side of the international boundary and in discussing this situation they told me, "It is not our desire, Mr. Given, that we should establish at all the religious or separate school. If we want them then we are quite prepared to go ahead and pay for that school. We do not think or believe that the public should be asked to support this type of school," because they had been brought up where there was little or no trouble of that kind existing. It has been pointed out there was very little difficulty. You heard what the Prime Minister, the Minister of Education, reported when he gave his address here yesterday, that he had received complaints that there were 113 schools, I believe, with 161 rooms where there was more or less of a practice of displaying religious emblems in the school rooms.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) a few minutes ago endeavoured to have us believe that there was very, very little. I do not consider this a small difficulty and if this difficulty — 113 schools with 161 rooms displaying religious emblems — can be eliminated then I believe it is our duty as members of this Legislature to pass this legislation no matter whether Liberal, Progressive or Conservative. It is our business as citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan to eliminate this trouble. It was mentioned also that there were no separate schools in British Columbia. I may say that I took the trouble to get in touch with the Minister of Education in British Columbia. They are not in favour of this type of school in British Columbia. They are not entirely all public schools there, as far as that goes, but to a very great extent the school is a public school.

It has also been mentioned, just a short time before the Leader of the Opposition sat down, that perhaps we as members here went to our constituencies with an understanding that it was our duty, when this question came up in the House, to clear up this school question and we are doing that, not so much because we think the question needs clearing up but because we had made that promise. In reply to that I would say this, that I still have this "Red Book" which I have got hold of, and here is a part of the treatise on the School Question — or part of the platform of the Liberal party to be placed before the people:

"It would appear that Dr. Anderson, lacking any substantial ground of criticism and attack of the Government's record, and unable to formulate any alternative policy, has deliberately set out to stir up feeling over a subject he knows lies so close to the hearts of the people of Saskatchewan."

Now, this is the part I want you to note:

"Whatever his motive, he is rendering poor service to his Province and is proving his utter unfitness for the position of First Citizen of Saskatchewan and the responsible head of its Government."

Further, it says:

"Boiled down, what does Dr. Anderson's criticism of the Government's educational policy amount to? What does he offer as a substitute, and to what extent do his party followers accept that substitute?"

Well, now, just reading that and going back

Mr. Gardiner: Read the whole page!

Mr. Given: Oh. It's far too long. But if you want some more of it, all right. Well, there it says:

"Dr. Anderson also criticises the provision in The School Act which permits one-half hour of religious instruction prior to the closing in the afternoon, provided the board of trustees so decide, but which, nevertheless, no child shall be obliged to attend unless the parents so decided."

And there is a lot more of it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the first part of what I read is what I want to emphasise — this "boiled down" stuff:

"Boiled down, what does Dr. Anderson's criticism of the Government's educational policy amount to? What does he offer as a substitute, and to what extent do his party followers accept that substitute?"

Now, just to answer that question I will leave it to this side of the House. There is the answer to Dr. Anderson's criticism. There is the other side of the House. It simply means that the Gardiner government was removed from this side to that side through the policy they were following out last June.

I was somewhat struck and rather amused, and I believe the members of the House could not help but be struck and amused by the words of the Leader of the Opposition and the meek and mild attitude he now endeavours to bring to this House. The Liberal Government existed and controlled the Province of Saskatchewan for twenty-four years and, Mr. Speaker, not one step did they ever take up to the present time to introduce any legislation of the sort which they now offer in the words of this amendment. It is a very strange thing that this attitude has never been taken by the members of the Liberal government during all these years to try out their own scheme. I think that the Leader of the Opposition would like us to believe that perhaps it would be good politics to institute some type of amendment for the control of education, or rather, to replace the Minister of Education by some other body. That may be all right; but, as I say, it has a strange appearance to me. It must have been a wonderful vision he had, after he had come back from that banquet last night, from his remarks. And I do not find fault. The remarks were very fine. But, as I have said before, no move has ever been made by the Liberal government with a view to instituting any such type or such system of education on the floor of this Legislature, up to the present time; and I do not believe there would have been any amendment had it not been that there was a Bill and had it not been that this Bill was before the House. There never would have been any move made!

Therefore, in conclusion, all I can say is this: We are very clear that it has aroused some ideas and thoughts in the heads of our Liberal friends that something must be done to bring this question to a head, and I believe that the Bill will cover all that is practically necessary for the elimination of this trouble. I think we should get down to brass tacks and consider the Bill as it is necessary to consider it. I shall support the motion, and not the amendment.

MR. J. M. UHRICH, M.D., M.L.A.

(*Rosthern*)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In rising to participate in this debate, I may say, at the outset, that I have listened with a considerable degree of interest to the remarks expressed by speakers on both sides of the House relative to the removal of sectarian influences from the public schools—influences which exist largely in the minds of some members of the Government.

It has been in past elections (as indeed it is in the present) a stock-in-trade argument of the present Leader of the Government and some of his supporters and the final result, of course, is the Bill now before the House with the amendment to that Bill proposed from this side of the House.

I wish to make just a few references to the statements expressed by my honourable friend from Rosetown (*Mr. Given*). My honourable friend contended that the object of this Bill—he spoke in reference to the Bill and not to the amendment, although the amendment was then before the House—was to bring about the Canadianisation of Canadian children. He very, very eloquently described the proper way (in his opinion) of getting all our children into the public schools of this province. Now, Sir, I want to know if the honourable gentleman from Rosetown has any monopoly on the nationalisation of Canadian children or does he think that monopoly rests with the public school. I want to let him know that there are many children attending many schools, public and separate, in this province who are receiving a first-class Canadian education. Therefore I claim, so far as Canadianisation is concerned, it is not the monopoly of the public school at all, nor of the Tory party, nor, for that matter, of the member for Rosetown.

We have nearly 5,000 schools in this province and to me it seems a very peculiar thing that it was only during the last few years that we heard the charge that there was any sectarian influence permeating the public schools of this province. I think this charge was first heard just before the present Leader of the Government became a member of this House and while, incidentally, he still was an employee of the government. Before that, there was not a ripple of discontent with the policy of the then Government, nor with the conditions in the public schools. But his stand along those lines has been known for years.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, might I rise on a question of privilege and say that it was discussed by the School Trustees' Association in convention as early as the year 1917, and from that time down to the present the matter has been raised and discussed by those trustees representing the schools of the province?

Dr. Uhrich: Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted that, whenever a political question—political in the sense that this question has become political—comes under the purview of the Government, my honourable friend the Leader of the Conservative Government takes the matter up with his colleagues in council. It is rather strange to note that, outside of his regularly constituted council, he has another council to which he refers matters which are political. We have that from his own lips. I am referring to the questionnaire which he referred to in speaking in support of his Bill. I have here a copy of that questionnaire, and this is the second time we have had authority of this sort quoted to us in the House. He referred to this questionnaire and you will see, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend not only submits problems of this nature and of another nature to his own council, but he also submits them to another political council which is composed of civil servants.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The honourable Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*) quoted extracts from reports of the last twenty years.

He also bases arguments on material supplied by members of the Civil Service, and here we have the argument from the former Minister of Public Health who says that we are using the Civil Service for a certain political purpose. It is unreasonable.

Dr. Uhrich: Allow me to read two questions from this questionnaire and to ask my honourable friend whether or not he has the right to ask any civil servant a question like this, for example: "Do you favour prohibiting teachers in religious garb teaching in our public schools?" Do you favour, mind you! Now I will ask any honourable gentleman if that is not submitting a political question to the Civil Service in this Province! I claim, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Government has no right to do that and has not the right to expect an answer.

Premier Anderson: What about the civil servant who gave you that?

Dr. Uhrich: Question No. 2: "Do you favour abolishing religious emblems from the public schools?" This, I contend, Mr. Speaker, is a flagrant attempt to interfere in a political way with the Civil Service. Civil servants are officials of the government and should not be asked to, or forced to, giving a political opinion; and I claim my honourable friend has no right to do it, particularly when he has made use of his own opinion in the matter in his pre-election campaign.

The object of the Bill to which the amendment has been moved (if I understand it right) is, first of all, to remove religious emblems from the public schools of the Province. A similar Bill was introduced, last year, by the Leader of the Opposition, today, the Leader of the Government. I asked him then what he meant by "religious emblems" and he refused to answer the question.

Premier Anderson: I thought you should know.

Dr. Uhrich: If you look up the Sessional Papers you will find that is the case. His definition today is just as vague as it was then. He says the presence of religious emblems in the public schools exerted a sectarian influence on the children in the school. Now, if he means that the crucifix is a religious emblem, he has been told, time and again, and I think he will agree, that whenever there was a school in which was hung a crucifix where objection was taken, that crucifix was removed, and that without exception. I think my honourable friend will agree—

Premier Anderson: No. Absolutely not!

Dr. Uhrich: All right. I want to repeat here what I said. If there is a school where there is an objection registered to the crucifix, though it be that only one ratepayer or one child objects, take it down. It is not a very difficult question to settle. What is the solution? Take it away if objection is raised. And that has been done in every instance where objections have been raised.

Premier Anderson: No!

Mr. Gardiner: It was—before you came in!

Dr. Uhrich: Now there are some schools (and I want to draw this to the attention of my honourable friend from Rosetown, where there cannot be any objection because there is no one to object. In the town of Duck Lake in this Province there is a school, Stobart School District No. 8. It is a Catholic Public School. As a consequence of the fact that the majority of the people in that town and district being Catholic (the district being largely Catholic, the town being largely Catholic) the Protestant minority in that town built a separate school of their own. Could there be any objection there where the public school is a Catholic school and the Protestant ratepayers have their own separate school and have had it for years? The school was built in 1903, and the people of the district have got along for twenty-five years before the Leader of the Conservative Government in Saskatchewan came in. Why, then, force a Bill through the House in this form? Why insist that a religious emblem in any school should be removed if there is no objection raised to its being there? Why not take the viewpoint as expressed in the amendment? If there is any objection to an emblem in the school (and it may refer to the "Burning Bush" and some others as well), take it away; by all means, take it away! I have referred to the conditions at Stobart School District No. 8, and I can also refer to the St. Louis de Langevin School District No. 14, where there has been a Catholic public school for years. No possible objection could be raised there, because they are all Catholics, the Protestant minority in the district having taken advantage of

the minority guarantee to erect their own separate school which the Protestant children attend. I would point this out to my honourable friend: Our Protestant friends have their own separate school at Duck Lake and the Stobart public school is taught by nuns and has been for the past twenty-five years.

Now let me point this out: Not all the Protestant children are attending their own separate school because we find fifteen Protestant children attending the public school in Duck Lake. Their minority rights are protected, but still we find fifteen Protestant children attending the Stobart school where nuns were teaching and where, probably, the crucifix is on the wall.

Regarding the second principle of the Bill, the wearing of religious garb by teachers in public schools, that has been very, very thoroughly discussed by the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Gardiner*). I want to bring out and emphasise this one particular point: If you allow nuns to attend Normal School in this Province, to become qualified as teachers in the Province, what right have you, Mr. Speaker, what right has any Government, to say that persons wearing a certain garb (and my honourable friends have not given us a legal definition of "religious garb") though qualified to teach in any school in this Province, shall not teach in any particular style of dress? If the qualifications to teach are there, if the Normal School issues them a certificate which shows them to be qualified as teachers, what right has anyone to say that they are not qualified to teach because they wear a certain garb? It is silly. I will, however, say this: Where there is any ratepayer, pupil or parent in any particular district who objects—take it away! I think that is fair. I think it is just and doing it in the British way. I cannot see how any person could hold another view. If you can argue otherwise, on what do you base the objection? Is it because the garb is black that you object? Is it because it is a flowing garb that you object? We find many oriental garbs being worn in various parts of our country! It would indeed be illuminating to hear the Honourable Premier, or my honourable friend the Attorney-General give us a legal definition of a "religious garb." If you can argue that these people are not qualified, if you can argue that they are not efficient, then they should be treated as every other teacher would in like cases. If they are inefficient, discharge them; but in this enlightened day and generation we should not insist that this or that teacher be prevented from instructing children because of the garb she wears.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the schools to which objection is taken. First of all, however, I would refer to the words of the Honourable the Leader of the Government at a meeting in Saskatoon where he was speaking in the Sons of England Hall, as reported in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, of April 26, 1929. This reads, in part:

"The speaker went on to explain the attitude of the Conservative party with regard to religion in the schools. The trustees, he said, might have a school open with the Lord's Prayer if they wished. The Conservatives were not opposing that but they were absolutely opposed to the display of religious emblems and the wearing of religious garb in the schools."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend the Leader of the Government is not even consistent. I was under the impression that he wanted to take what he calls "sectarianism" out of the schools, but he says that the Lord's Prayer may be repeated on the opening of the schools if the Bill goes through the House. I defy any man to show that is true. The Bible is an emblem—the emblem of the Christian faith, but if there are any Jewish children attending that school they might, rightfully, object to that. I claim the Bible is banned from the schools, because it contains the New Testament which in turn contains the Lord's Prayer. Therefore, I contend this Bill means the taking of the New Testament out of the public school room; it means that you cannot recite the Lord's Prayer because it is from the New Testament and people of the Jewish race may reasonably object. Do not forget: It means, at least, the New Testament out of the schools; it means the Lord's Prayer out of the schools, in spite of what the Honourable the Minister of Education says!

Let us review some matters relative to schools in which the Sisters are teaching and see what work is being done. Before doing that, I wish to call attention to the words of my honourable friend (*Premier Anderson*), the other day, while reading the letter sent by him in answer to some of the resolutions he had received of which he did not read all. He only read part. Here is the resolution sent to him from Duck Lake from the Stobart School district which he did not read but which I am going to read to him:

"Whereas it is rumoured that the Government might submit to the next Legislature an amendment to the School Law concerning teachers in the Public Schools

of the Province, it is moved by René Bonnet and seconded by Ambroise Barré that, in order to preserve the harmony which now exists between them, all the ratepayers of the Stobart School District No. 8 humbly request the Honourable Minister of Education and His Honourable Colleagues, that the present conditions be maintained in the said School District."

You will note, Mr. Speaker, they used the word "request." They did not demand.

I have a copy of his reply to that resolution and this is what he says:

"I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 22nd, enclosing resolution dated January 18th. This resolution is worded exactly the same as many others that we are receiving, which would indicate that it is not a voluntary resolution on the part of your board. Someone is responsible for asking the various school districts concerned to pass this resolution and send it on to the Government. This is a further evidence of interference with the management of our public schools."

"This is a further evidence," he says, Mr. Speaker, "of interference with the management of our public schools." Well now, Mr. Speaker, the word "Mussolini" has been thrown at my Leader, but if there is a qualification in evidence among members of this House for that title, I claim that last sentence in his letter is perfect proof. Has it come to pass that people in the Province of Saskatchewan, ratepayers and citizens in this enlightened age, cannot ask the Government for what they want by letter or resolution without being told that "it is further evidence of the interference with the management of the public schools in this Province"? I claim that is an absolutely insolent phrase recklessly thrown at our citizens. It does not occur in this letter alone, either. It was used in practically every letter.

We have heard a considerable amount about the Gravelbourg school in which nuns are teaching. We heard much concerning this school during the election campaign, and we have also heard it at other times. Now, if my honourable friends want to make out a case, let them try to make it there! I may say this, there is not a crucifix on the walls of the Gravelbourg school today.

Premier Anderson: When were they taken down?

Dr. Uhrich: Were the teachers efficient? Let us look at the records and see what they have done; but first let me finish with the Stobart School where the sisters have been teaching since 1903 and where, as I say, perfect harmony has prevailed, and where there were fifteen Protestant children voluntarily attending the school. In 1927—and I am now reading from records I procured from the Department of Education while I was still a member of the Government—we find the following:

"Of ten candidates who wrote upon the Grade VIII Departmental Examination from the school (that is, Stobart Roman Catholic Public School District, No. 8, Duck Lake) in 1927, eight were successful. In 1928, out of 19 Grade VIII candidates from this school, 18 were successful.

"Out of 24 Grade X papers written by candidates from this school in 1927, there were no failures. Out of twelve Grade X papers written by candidates from this school in 1928, there were no failures.

"Out of 18 Grade XI papers written by candidates from this school in 1927, there were no failures. Out of 27 Grade XI papers written in 1928, there was only one failure."

That was Stobart School at Duck Lake. I come now to another school: Marcellin School District No. 1658, a school situated in the constituency of my honourable friend from Shellbrook (*Mr. Clinch*). In 1927, the results of the Departmental Examinations in this school, according to records of the Department, were as follows:

"Out of eight Grade VIII candidates who wrote from this school, seven passed. The percentage of failures at this examination throughout the Province that year was over 30 per cent.

"Out of 18 Grade X papers written that year, there were no failures. The percentage of failures throughout the Province in Grade X subjects ranged from 6 per cent to 30 per cent.

"Out of 47 Grade XI papers written from this school there were only two failures, namely, one in Literature and one in Geometry. The percentage of failures in Grade XI subjects throughout the Province in that year ranged from 5 per cent to 38 per cent.

"Out of 10 Grade XII papers written from this school there was only one failure, namely, Literature. The percentage of failures in the Grade XII subjects throughout the Province ranged from 2 to 29 per cent."

These were the results for 1927. Now let us look at those for 1928:

"Out of seven Grade VIII candidates who wrote from this school, all passed. The percentage of failures in this grade throughout the Province was 23%.

"Out of 24 Grade X papers written by candidates from this school there was only one failure and that was in Geography. Throughout the high schools in the Province the percentage of failures in the subjects of Grade X ranged from 3 to 20%.

"Out of 44 Grade XI papers written by candidates from this school there was not a single failure. Throughout the Province the percentage of failures in the subjects of Grade XI ranged from 9 to 33%.

"Out of 27 Grade XII papers written by candidates from this school there were only six failures, namely two in Algebra, one in History, one in Physics and two in French."

Now, turning to Gravelbourg, there are eleven teachers on the staff of the Gravelbourg school. Two of these have B.A. degrees, two have Permanent First Class Certificates, two have Interim First Class Certificates, two have Permanent (and one an Interim) Second Class Certificates and two have Third Class Certificates, their years of experience ranging from twelve to two. That was in 1927.

I have here, also, and it is very, very illuminating, some statutory declarations. As we have heard a great deal about statutory declarations at this Session, I intend to read a few of those regarding this Gravelbourg school. I have here a statutory declaration, which is in legal form, sworn to before a Commissioner of Oaths, by J. H. Stewart, United Church Minister at Gravelbourg for a number of years:

"In regard to the School at Gravelbourg, we were surely well satisfied with the treatment and kindly efforts made by the Staff and Board. Our children always speak of Gravelbourg School as being second to none they have ever attended and hold the Staff in high esteem. The progress made by them was surely extraordinary as two of them graduated fully. We have appreciative memories of our Catholic friends in Gravelbourg."

That is the statement of J. H. Stewart who was United Church Minister in Gravelbourg for two years; so, at least, in the opinion of this Protestant Minister the religious convictions of his children were not interfered with while they attended the Gravelbourg School.

I have another here—the statement of Doris Irene Daniels and Evelyn Stella Daniels:

"This is to certify that we, the undersigned, teachers, of the Town of Gravelbourg, in the Province of Saskatchewan, have attended the Public School at Gravelbourg for a period of seven years, during which time we have had no cause to complain of the treatment which we received at the hands of the Instructresses of the said school. Everything was carried out according to the regulations of the Public Schools in Saskatchewan."

I have another here, Mr. Speaker, which is from the parents of these two teachers:

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

"This is to certify that we, the undersigned, of the Town of Gravelbourg, in the Province of Saskatchewan, have had two daughters attending Public School at Gravelbourg for the past seven years, during which time we have never had any cause to complain regarding the treatment which they received at said Public School, and in my opinion there has never been any cause for complaint on either our part or on the part of our daughters. We are not of the Catholic Faith and we do not think that the Instructresses have gone beyond the bounds in regard to discouraging them in their belief. Signed A. P. Daniels and Emma C. Daniels."

And here's another, Mr. Speaker—these are all certified copies of sworn declarations:

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

"This is to certify that I, Mrs. Rose Hyman, of Gravelbourg, Sask., have two sons attending the Public School here for the past three years, during which time

I have had no complaint to make of the treatment received from the instructors in respect to studies, nor have they interfered with their religious beliefs."

This one is signed by Mrs. Rose Hyman, a lady of the Jewish Faith.

I contend, Sir, that, in these documents we have sound proof that there has never been any objection taken to the sisters teaching in the Public School in the town of Gravelbourg. It is a very peculiar thing that, as you go out through the Yorkton district you will hear complaints in regard to this school which is 100 miles away, whereas you never hear of any complaints in the town of Gravelbourg itself where, if anywhere, the complaint would arise if there were cause. And what about academic training in that school? What do the department records show with regard to that school? In 1927, they sent 75 pupils to write the Departmental examinations; 29 wrote in Grade VIII and every one of the 29 passed; 22 wrote in Grade X, and 21 passed; 12 wrote in Grade XI and all 12 passed; and 12 wrote in Grade XII and again all twelve passed. That is, Mr. Speaker, 74 of the 75 pupils from this Gravelbourg school who wrote the departmental examinations in 1927, passed with flying colours. I maintain, Sir, that is an excellent record for a school in which, as has been said, 75 per cent of the time was spent in teaching the Catechism.

Premier Anderson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I would inform the honourable member that there are children in Gravelbourg who have never attended a public school at all.

Dr. Uhrich: My honourable friend the Minister of Education told us, in moving the second reading of this Bill that, at the Trustees' Convention a French Catholic trustee had told him he was satisfied with it. I have here a series of representations sent to the Minister of Education as Leader of the Conservative Government, to which he has not referred and these were drawn up at the recent convention of The French-Canadian School Trustees Association and The Christian School Trustees' Association held at Saskatoon.

Eleven hundred attended the meeting of the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association which was held in the city of Prince Albert and I think it is safe to assume that not all of those were school trustees. I think my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works will agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Agreed.

Dr. Uhrich: The honourable gentleman agrees. Well, there are 5,000 school districts in the Province of Saskatchewan, consequently I claim that even if the 1,100 who attended that meeting were all trustees they did not represent anything like the majority of the school trustees of the province and certainly could not express the opinion of more than one-fifth of the school districts of the Province. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Government, did not refer to the representations of the other convention held in the city of Saskatoon, and there are other resolutions also sent to the Minister of Education which he has not read and I can only assume he did not do so because they reveal that there are many people in this province who object strongly to his Bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me emphasise the fact that I object just as much to any Catholic majority dealing unfairly with their Protestant neighbours, who are in a minority in any district, as I do object to a Protestant majority dealing unfairly with a Catholic minority. Let me repeat: I believe the best way to handle affairs of this kind is to leave it to the districts themselves—if objection is raised, let the objectionable thing be removed. I think that is fair. I think it is right and just. All I would ask members of this House to do is to deal with this matter in a just way—which is the British way.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D.P.AED.

(Premier and Minister of Education)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1930.

Hon. Mr. Anderson, in closing the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill to amend The School Act, (No. 1), said:

Mr. Speaker,—It has been stated from the other side of the House that, when I introduced a measure similar to this, the second reading of which we have been debating, from the Opposition benches one year ago (which by the way was also called Bill No. 1), I had very little to say on that occasion. I have also been criticised for the comparatively short address which I delivered on the present condition. Notwithstanding this criticism, let me tell my honourable friends I am not going to say very much in closing this debate.

The principle of the Bill is absolutely clear to one and all. My assertion that the passing of this legislation would settle this vexed question definitely for a number of years in this province has been brushed aside all too lightly by some of my honourable friends opposite. During the election campaign that has been referred to, I did not waste much time in discussing this particular question. I did make the statement most emphatically that I believed in a non-sectarian public school and that, if I were placed in a position to do so, I should assist in placing on the statute books of this province legislation which possibly might have been avoided and might not have been necessary had we had an administration willing to do, by regulation, what we now propose to do by legislation. It is no use for my honourable friends to say that there were only a few isolated cases in this province where trouble existed. If they did not know of the situation that existed it showed an entire inability to manage the school affairs of this province.

The main accusation directed against us, Mr. Speaker, would appear to be that we have, for purely political reasons, introduced this Bill. I want, Mr. Speaker, to deny that charge most emphatically and I want to state just as emphatically that in introducing this legislation we have implemented our promise to the people of this province. We have introduced it because we feel that it is in the best interests of the rising generation in this great province. If we have made a mistake we shall suffer for it, but, if we are right, then the people will bless us in the years to come.

Is it reasonable to have the honourable member (*Mr. Gardiner*) say that our only motive for introducing this legislation is political, when we are introducing it, Mr. Speaker, in the face of very definite opposition, in the face almost of threats, in the face of requests and demands from several thousand people that it be not done? Does that indicate that we are trying to play politics? Surely, Mr. Speaker, it indicates as clearly as day that we are trying to do our duty by the people of this great province. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and let me repeat again, that there is no feeling of antagonism in the hearts of any of the members on this side of the House, toward the people of any particular religious faith. Let me say that the teachers who will be affected by this legislation are not being charged as incompetent by the members on this side of the House.

My honourable friend from Rosthern mentions the excellent scholastic record of the students of Gravelbourg school. This is not the question at issue. It is not a question of how many students passed or how many students failed, or how many students received a certain percentage of marks on departmental examinations. It is not a question of the efficiency or the inefficiency of teachers. Not at all. There is no doubt but that the teachers who will be affected by this legislation are, in the vast majority of cases, doing excellent work in their schools, I know that to be true because I have inspected some of the class rooms in which these teachers perform their duties. There is no charge against them in so far as their method of teaching is concerned; there is no suspicion of their conscientiousness; there is no reflection on their teaching

ability or their integrity. That is not the question at issue. The question is, as we have stated before, that our public schools should be institutions where children of parents of various races and various creeds can assemble together day by day and not have any influence during the school hours in that school interfering with the faith that was taught them at their mother's knee. That is the question at issue and the only question.

Now, my honourable friends say there are only certain schools affected. We take a stand as I have stated before, that we are bringing in one law to govern all the public schools of our province. If my honourable friend says that we are introducing one law for public schools, whereas we have another one for separate schools, then if he is going to be consistent and conscientious in his treatment of this Bill in the Committee of the Whole, we shall expect him to offer an amendment to add the word "separate" after "public." He has a perfect right to do that. Some of my honourable friends say that there has been no such legislation as this for two hundred years. Perhaps it never was so necessary in other parts of the world, during that lapse of time in the history of the world, as it is in Saskatchewan today. But there are many things that should have been done in the last two hundred years and it is time to take action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that certain pictures in certain books will be interfered with by this legislation. That is what some honourable member has referred to as "tittle tattle." The honourable member for Pipestone was not serious, surely, when he made that remark. Let me point out now in connection with this question on the school situation, we find that just the other day in the town of Verwood, where there was considerable discussion because of the school situation there, the supporters of the Roman Catholic separate school got together and decided to disorganize their school and join in with the public school. The same will be true of other sections. The situation referred to by my honourable friend, the member for Last Mountain (*Mr. Benson*), will be cleared up just so soon as sectarianism is removed from the public school.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to Holdfast where they had a Protestant separate school. Why have they? Why was it organized? He did not answer that. It was because of sectarian influences in the public school which drove the minority out to form a separate school. Reference has been made to parochial schools by my honourable friend from Vonda (*Mr. Hogan*). We admit that citizens have the right to start a private school if they wish, but he will not agree that the state has the right to step in and inspect the work of this private school. Let me say if the number of private or parochial schools increases in this province they will be placed under supervision and will be subject to inspection by the province, to the same extent as other schools, and if the time comes when they are a menace to our national school system we can deal with that situation. But that is not the question at issue at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion let me sum up briefly: We have introduced this Bill in the interests of this province. We have been criticised very severely for doing so. I feel quite certain that when the Bill comes into effect, when our people become acquainted with the motive behind this Bill, the feeling that exists perhaps in some quarters at the present time will disappear. An amendment was introduced recognizing the principle of the Bill but not going as far as the Bill does. Those who are in favor of this Bill are in favor of having non-sectarian public schools in this province; those who are opposed to this Bill are in favor of sectarian public schools.

Opposition Members: No, no.

Premier Anderson: They are in favor of sectarian public schools at least to some extent, in this province. I have nothing further to say but that I would urge the support of this Bill.

SPEECHES ON
THE SECOND READING
of
AN ACT TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ACT (No. 2)

THE HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D.Paed.
(Premier and Minister of Education)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—In this Bill to amend The School Act there are several principles involved and, perhaps, a few of these may be more or less contentious. I think, however, the majority of the items can best be considered in Committee of the Whole. In the meantime, I shall try to point out a few of the proposed changes which may be considered as vital.

In the first place, provision has been made to meet the insistent demands made on behalf of managers of banks, of elevator companies and so forth—that they be allowed the same rights as “resident ratepayers” now enjoy. In the past, as members will know, the name of the company or corporation would appear on the tax roll. This, however, did not mean that the manager was a “ratepayer,” and the proposed amendment to The School Act will make him a “ratepayer” if he sees to it that his name is placed on the voters’ list.

In connection with the second important proposal advanced in the Bill in clause 4, the idea is to create a text book repository for the distribution of text books to our elementary and secondary schools. In Alberta, this system is followed with the result that a saving of many thousands of dollars each year to the Province of Alberta is effected. A similar scheme is followed, I believe, in the Province of British Columbia. We are, consequently, asking the Legislative Assembly to give us authority to establish a distribution centre in connection with the Department of Education, whereby books may be provided at a much lower cost than is the case at the present time. The books will be supplied at cost price plus a slight additional charge to cover the cost of administration. There will thus be no burden on the public treasury in this connection. We would like to have the authority to proceed as quickly as we can.

In clause 5, provision is made whereby there may be an appeal from the decision of a municipal council in connection with the formation of a new school district, or a change in the boundaries of an existing district. At the present time the word of the council is final, and we believe it is in the interest of education generally if we have some appeal provided for from the decision of the council. The proposal is to have a Board of Arbitration to deal with such cases. Since coming into office in September, I have found quite a number of cases where a decision of the council has not been satisfactory to a large number of the ratepayers. We made enquiry into these and it was alleged that in some of these cases the decision of the council was biased and we are asking that a Court of Appeal be established under section 8.

Now, I would like to call attention particularly to clause 6. This was suggested because we find that there are certain minorities in this province — I might mention

a Jewish minority or Greek Orthodox minority in a district composed largely of Slavic Canadians — who have no protection or consideration under the school laws in so far as the establishment of a separate school district is concerned, because, when the Autonomy Bill was passed in 1905, there were two kinds of separate schools in operation at that time, one the Protestant separate school and the other the Roman Catholic separate school, and there was perhaps no other minority that required attention or consideration at that time. However, we have at the present time situations in the Province where, if we are going to grant rights to minorities at all I believe we should extend these to all minorities so long as the law relating to minority rights remains in its present form. The situation as it is now, can be illustrated by the following:

In a certain district there are 105 Roman Catholic ratepayers and 100 Protestant ratepayers and 20 Greek Orthodox ratepayers. There you have 105 Roman Catholics, 100 Protestants and 20 are neither Catholic nor Protestant under The School Act. Under the rulings which have been given to the present time the 105 Catholic ratepayers might form a separate school district and, according to the legal opinion I have in hand from the law officers of the Crown, they would be considered the minority and the majority would be considered to be the 100 Protestants and the 20 Greek Orthodox ratepayers. However, if the 100 Protestant ratepayers took action first and asked for a separate school they would be entitled to one because they were in the minority in so far as the total number of ratepayers of the other two denominations or sects are concerned. So you will see the confusion that might arise there, and I consider a very great amount of injustice might be done in so far as the one particular minority is concerned. Now, I have decided, in view of the constitutional question that looms up here, and, in view of some recent interpretations of the present law which I have received, that, when the Bill comes into committee, I am going to ask for the deletion of clause 6. Here again is another reason why we should, as soon as possible, make provision for placing this question before the courts of the land or before the Privy Council in order that, for all time, this matter may be settled, and here again I say the Government is prepared to assume the responsibility of bringing about a solution of the situation in this way. Ordinarily, if the situation existing today continues, there will be certain minorities in this province who are not getting the consideration that other minorities are receiving under the law.

Now, in clause 9 the suggestion is that all our school meetings shall be conducted in the English language. I think this is only right. But the chairman may provide for the attendance of an interpreter for the benefit of those who cannot understand English. We have many cases coming to our attention where minorities at school meetings are unable to take any part in the proceedings because the meetings are conducted in a foreign language. I believe, in this English-speaking country, that meetings should be in English but I also believe that no ratepayers should be deprived of knowledge of what is going on. For that reason provision is made for an interpreter.

Clause 10 is just a matter of amending section 70 by providing for the reading of the minutes of the last annual meeting. There is no provision for that now.

Clause 11 is a clause that should receive very careful consideration from members of this House and, owing to representations that have been made from various sources, I am quite prepared to have that amended in such a way as to recognise the contributions that many trustees, who may not be qualified as set forth in the section, have made towards our school work in this province. The clause reads, "they should be able to read and write The School Act in English." There will be a House amendment that will cover this situation better perhaps than the words of the Bill.

Clause 12 provides for the addition of three sections after section 98. Section 98b will be deleted because of the changes in The Secondary Education Act the other day. The same is true of section 98d.

In clause 13, provision is made for the addition of section 33a, reading: "To expend a sum not exceeding \$25.00 in any one year for miscellaneous school purposes not otherwise specified in this Act."

Mr. Gardiner: Just while the honourable member is on his feet, on a point of order, I think it is definitely stated in the rules that we are not supposed on second readings to consider the clauses *seriatim*. I just raise the point so there will be no objection raised to our doing so.

Premier Anderson: Well, I am very glad to terminate my remarks.

Mr. Gardiner: No, no, go ahead!

Premier Anderson: Well, there is another principle involved in the clause I was dealing with, but we will pass on to clause 17. In connection with the expenditure of certain moneys to improve conditions educationally in the district, the idea is to allow the minister to state whether or not certain additions should be made to the school building. We had an example last year of a school district where there was an extension required and recommended but, on the vote of the ratepayers it was voted down. Additional facilities were needed in that district and it is intended to give some authority to the board to refer the whole matter to the minister for enquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill be now read the second time.

MR. T. C. DAVIS, K.C., M.L.A.

(*Prince Albert*)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1930.

Mr. Speaker,—I did intend and still do intend to make some remarks in connection with one particular clause of this Bill and that is the clause which has to do with the amendment in connection with separate schools, the clause which the Honourable the Minister of Education says he will withdraw when the Bill comes down to be considered in Committee, namely clause 6.

As I understand it, this clause 6 still remains in the Bill until we reach Committee, and as it is the custom to discuss the principle of a Bill when the second reading is moved, and as we must consider the principle contained in the clause on the second reading of any Bill, it strikes me that, if it was the intention of the Minister to withdraw that clause, then the Bill should have been discharged from the Order Paper and the Bill introduced in that form now, instead of withdrawing it in Committee. Now, I say, while there may be some force in the contention that that is the proper procedure, it strikes me that it is difficult to withdraw this clause in Committee. It may be permissible under the rules but as I say that is not my interpretation.

Premier Anderson: You can strike it out any time.

Mr. Davis: It just strikes me that if it is the intention to strike it out, it should be struck out before being read a second time and before we are required to vote on the principle, if it is going to be struck out hereafter. I thought that the Minister intended to go ahead with this clause. However, in view of the confusion existing in the Province and in the Legislature and apparently in the mind of the Minister himself with respect to the position of separate schools, I thought it would be well if we had some discussion as regards the position of separate schools in our constitution. With that end in view I have gone to some trouble to look into the legal aspect of the case, and intend, Mr. Speaker, with your consent, to discuss it.

First of all, I want to say that the Minister, in connection with two of his School Bills, has had in those Bills clauses which relate to the separate schools of the Province under the constitution, and in both these cases, largely upon the advice of members from this side of the House, he has been obliged to withdraw the amendments.

Premier Anderson: Not at all!

Mr. Davis: I think my honourable friend must admit he has; and I do not doubt that he withdrew those clauses following submissions from this side. I would point out to him now where we are heading in so far as this particular part of the constitution is concerned; and that there is a possibility of creating in this province separate high schools. In connection with this clause he now tells us he is going to withdraw, I think it would be well if we discussed the Bill and frankly heard a statement with respect to the position of the separate schools in the Province, particularly in view of the fact that the honourable member, in introducing the Bill stated that at the time the Autonomy Bill was passed, there were provisions for two separate schools, Protestant and Roman Catholic. Before the honourable member spoke and expressed the intention he has expressed, I had intended dealing with it in my remarks, and will deal with it as we pass along.

If this clause 6 were to stand, then it constitutes to my mind the most important change in the School Law of this Province since 1901. In my opinion, after considering it, the clause is *ultra vires* of the Legislature, absolutely beyond the power of the Legislature, and is not in the interest of the public school system in the province. That is the chief point I wish to make. As I stated, when I was speaking in the debate on the other Bill, I believe this clause, if it stands and any other similar clause hereafter

introduced, would have a detrimental effect upon the public schools of the province. Therefore I wish to trace the development of separate schools in the province, and give some idea of the legal history and the development of this system. It might take me a few minutes to do so, but I do not think it will come amiss in view of the constitution of this Province as regards separate schools.

Now, this country, until 1870, was under to control of the Hudson's Bay Company. They had been granted the country, that is all this western territory, under Royal Charter from King Charles the First and thereafter they had absolute control of the Government and of everything in this western land. As a result of Confederation in 1867, the Government of the day (that is, the Canadian Government) contemplated the inclusion of this territory in the Canadian Union, and they negotiated with the Hudson's Bay Company through the Imperial Parliament for the extinguishment of the rights of the Company which had been theirs since the granting of this territory, and for the inclusion of the territory into the Canadian Confederation. The result of all those negotiations (which have been discussed in this House in past sessions in connection with the natural resources) was that all these territories were brought into the Dominion of Canada, and became known as the North-West Territories.

Now, in 1870, when this territory was included in the Canadian Union, there were in this western country just a few scattered settlements along the North and South Saskatchewan rivers that were, in turn, separated by vast unsettled districts—one at Prince Albert, one at Cumberland House, Battleford, Edmonton and settlements on the South Saskatchewan river both in what is now Saskatchewan and Alberta. These settlements were separated by great distances, and it was impossible to set up in this country a self-governing parliament or legislature as in Manitoba. It was, therefore, necessary to provide some means for the governing of this western country. Under our Canadian constitution there is a clear division of power between those matters which are left within the jurisdiction of the local governments and those matters within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government—those under Dominion authority and those of purely local authority and within the control and authority of the province.

As soon as this country went into Confederation in 1867, naturally, the Dominion Parliament had the power to legislate in all matters purely of Federal concern. They had that right as they had it in matters of Federal concern in all other parts of Canada. As I have said before, there were not sufficient people out here to set up our own Legislature for legislating in matters of purely local concern and, therefore, under Orders-in-Council and addresses and laws enacted at that time, the Dominion Government was given the power or the capacity to legislate for the North-West Territories—to pass legislation in so far as local affairs were concerned. They legislated with respect to Federal matters under the *British North America Act* and they were also constituted a local assembly or given the powers to legislate with respect to matters of purely local concern, and, therefore, for some time, we had instead of the Federal Government or Parliament merely legislating in so far as the North-West Territories as part of this Dominion or Confederation was concerned, but also legislating in matters of provincial concern dealing with those matters of local concern.

We find that the first Act that was passed by the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa in its capacity as a local legislature was the North-West Territories Act, which is to be found at Chapter 45 of the Statutes of Canada, 1875. For instance, that Act made provision for the devolution of estates and legislation with respect to wills and other matters of purely local concern, and it is of interest to take a look at that Act of 1875 and you will see dealt with therein everything that is now included in a very much broader sense in the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, that is matters such as highways, lunatics, administration of the Civil and Criminal Laws, etc., all included in the one Act.

Now, in that Act were provisions with respect to education and it is there we find the first appearance of any school legislation governing the territory which is now the present Province of Saskatchewan, having to do with schools and the matters of education out here, and the section which deals with this is section 11 of the North-West Territories Act, being Chapter 49 of the Statutes of Canada, 1875, and section 11 reads as follows:

"When, and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the North-West Territories, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the Council or Assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the North-West Territories, or any lesser portion or sub-division thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the

necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and further, that the minority of the rate-payers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the rate-payers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

Now, it is interesting to note that this is the first law with respect to schools, the very first enactment in this western country with respect to schools, and that provision was made for separate schools, and it is also interesting to note—and an investigation will show—that at the time, Roman Catholics were in the majority and the minority in the country was Protestant. It is to be noted also that the majority of the ratepayers could form a school district, which would be the public school district, and that the minority, either Protestant or Roman Catholic, could form a separate school district.

In 1880, the Dominion Parliament consolidated the North-West Territories Act, and section 11 of that Act of 1875 was re-enacted as section 10 of the Act of 1880. And by this Act again—a Dominion enactment—the Dominion Government was legislating for the people of the North-West Territories in a matter of purely local concern. In 1880, in this consolidation of the several Acts, as amended, relating to the North-West Territories, they continued section 11 without any change; they re-enacted in the Act of 1880 section 11 of the Act of 1875, and that section is section 10 of the North-West Territories Act of 1880. That Act, namely the North-West Territories Act of 1880, also made this provision, which is interesting, regarding the future development of the country, that there should be local self-government as soon as conditions would permit, and as soon as settlement grew to a point which would warrant the election of a legislative assembly, that such assembly should be elected with the ultimate object of setting up local self-government in the Territories.

The Council of the North-West Territories—and I might say there was, first of all, by way of local government in the Territories provision made for a North-West Territories Council to act in the capacity of a legislature, and that Council had the right to enact laws which had hitherto to be passed by the Federal authority. Now, this Council which was subsequently appointed, met and enacted certain legislation. Provision for the appointment of this Council is to be found in the Ordinances of the North-West Territories in Chapter 5 of the North-West Territories Act, 1880, which provides:

"The Governor General, with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, by warrant under his privy seal, may constitute and appoint such and so many persons, from time to time, not exceeding in the whole six persons, of which number the Stipendiary Magistrates hereinafter mentioned shall, *ex officio*, form part, to be a Council to aid the Lieutenant Governor in the Administration of the North-West Territories:"

This was an appointed body, this first Council of the North-West Territories.

Remember, in the first legislation which was passed in 1875, and re-enacted in 1880, there were these provisions dealing with schools, and in 1884 we find the Council of the North-West Territories enacting the Ordinances. Section 5 of Chapter 5, of such ordinances reads as follows:

"The Board shall resolve itself into two sections, the one consisting of the Protestant and the other of the Roman Catholic members thereof; and it shall be the duty of each section:

- (1) To have under its control and management the schools of the section and to make from time to time, such regulations as may be deemed fit for their general government and discipline and the carrying out of the provisions of this Ordinance.
- (2) To arrange for the proper examination, grading licensing of its teachers, the recognition of certificates obtained elsewhere, and for the withdrawing of the license upon sufficient cause.
- (3) To select all the books, maps and globes to be used in the schools under its control and to approve of the plans for the construction of school houses; provided, however, that in the case of books having reference to religion and morals, such selection by the Catholic section of the Board shall be subject to the approval of the competent religious authority; and
- (4) To appoint inspectors, who shall hold office during the pleasure of the section appointing them."

Now, it will be noted that this section is most important in view of the particular clause which we are discussing at the present time; and that section made material

changes in the separate school law in the North-West Territories up to that time and took us to the Ontario system of separate schools. Under the original Act of 1875, a separate school could only be formed in the same district where the public school was formed; but in 1884 it was changed. Under the Act of 1884 a separate school could include a part or parts of a public school district or districts, the same as under the system in the province of Ontario and this was a material change, with which I will deal at a later stage.

That legislation of 1884 increased the possibility of separate schools because under the Act of 1875 their boundaries were restricted to the same boundaries as the public school district, but under the 1884 Act they could take in any part or parts thereof and by so doing they were increasing the rights of the minority and thereby increasing the possibility of separate schools.

By 1888 we had in this western country by development of the country, an elective assembly, the North-West Territories Assembly, and this Legislative Assembly passed legislation with regard to public schools and the first enactment is found in the Consolidated Ordinances of the North-West Territories, 1888. Chapter 59, section 37 of this Act deals with separate schools and reads as follows:

"In accordance with the provisions of The North-West Territories Act, providing for the establishment of separate schools, it shall be lawful for any number of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, the same being a minority of the ratepayers resident within the limits of an organized public school district, to establish a Separate School therein, by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, with the same rights, powers, privileges, liabilities and method of government as herein is provided in the case of public school districts."

It will be noted that this section was a change again from the section of 1884. We had the original section in 1875 which restricted the bounds of the separate school and made them co-terminus with the bounds of the public school; then in 1884 the Act was changed and did not require them to be co-terminus with the bounds of the public school district. Then by this section of 1888 we come back to the same legal position as we were in 1875 which requires them to be exactly co-terminus with the bounds of the public school district; and that law, of course, still remains in effect. Now, that change was a very, very important separate school law amendment, and perhaps the most important change in the separate school law of the Province of Saskatchewan, because it did, as I have said, set the bounds of the separate school and required them to be co-terminus with the bounds of the public school district. That was in 1888, prior to the advent of the Haultain Government. Now, it also made another change from the law of 1884 when it provided that the religious minority had the right to form a separate school. That is, first of all a public school district could be formed and only after it was formed could the separate school district be formed by the religious minority—in the public school district—and once they withdrew and formed a separate school district everything remained with the public school. That is, when the public district is first formed it takes in all the assessable property in that district, including the property of the religious minority and, if the religious minority withdraw they could take with them only the children of their own religious faith and property owned by members of such faith and everything else had to remain with the public school. The object of this was to make the public school the school supported by the majority of the ratepayers, and the strongest school in the district; but, as I said before, any minority could separate. It also had the effect of materially restricting the growth of separate schools in the territory because, while there was in theory a right to form separate schools still in effect and in practice they were not being formed to a large extent because of the economic impossibility for the minority of the ratepayers to support a separate school. The result of that legislation consequently has been to restrict the growth of separate schools in the North-West Territories, and the growth of separate schools in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, the school law was again consolidated in the Ordinances of the North-West Territories of 1901 and this is the consolidation referred to in our constitution. At that time we were a fully constituted authority, the appointed members of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories having ceased to exist and the whole legislature being made up of duly elected members. The legislation spoken of is, therefore, duly enacted legislation by duly elected legislators, acting and functioning as representatives of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. In that Act you will find sections 41 to 45, which deal with separate schools, and as I say, these were the sections incorporated into The Saskatchewan Act dealing with separate school rights; sections 41 to 45 of the Consolidated Ordinances of the North-West Territories, 1901, which is Chapter 29 of the Ordinances in question. Section 41 reads as follows:

"The minority of the ratepayers in any district whether Protestant or Roman Catholic may establish a separate school therein; and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

It is to be noted that this is a reiteration of the law of 1888. It is a change in wording but the substance is exactly the same. It brought us back to the law of 1875, the Act 1875 being the first dealing with school matters in the North-West Territories. Then there was the material change in 1884, and changed back in 1888 and the Act of 1901 taking it back to the law as it was originally enacted in 1875. Now, that is the position of the law when the Province was formed in 1905. Those were the provisions of the law in respect to separate schools when the province was formed in 1905; and let me reiterate, again, that these provisions were first in the Act of 1875, changed in 1884, changed again in 1888 to bring them back into conformity with the original law of 1875, and then re-enacted in 1901 and they stayed from 1901 in exactly the same form until the province was formed in 1905, when the provision was made in the constitution for the continuance of those provisions.

Now, let us deal with the constitution of the province, and this is what I have been trying to lead up to, and the questions referred to by my honourable friend. In the British North America Act, section 93, control of educational matters is handed over to the provinces of Canada, in these words, "In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions," . . . and it goes on making provisions for the retention of separate school rights which existed at the time of the entry of the province into the Union. This matter of education was delegated to the provinces with certain restrictions put upon that power and those restrictions had to do with separate school rights.

Now, our constitution is to be found in The Saskatchewan Act, which is Chapter 42 of the Statutes of Canada, 1905, pages 201 to 216. The section of that Act which has to do with separate schools is section 17, which we have heard a great deal about in the discussions on educational matters. That section provides:

"Section 93 of the *British North America Act*, 1867, shall apply to the said province, with the substitution for paragraph (1) of the said section 93, of the following paragraph:

"(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the Ordinances of the North-West Territories, passed in the year 1901, or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate school as provided for in the said Ordinances."

Subsection (1) of section 93 of the British North America Act reads as follows:

"Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union."

And let me say if you go back to this ordinance you will find the same provisions for denominational rights as you will find in The Saskatchewan Act. Let me read subsection (2) of The Saskatchewan Act:

"In the appropriation by the Legislature or distribution by the Government of the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with the said chapter 29, or any Act passed in amendment thereof or in substitution therefor, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in the said chapter 29."

That is, in so far as school grants are concerned, there shall be no discrimination against any school organized under the provisions of the Act.

Now, it will be noted that by this restriction in The Saskatchewan Act, the provisions concerning separate schools in the Ordinance of 1901 were continued in the constitution of the Province of Saskatchewan. Our constitution is The Saskatchewan Act. The constitution of the province of Alberta is The Alberta Act, and section 17 of The Alberta Act is, word for word, the same as section 17 of The Saskatchewan Act.

In 1926, when the question of the return of the natural resources to the province of Alberta was up for discussion and again in 1927, you will remember certain discussions took place with respect to section 17 of The Alberta Act and The Saskatchewan Act, and as a result of an agreement reached at that time by the Dominion and the Government of the Province of Alberta, the agreement arrived at was held up and that

agreement has never been acted on at all in view of the much better agreement that has since been entered into. It was decided not to complete that agreement but, in the meantime, it was stipulated that there should be an appeal to the courts to find out whether or not section 17 was constitutional. Therefore, by agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Federal Government, the question was submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada to ascertain whether or not this section 17 was constitutional, somewhat along the same lines as the question my honourable friend will be submitting. On that occasion the question was argued before the Supreme Court and the decision of the Court is to be found in the Canada Law Reports (1927), at page 367, whereby, by unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of Canada it was agreed that the section was within the power of the Dominion of Canada and therefore was properly in the constitution of the Province of Alberta and it could only be deleted therefrom by the Imperial Parliament.

Now, the effect was that the same identical section which is in The Saskatchewan Act, so far as the law stand today, was *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada and is part of our constitution. The result is, therefore, that our law stands in the same position as it stood in 1901.

With that thought in mind, I want to discuss and point out, if I may, the effect of the particular section in question,—the effect of similar legislation upon the public school system in the public schools of the Province of Saskatchewan. As the law stands now, only one minority, either Roman Catholic or Protestant has the right to form a separate school. There was no provision made (and I presume they understood what they were doing) in The Saskatchewan Act for the formation of separate schools by minorities other than Protestant or Roman Catholic. We must remember that the majority cannot form a separate school in Saskatchewan though the majority in Ontario can. In Ontario it does not matter whether it is Protestant or Roman Catholic, majority or minority. They are not bound to form a separate school district with the bounds hereof co-terminus with those of their public school district. A majority can get together there to form a separate school district and pay no attention to boundaries of existing districts, but it is, as I say, a totally different thing here.

Hereafter if I use the term "majority" I use it in its proper meaning, namely: the majority of the ratepayers in the district.

Let us just trace up the formation of a public school district and the subsequent formation of the separate school district. The first must be the public school district and all the people in that unit are originally public school supporters. The minute a public school district is set up every person therein becomes, of necessity, a public school supporter. Then, after that district is set up the minority, Roman Catholic or Protestant, as the case may be, may break away from the majority and form their own separate school; but the boundaries, of the new separate school district, as I said before, must be co-terminus with the boundaries of the public school district. We must not forget that principle during the debate on this matter.

Is it the wish that you now declare it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker? Then I will move adjournment of the debate.

Speech continued by Mr. Davis, Thursday afternoon, March 20, 1930.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was just concluding some remarks I wanted to make in connection with this School Bill (No. 2) and, before I proceed, I wish to make a correction in one argument I was endeavouring to develop during the course of the debate, yesterday. I made the statement, as I recollect it, that the law with respect to separate schools as it at present stands, comes from the Consolidated Ordinances of 1901, and was carried forward into our constitution through section 17 in The Saskatchewan Act, and while different in terminology and phraseology, is the same in substance and effect as enacted in 1875. In making that statement I was incorrect in one particular: The law, as originally enacted in 1875, provided for a system of division of schools into public and separate schools along the lines of and very similar to that system which is at present in vogue in Ontario and not in line with the enactment as it stands at the present time in our statute books. That way it remained until 1880 when it was amended and that amendment restricted the general powers contained in the enactment of 1875. It was general and it provided the system at present in effect. Then the Act of 1884 further altered the terms of the act of 1875 by providing, if a separate school were formed, it could include the public school district, or a part thereof, and a part of another contiguous thereto. Then in 1888 the Act, as it presently stands, was enacted, which restricts the boundaries of the separate school, when formed, to the

bounds of the public school district already formed. Now, that is the correction I wish to make in connection with the line of argument I was endeavouring to advance.

At this point, I want to point out that the law, as it presently stands on the statute books of the province would indicate two things which seemed to be of fundamental importance in the minds of the men who originally prepared and drafted this legislation of 1888 and confirmed it in 1901, and caused it to be re-enacted in the legislation of 1905.

Premier Anderson: You say "the men." It would not be the same men!

Mr. Davis: I think it was the North-West Council in 1888; whether it was a combination of appointed members of the North-West Council and elected members I cannot say. But in 1901 when the legislation was re-enacted the North-West Territories Assembly was a fully elected body.

The legislation of 1905, The Saskatchewan Act, was enacted by the Federal Parliament and provided for the continuation of the legislation of 1901. It strikes me that the Parliament of that day—that is of 1901—had two ideas in mind. The first, as I said yesterday, was that the bounds of the separate school district must be and should be the same as the public school district. You must first have a public school district and then after the public school district is formed, the separate school district may be formed and placed thereon, but the bounds of the separate school district must be exactly co-terminus with those of the public school district. The second fundamental fact or idea, which appears to me to have been in the minds of the men who prepared this legislation, was that, first of all there must be the public school district and that everyone in that public school district must originally be public school supporters; and it is only after the public school district had been formed and everybody was a public school supporter that a separate school, or minority school could be formed. Thereafter the law gave the religious minority, Roman Catholic or Protestant, the right to withdraw and form their own separate school. But the legislation provided that the only ones who could withdraw were the members of the religious minority forming that separate school. All other public school supporters in that public school district had to remain with the public school and the only one who could be taken away were the members of the religious faith which formed the minority, or which in turn was forming the separate school.

Now, the apparent purpose in the development of this legislation from 1875 down to the present time was to restrict as much as possible the growth of separate schools in the North-West Territories and, again, in the Province of Saskatchewan. Bearing that thought in mind, I wish to discuss this amendment and to offer this contention, that this proposed legislation and legislation of this kind cannot be now or hereafter enacted in Saskatchewan. In saying that I suggest that, if such legislation were permitted now or at any time in the future in the Province of Saskatchewan, it would permit the religious minority not only to form a separate school unit but I take the view that they would have the right to carry with them people not of the religious faith of the minority. The principle of the whole thing is that only those of the religious faith of the minority can be supporters of that separate school. But any enactment of legislation of this character would permit the separate school supporters, whether of the Roman Catholic or Protestant faith, to take any other minority away from the public school district with them.

Premier Anderson: Mr. Speaker, that is hardly right. The honourable member says they would have the right to take with them. They elect. It would be optional on the part of the minority left out.

Mr. Davis: Yes, if I said that the legislation as drafted gave them the right to take these people with them, I was incorrect. The minority goes to the separate school; but it gives these people in between the right to elect as to which they support, and, should they elect to support the minority, then they become separate school supporters. In that way the "minority" might then become the majority and that is something which was not intended by the law as it was drafted, according to the way I read that particular legislation.

It could possibly have another effect. Legislation as it now stands provides that the majority support the public school and the minority the separate. But legislation of this kind could reverse the order of things and after the separate schools have been formed and another minority elected to support the separate schools, then by adding minority to minority, the final result would be that the minority school would be the majority school. Therefore it strikes me that legislation of this kind will vastly increase the number of separate schools in Saskatchewan.

For instance, it might be possible for the religious minority in the public school district to be so small that it would be economically impossible for it to set up a separate school and this is one of the many reasons why separate schools have been limited. The minority in many of these school districts is small. They cannot financially support a separate school. But, when you are going to provide assistance, then it makes it easier to form a separate school district, and, with the knowledge that after they get the school district formed they are going to get assistance in the matter of assessments, in taxation, the minority, which ordinarily might not set up a separate school district, knowing that this group in between the Roman Catholic and Protestant members, could elect to support the minority school, would form a separate school district, and thereby secure the assistance of the province to carry on that type of school. It would result in an increase in that way, or encourage the growth of separate schools in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition also to that, legislation of this kind, if passed, would work a hardship on the public school supporters. The public school district might have incurred large expenditures in the erection of buildings and otherwise. Then this minority in between these two groups (Protestant and Roman Catholic) elect and decide to support the separate school because they think they are going to get some tax relief, by supporting the separate school. All go into the separate school and leave the supporters of the public school who might—and in many cases would be—in a minority in the public school district, holding the bag with a big debt in connection with the erection of the school and for its equipment. There it seems, Mr. Speaker, that legislation of this kind would be unfair to the public school supporters of the Province of Saskatchewan.

There is another objection which I have to legislation of this kind, and that is, that I believe it would make it more difficult in connection with finances. Anybody who buys bonds issued on behalf of the public school district knows they have the property of the majority in the public school district by way of security and they know there is always a possibility of the minority withdrawing. They have as security the property of the majority. Under this legislation the religious minority may withdraw and the group in between may elect to join the separate school and the bondholder would then have as his security the property of the minority in the public school district, and no longer the security of the property of the majority. It, therefore, seems again that an enactment of this kind would make it very difficult for the public school to finance and might bring about an increase of interest rates because the greater the risk the greater the return the investor expects to be assured.

One further point in this connection, Mr. Speaker. This legislation would provide that the group in between be given the right to elect which school they shall support after both public and separate school districts have been set up. That cannot be done under the legislation as it stands at the present time; and I do not think there was ever any intention that they should be given the right to elect as to whether they would support the public or the separate school. I doubt if the right could be given to them. It is only the minority, either Roman Catholic or Protestant, which has the right to support the separate school and when once they go in everybody else remains in the public school and this group in between has no right to elect whether they will support the public school or support the separate school. If they were given this right it would create an impossible situation. After electing to support the separate school, a man could then re-elect to support the public school and then he could be jumping back and forth from separate to public school and from public to separate school until there would be such a degree of uncertainty that it would be virtually impossible for many school districts to carry on.

Now, in so far as the constitution is concerned, as I have said, section 17 of The Alberta Act, which is exactly the same as section 17 of The Saskatchewan Act, has already been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada and the Supreme Court has unanimously held that that law was within the power of the Federal Parliament and, so far as that section is concerned, it is part of our constitution and as long as that decision of the Supreme Court remains it is to be considered a correct construction to be placed upon the law. Therefore, so long as that decision remains and it is not overturned, we must accept it as the constitution, until the courts of the land declare otherwise. We must accept that as the constitution of the province and it strikes me as long as it is so then there must be no encroachment on the rights of minorities and no enlargement of those rights and that we must hew to the line. I do not think we should increase the rights of minorities nor, on the other hand, should we subtract therefrom.

Now, my honourable friend yesterday said, in discussing the Bill, that it was the intention of the Government to submit to the courts of the land the question with

respect to the validity of the separate school provisions in our law. I think my honourable friend reiterated that intention yesterday. I do not know how that would be done, nor what his intention is as to the way in which it is to be done—whether it would be done by an appeal against the present judgement of the Supreme Court or whether it would be done by way of a new submission to the Supreme Court, with the right of appeal to the Privy Council. It seems to me that my honourable friend, before starting into a matter of this sort, should be careful to see that they are not going to do more than they intend should be done. It seems to me that, in the matter of further legislation with respect to separate schools, the proper attention and consideration has not been given to the constitutional aspect of it, because, as we have found—and my honourable friend now admits it—he has decided that certain things had better be left out of his two School Bills. I want to give a word of counsel to my honourable friend. Should this matter be referred to the Supreme Court and to the Privy Council and should they hold that the enactment of section 17 of our Act was beyond the power of the Parliament of Canada, where do we go from there? What are the rights then of the minority? What separate school right are there? Because, if the Privy Council held that this section was *ultra vires* of the Federal Parliament, what would be the position then? Then, I submit, you would have the situation that, failing section 17, they can fall back on section 93 of the British North America Act and the protection of the minority rights therein granted. And if it were held that they had rights, with the protection granted in section 93, then you would be in the position in this Province that the law of this Province with regard to separate schools would be similar to the law of Ontario, where there is a system which I do not think begins to equal ours—I think that my honourable friend will admit this because they have, in Ontario, two departments of education with a distinct cleavage, between the Public and Separate School Systems, whereas in this province you have one School Act, one Department of Education and everything identically the same with the law, the same with respect to the one as to the other, and where the only way in which they differ is that the schools are held in separate buildings. Therefore my honourable friend should enquire into the matter of this reference, if it is made, to ascertain, when the matter is referred to the courts for a decision, not only as to the legality of section 17 as it has to do with these questions but to all questions or possible contentions with respect to separate school rights should section 17 be held beyond the powers of Parliament. Because, if this matter is to be settled it should be settled once and for all. I think he should, before approaching the courts to get a decision, get the best possible advice as to whether such a decision, if it is to be held that section 17 is beyond the powers of Parliament, is not going to result in the increase of separate schools and separate school rights in Saskatchewan. I do not think there is any agitation with respect to changes in the separate school system in the province now, and it is quite possible that separate school rights might increase if the decision was that section 17 was beyond the powers of the Parliament of Canada. In my opinion it would materially increase the rights of minorities and we might find ourselves in the same condition as now exists in Ontario under section 93 of the British North America Act. Personally I do not think it is in the interests of the province that the law as it is now in effect in Ontario should be in effect in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when I arose to address the House in connection with this Bill, I called the attention of the Minister to the peculiar position in which he places us. He told us that certain clauses therein were to be deleted in Committee. Those clauses are in the Bill now and we are to be called upon now to vote upon the Bill, upon the principle contained therein, and after the vote upon such principle then these particular clauses will be deleted. In addition to that, certain other clauses would be amended in Committee and I believe that a minister of the Crown, the Minister of Highways, also suggested or proposed to bring in an amendment to one of these particular clauses. Well, I believe when a Minister brings in an amendment that that amendment should represent the opinion of the Government, and no information has been given to us with respect to the contents of that particular amendment.

I suggested yesterday that this Bill be discharged from the Order Paper and that there be deleted therefrom these clauses, which the Minister has declared will be deleted in Committee, and further, that, if there are any clauses he would amend, they be amended and have the Bill reintroduced into this House—a Bill that the Government intends to support. We had a good illustration of that procedure to-day. Item No. 1, Bill No. 21, which was on the Order Paper and came up for second reading, was withdrawn by the Minister of Public Works. The Minister got up and explained that he proposed to make certain changes in the clauses of that Bill and, therefore, he asked that it be discharged from the Order Paper and that he be given leave to re-introduce the new Bill. The motion to discharge it from the Order Paper was agreed to by the House, and the new one introduced with the changes in the Bill, and it is now on the Order

Paper. I think that is the proper way to have matters of this kind handled for then we know we are not forced to vote on the principle contained in a Bill which contains clauses with which it is not the intention of the Government to proceed. I doubt very much if my honourable friend is in order in putting through the second reading of the Bill and then deleting these clauses, and I would refer to Rule 766 of Beauchesne, which reads:

"It may become necessary, before the second reading of a bill, to make considerable changes in its provisions, which can only be accomplished, at this stage, by discharging the order for the second reading and withdrawing the bill."

Now, under that rule, Mr. Speaker, I submit the proper procedure for my honourable friend to follow is to have this Bill discharged from the Order Paper, have it reprinted and reintroduced, just as was done in the House to-day with another Bill, by the Minister of Public Works. Then I would refer to Rule 775, which reads as follows:

"Amendments must be made in the order of the lines of a clause. If the latter part of a clause is amended, it is not competent for a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause. But if an amendment to the latter part of a clause is withdrawn, then it is competent to propose one to an earlier part."

And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose moving in amendment, seconded by Mr. Spence:

That all the words of the question after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"further consideration of this Bill be deferred until there has been deleted therefrom the principle of giving rights not already provided for in the Constitution of the Province and until the Bill discloses the true intent of the Government with respect to certain sections thereof which it has intimated will be changed."

THE HONOURABLE J. T. M. ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., D.Paed.

(Premier and Minister of Education)

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1930.

(Closing Debate)

Mr. Speaker,—Might I just remind the members of the House of the criticism directed against the Government in connection with the bringing in of School Bill (No. 1), because it was noted at the same time there was a School Bill (No. 2)! One of the reasons for bringing in Bill No. 1 was because there was a definite new principle involved, and I might argue that Bill No. 2 might be divided into several sections because several new principles are involved and if I had brought in, instead of Bill No. 2, two or three Bills, number 2, 3, 4 and 5, say, then my honourable friends opposite would have criticised us for that. It has been very distinctly stated that the clauses will be deleted during the committee stage and I do not see any reason why we should have to go to the trouble and the expense of having this Bill reprinted. The whole situation, so far as the separate school law is concerned, has been gone into by the honourable member for Prince Albert, (*Mr. Davis*). He has set forth very clearly to us that the old Territorial Government had more rights founded on a wider constitution than the present Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. In other words, we, as a full-fledged Province of Confederation, have not as far-reaching rights and powers as had the old Territorial Assembly before the Province was formed.

He also pointed out there are certain minorities who have no rights or consideration under the law relating to separate schools.

Now, I am not going to spend any time debating this amendment but, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, notwithstanding the ironical smiles of my friend from Maple Creek (*Mr. Spence*), I have made it clear that these clauses will be deleted during the committee stage, and I do not see that time should be spent and expense incurred of having this Bill reprinted. Of course, I am quite willing to abide by the decision of the House.

SPEECH ON
AUDITORS' REPORTS RE
THE DEPARTMENT OF TELEPHONES

MR. W. J. PATTERSON, M.L.A.
(Pipestone)

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1930.

Mr. Patterson, in moving a Resolution—

“That all matters regarding the Department of Telephones referred to in the Reports of O. J. Godfrey and Company and G. B. Munnoch and Company of Calgary be referred to the Royal Commission which this Legislature has humbly petitioned His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to appoint.”

said:

Mr. Speaker,—It is frequently said of the Province of Saskatchewan that it is a great “next year” country. I think we may take credit for being a people who look forward and who are more interested in the future than in the past. For some, however, that does not apply. They are much more interested in looking backward than in looking forward, and if there is one outstanding example of this it is probably our friend, the Minister of Public Works and Telephones (*Hon. Mr. Bryant*). He took some four or five hours in the debate on the Address to go into the past history in every department of government and condemned those departments in no unmeasured terms.

Again, a few days ago, in the Budget Debate he took two or three hours to deliver a speech. On that occasion he singled out one particular department and delved into the history of that department from its very inception.

I sometimes wonder if the honourable gentleman has heard the story of the boy who cried “Wolf, Wolf!” and the reputation he got in the community in which he lived. Members of the Legislature can offer no objection to criticism of past administrations by responsible ministers of the Government, but I think that they expect something constructive, some information as to what is going to be done to correct the abuses that may be alleged to exist. We listened to our honourable friend, as I said, for some two or three hours the other day and the context of his speech was a series of denunciations and criticisms of past alleged mismanagement in the Department of Telephones. It does not seem to me that these criticisms are very serious but they reflect upon a large number of people in the Province of Saskatchewan and for that reason, before I resume my seat, I propose to move the resolution which stands in my name on the Order Paper.

It will be noticed the Minister presented two reports, one by O. J. Godfrey, dated December 21, 1929, and the other presented by G. B. Munnoch, of Calgary, dated February 5, 1930.

On the 21st day of February, which was one month before the Minister made his speech and at least two weeks after the second of these reports was completed, I moved in this House a motion for a Return showing a copy of these reports. That Return was not filed until two days before the honourable gentleman made his address, when he supplied us with two copies of these reports. Now some members of the House may wonder why, when an accountant of the standing of Mr. Godfrey had presented

a report to the Minister, it was necessary to engage an "efficiency expert" to prepare a second report. I think if you followed the Honourable Minister's speech you will have noted that Mr. Munnoch's findings were quoted more often than were Mr. Godfrey's and were used much more extensively by the Honourable Minister. I think, perhaps, this Legislature will appreciate and understand why the Minister thought it was necessary to have this second report prepared.

Now, Sir, in order that members of the Legislature may properly understand and appreciate the instructions given to the investigator and the report subsequently made by him to the Minister, it is necessary that they have some outline of the history of the Department—something in the nature of an historical background.

In the first place, I might say that it is universally admitted that the Telephone business is best operated in the nature of a monopoly. At one time there were a number of communities in the United States which were served by two companies and there were people who thought that that was good business, but I do not suppose there is a sound economist in the world today who approves of such an idea, though it might be expected that competition would work to the benefit of the user of telephone service, in reduced cost; instead of the cost being reduced, actually it was increased. As a matter of fact, it was found that where one-half of the people in a community supported one system and the other half another system, there resulted poorer service to the people of that community than where there was one concern operating and giving service to all. So, for that reason, the telephone system falls into the class of a natural monopoly.

In 1908 the question of telephone service received the attention of the Legislature of this Province, and in that year was adopted a policy of public ownership: Government ownership as to urban and long distance lines, and local ownership in the rural districts.

The report of Mr. Munnoch refers to some details of policy which he says were not intended by the Legislature in 1908. Well, I doubt very much if the details to which he refers ever entered into the consideration of the Legislature and I do not know where he got his information, because there is only one member of that Legislature here and that member sits on this side of the House. I doubt whether Munnoch consulted him. I think there were some important considerations actuating the members of the Legislature when in 1908 they decided on a policy of public ownership of telephones. I do not think they worried very much how Treasury advances were to be made or over details of that nature; I doubt if they bothered much about that. But I think they did have several important factors in mind: First of all, they realized that telephone service fell into the class of a natural monopoly and believed, for that reason, it was wise that the telephone system in Saskatchewan should be under public ownership and control. I think they decided that a business of this nature would be best under the control of the Government, and they wanted to insure for the public the lowest costs of service.

I think they also had in mind a number of conditions existing in the province in 1908. At that time the province was going through a period of development. Settlement was going ahead very rapidly, new territories being opened up, new railways being built and new towns and villages springing up all over the province and, no doubt, Sir, they felt that the need was for a Government system which would not be concerned with a return of profits to its shareholders, or with building lines only for profit. I think the Government of that day had in mind that, under a Government system, they could give the people of this province a service of very much greater dimensions than any private company was likely to do. I think, when they did this, they also intended that the people who used the service should pay for it, and I think we might fairly assume, from our reading of the law and from what we know about conditions as they were then, that these were the important factors influencing the Members of the Legislature in 1908 in passing The Department of Telephones Act.

Now, I do not know that I need to elaborate these points. It is palpable to anyone that a public utility system privately owned may easily become inefficient, the people in control may be careless as to public interests, and the rates may be high. To ensure the lowest cost, by Government-ownership, we disposed of the necessity of paying dividends or building up large accumulations for dividends. To provide a good public service at cost was the intention in 1908. At that time, there were some telephones in Saskatchewan. The Bell Company had made a small start towards development of a system in the province. There was also another system which ran along the Soo Line, I think, called the Saskatchewan Telephone Company, and one or two other small private systems throughout the province; so that a small start

had been made. I think we can assume that the Bell Telephone Company, if the Government had not stepped in, would have extended its system and enlarged its field of service, but we can be quite sure that at the back of the minds of the heads of the Company, revenue and the profits to be returned from their lines would be, at all times, the first and controlling factor.

Let us consider for a moment what the Department of Telephones has accomplished from 1908 down to the present time. Although the Department was organised in 1908 it did not start to function until 1909 and we can, therefore, say it has been in operation for almost twenty-two years. Having in mind the principal factors or the principal arguments that persuaded members of the Legislature in 1908 to vote for the establishment of that system, what can be said today?

Insofar as excellence of service is concerned (and that is an important thing in a public utility) I think it is realised all over this province and it is admitted throughout the continent of America that we have an excellent service indeed. As a matter of fact, neither in the report of Mr. Godfrey nor in that of Mr. Munnoch is there one word of criticism of the service; of the equipment; of the efficiency of the plant; or of the attitude of the employees toward the public. There is not one word of criticism of any of these things and I would say that efficient service and efficiency of plant are about as important things as you can have in connection with a telephone business. In addition to that, there is the attitude of the employees to the public. The condition in that respect is exemplary, and there is no criticism in either of the reports in that connection. No suggestion is made of favouritism to any party, any class, any race, or any creed, either by the auditors or by the political investigators; they do not say that any class of people gets any better a service than any other class. There is no criticism or suggestion of the kind. As a matter of fact, you can read both these reports from beginning to end, and you will find not one word of criticism of the service, of the equipment or of the attitude of the employees towards the public they serve.

I might point out that in Saskatchewan extensive use has been made of automatic equipment. In this direction we have progressed further than anywhere else in Canada or on the continent, for we now have nine automatic exchanges in operation. We in Saskatchewan have led the way, and if you study the history of the automatic telephone and consider how many great urban communities are still served by manual exchanges, you will be astounded at the progress we have made. Saskatoon has had automatic service for almost twenty years, that is since 1911.

As I said before, the people who passed The Telephone Act in 1908 intended that the cost of the system should not be a charge on the Public Treasury, but should be borne by the users, and the auditors in their reports, dealing with the rates charged rather suggest (they do not say it openly) that we are not charging enough for the service given. I think perhaps they are right in that, as I pointed out in addressing this House in the session of 1928-29 (and if members are interested they will find what I said in the Sessional Papers at page 249). In that address I gave some information as to the rates charged in this province as compared with those charged in other provinces and absolutely proved that our rates are the lowest of any place in Canada for similar classes of service. I might remind members of the House of the statement I made on that occasion, that we are charging the same schedule of rates as was charged in 1908. There has been no change except in one case. At that time, the minimum charge for a long distance call was 10 cents, and it has been raised to 15 cents, but otherwise, the whole schedule is the same. Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that the rental charged in Regina is the same today as it was in 1908. It is not, and the reason is that in the meantime, Regina has been raised from one class to another. But it is true that, throughout the history of the telephone system in Saskatchewan, there has been no change in rate schedules since 1908. In the meantime, the wages have increased, the cost of material has increased, the cost of doing business has increased and practically everything connected with the system has increased, but there has been no corresponding increase of rates to telephone subscribers, although increases have been made both in Manitoba and in Alberta. Both reports make mention of this fact, and both reports suggest that the present rates are too low.

Now, Sir, I am trying to deal with this matter in a properly connected and consecutive manner. One of the things I think that influenced the members of this House in 1908 was to provide a service to keep pace with the province's growth and development. What has the Department done in that respect?

In 1908, there were 3,000 telephones in the province (the figures are somewhat difficult to ascertain, but there were about 3,000) and in 1929 there were 40,000 tele-

phones. That is, Mr. Speaker, there was a growth of from 3,000 in 1908 to 40,000 in 1929. In 1908 there were 18 telephone exchanges (that is where local exchange service is given) and today there are 313 telephone exchanges. The total number of telephones or exchanges is not the only factor to be considered; one must give consideration to the territory covered. Today, every city and town in Saskatchewan, every village with the possible exception of three or four, and hundreds of hamlets in the province are supplied with telephone service. With the exception of Big River and a few new villages established in the last year or two on new railway branch lines, practically every portion of the province has telephone connection with 110,000 telephone users within the province, and with every other province in Canada; with the states to the south of us; with Great Britain and with some countries on the Continent of Europe as well.

I want to say in fairness to the Saskatchewan Government system that I doubt very much if a privately-owned system would have given service to many of the places in Saskatchewan which are served by the Government Telephone System today. And that, Sir, has been done without cost to the non-users of the system or to the public treasury. The reports of the two gentlemen which are before the House show that the province is not assisting the Department. On the other hand they claim that the Department had not only maintained itself but has contributed to the Treasury of the province, but I propose to deal with this claim in detail a little later on. In view of these facts, I would state most emphatically that every important principle and anticipation has been met, and that the Telephone Department has absolutely justified the expectations of those who brought it into being some twenty odd years ago. I would say further, that this excellent record and the success achieved are not minimised by petty, unfair and unjust criticism. I may say this (and I am perhaps in a better position to say it than others in this House), the Department of Telephones is well esteemed and well regarded throughout Canada as an efficient and well-managed organization.

The Department, as I have stated, was organised in 1908 and, early in 1909, the Department bought out the two large systems in Saskatchewan at the time, which were small, however, in comparison with the system we have today. The Bell Telephone Company entered the province at Fleming and the Saskatchewan Telephone Company's lines ran down the Soo Line. The Department bought the Bell System for \$368,924.90, the Saskatchewan Telephone Company for \$150,586.20 and the small Wapella Harris system for \$1,204.25. The systems existing in 1908 which were privately-owned were purchased for something over \$520,000.00. Today the total investment in the Saskatchewan Government Telephones System is \$13,000,000, which means that the balance of \$12,500,000 (outside the purchase of a few small exchanges) represents money expended by the Telephone Department to build up the urban system and to give long distance service. Now what is the general criticism of telephone service? The most frequent criticism is "poor service." But these two gentlemen go to work and investigate the system in this province and do not bring in a single criticism of the equipment, or of the efficiency of the service. They do not say the system is not kept in good repair and they do not say the public is not given good service. During the 20 odd years the Department has been in existence, it has expended \$12,500,000 on new construction, on Capital Account, and the system we have today is a result. During that time, the Department has collected \$30,500,000 in revenue and has spent from these revenues to keep the plant in good running order and maintain it in a high state of efficiency. It has spent out of these revenues \$2,000,000 on renewals and at the same time has created reserves amounting to \$3,500,000. There is one thing that we can be proud of, and I say "we," because I am in one respect, at least, able to claim some personal interest in this Department. It is quite true, as Munnoch points out, that I was an employee of the Department of Telephones for a number of years before I went overseas. I have, therefore, a personal interest in the Department.

There is another thing that we are rather proud of and that is with regard to engineers. It has been the practice in the Department to encourage young men in the Province of Saskatchewan to apprentice themselves to the Department, to work for it in the summer, attend University in the winter and thus to qualify as engineers, as fully qualified electrical engineers. There are, in the employ of the Department at the present time, half a dozen young men who are fully qualified electrical engineers, who got their training in that way, and I might say they are just as capable as any engineers with the same number of years of experience.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if a Department that has done these things can be accused of favouritism—but there is no evidence, there is no suggestion even, of

favouritism in giving service in either reports—and Mr. Munnoch does not refrain from making suggestions of the kind if he thinks he has a peg on which to hang them. I make the statement that these are the conditions in this Department, these are the things which this Department actually has accomplished and when we realise that the telephone business is a complicated business with a multitude of details (thousands and thousands of dimes and five-cent pieces passing through its hands) that requires careful supervision, I wonder how the Department has been able to accomplish all these things and still have the loss of millions and millions of dollars, as my honourable friend the Minister of Telephones suggested the other day.

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

Resuming at 8 p.m., Mr. Patterson said:

When you left the Chair at 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I had just finished outlining something of the history of the Department of Telephones and I had been attempting to show the House that the principle factors in mind when the Department was created had been successfully carried out in the Department. I had stated that the ideas which were in the minds of the House at the time were that the system should be a government system, that the people of the province should have efficient telephone service commensurate with the development of the province at the lowest possible cost, and finally, that the cost would be borne by the users of the telephone system. I had also stated that there was nothing in the two reports to indicate that anything was wrong with the service rendered or with the efficiency of the equipment. I quoted figures to show the development of the system since its inception, and I emphasised the fact that the schedule of rates was the same as in 1908, that there had been no cost to the Public Treasury and that, in these particulars at least, the Department had fulfilled the intention of those responsible for its establishment. I had just completed my remarks in that connection and had stated that the telephone business is of such a nature, deriving its revenues from thousands of users, that careful and economic management is necessary if it is to be successful; and, in spite of some of the criticisms made by the Minister, these criticisms do not alter the substantial fact that the records of the Department show that it can be claimed to have been a signal success from its inception to the present time; and it would not have been the success it is if graft or corruption had been rampant in the Department as suggested.

It must be obvious to all that a Department of this kind must have made mistakes. I am not going to argue that it has not made mistakes, sometimes, that have cost money. I want to point out again that, at the start, there was very little development, telephone or otherwise, in the province, but, after 1908, the greatest influx of settlers took place, new settlements arose and thousands and thousands of immigrants came and established themselves here. Hundreds of miles of railway lines were built, hundreds of new towns and villages grew up and all demanded telephone service. During the war years it had grown to large proportions but there were still demands for expansion of service and the Department found difficulty, like every other employer of labour at the time, in securing a sufficient supply for its needs. This was particularly true of the Accounting Department, for this is a Department in which most of the employees are young men of the type that would be first to go to war. The Telephone Department is controlled largely by engineers who are chiefly concerned with construction and operation; perhaps they are a little bit inclined to under-estimate the importance of the Accounting Branch, and it was hard to secure a competent telephone accountant during the war years. Perhaps the greatest difficulty (and I may say that I found this true in my experience as Minister) is to operate a commercial concern under legislative restrictions and governmental regulations; to set up a Department of Government and expect it to operate as a private business concern and at the same time to hedge it around with legislative restrictions is not in the best interests of the concern. During the time I was Minister we had a great many conferences between members of the Treasury and Telephone Departments' staffs on questions of accountancy and it was exceedingly difficult to get the two groups of officials to agree, on matters of accountancy. I am inclined to think there will always be a conflict of ideas between the Departmental and Treasury officials in that regard.

The Department usually is under someone with an engineering cast of mind, (the present Deputy Minister is one of the best telephone engineers in Canada and, to his

credit be it said, he worked up to that position from labourer on a pole gang). The Departmental officials are inclined to be rather restive under legislative and Treasury Board restrictions and regulations and possibly inclined in some cases to neglect them.

We have had those difficulties, and in every large business they have such problems as those which the Department has had. We must realise that this is a big business, one of the largest in Saskatchewan, and it should not be judged by isolated incidents. It is not fair and just to claim that the whole system is at fault and something wrong with the Telephone Department as a business concern because of minor errors or mistakes.

The Department does business with Telephone Systems in all the provinces of Canada and nearly all the States of the American Union—I mean telephone business. It has inter-traffic arrangements with these provinces and states and, in some cases, our Department had made very favourable traffic agreements with some of the large telephone concerns on this continent. I think that is something to its credit.

There are some things that should be explained to give you an idea of the subsequent story. In the telephone business the larger the system the greater the cost per unit—in this the telephone business differs from most other businesses. The larger the city, the greater will be the cost per telephone both for construction and operation. I do not need to go into this. It is a well-known fact in the telephone business, and increases in size do not bring about decreases in rates. But there are some cases in Saskatchewan where you do get a decreased cost by increasing the business. Suppose, for instance, the Department builds a line of telephone poles and carries on it only one pair of wires which is sufficient for the traffic. The revenue with only one pair of wires is limited and the return from the line will be much poorer than when three pairs of wires are necessary for the business available, although the extra wires can be added at a small additional cost. We have had from time to time to build pole lines where local development was in the early stages, and where there was a heavy initial expenditure for a small amount of business.

Keeping in mind the original intentions, remembering the difficulties I have already outlined I am going to ask the House to bear with me while I briefly consider the Godfrey report.

May I say this at the outset: I quite agree with the Minister of Telephones in the remarks he made with regard to Mr. Godfrey, both as to the position he holds and his abilities and undoubted integrity. I would say further that nothing in his report makes me think any the less of Mr. Godfrey, though I know him only slightly, and I know he is not on my side of politics. He has prepared this report with a serious consideration of what the duties of an auditor are. He left his political feelings to one side and made an honest audit of the Telephone Department with results perhaps contrary to the desires of his employer. He was anxious to retain the reputation he properly holds in this province as a competent auditor, and I want to say of him that he is the one auditor the present Government has so far engaged of whom that can be said. I give him credit for being fair, and I think I can be fair to him—fairer indeed than the Minister who engaged him was. I propose to deal with his report separately so that there can be no misunderstanding.

The Minister of Telephones in his address referred to the appointing of Mr. Godfrey. Then he referred to the appointment of Mr. Munnoch. During the rest of his speech the people of the province would get the idea that a great deal of what he said was submitted to him by Mr. Godfrey, whereas it was really said by Mr. Munnoch. I am going to try to be fairer to Mr. Godfrey than the Minister was, and will deal with the reports separately.

Mr. Godfrey's report consists of seventy pages. The first twelve pages deal largely with suggested changes in The Telephone Department Act and Treasury Board regulations, and I might say that in the main I agree with these recommendations. I would say further, that probably some of them should have been put into effect before this, and possibly I am to blame for that. They are not very serious, but my honourable friend the Minister will, it is to be hoped, provide for some of the changes Mr. Godfrey recommends. I might say with reference to the whole report that there is a great deal that I will agree with in the report of Mr. Godfrey. There are some statements that I would like to argue with him and there are things, too, on which I will have to disagree with him. But for these first twelve pages I am prepared to accept his recommendations. There are one or two places where, if I wanted to be picayune, I might criticise: For example, on pages five and six of his report, he says that no

system of bookkeeping was prescribed for Rural Telephone Companies, and quotes from The Telephone Act clause (b) of section 9, which reads:

"The minister may

(b) prescribe rules and regulations for the keeping of books and accounts of all receipts and expenditures for and on account of any municipal or rural telephone system."

He then comments:

"This clause has apparently no meaning. The wording should either be 'receipts and disbursements' or 'revenue and expenditure,' unless 'of all receipts and expenditures' be deleted as unnecessary. We are advised that no such system has been prescribed."

While this may be strictly correct, the Department did advise companies what books were required to be kept and approved of certain books for the use of Rural Telephone Companies, which were published by various stationery houses. We also had a certain standard form for annual reports, which would give the company some idea of the bookkeeping practice that should be followed.

I will now possibly have to be a little harder on Mr. Godfrey as I propose to go into that part of his report where he discusses the question of borrowing from the Treasury and the methods that were followed. It has been the practice for many years, of course, for this Legislature to vote each year a sum of money for the Telephone Department to be expended for the construction or extension of the telephone system, and for the ensuing year the estimates provide \$800,000 for the Telephone Department to be spent by that Department on Capital Account. For a good many years now the Department has been in good shape financially, and often has a large balance to its credit in the bank. In connection with Capital Account moneys spent for construction, the Department frequently pays for Capital expenditures out of its own money and only draws on the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year. The auditor suggests it has lost a lot of money by this practice and he gives these reasons: He says, once the estimates are passed and the money is borrowed, the money is held in the Treasury Department and the Telephone Department does not call for it until the end of the fiscal year; and during that time, on money which has been borrowed at the current rate of interest on debentures, say 5 per cent., the bank only allows 3½ per cent. interest. Now that statement is true, to a certain extent, but it is very, very seldom that any Provincial Treasury in Saskatchewan borrows for the current year early in that fiscal year. Particularly is that true of the past years when we have been borrowing on Treasury Bills, and the present Provincial Treasurer told us he proposes to do the same thing, for a time at least.

Where that method of financing is followed the money is not borrowed until the day the Telephone Department gets the money from the Treasury Department, and on that day the Treasury goes and gets the money from the bank on a Treasury Note. Most of our financing has been done in that way. In that case the Department of Telephones does not lose one cent of interest. Supposing, however, that, during any month in the year, the Provincial Treasurer decides to float a bond issue, he knows that the Department of Telephones is going to call on him for money sometime in that year and he includes their requirements in his bond issue. Now, I submit, if the Provincial Treasurer has to do that it is only proper that the Telephone Department should pay for it. I do not think it would be possible for the Provincial Treasurer to float a bond issue every time the Telephone Department called on him. The Telephone Department may in some years have to pay the difference between 3½ per cent. and 5 per cent., or as the case may be, while capital money borrowed for it is held by the Treasury to be called for. But I do think, Mr. Godfrey rather exaggerated when he said it was the practice to borrow money early in the fiscal year and, if you look back, you will find that the usual practice was to borrow in the latter part of the fiscal year. But I want to emphasize this point, that it was not often, if at all, that there was any loss to the Department of Telephones, because, as a general rule, the Treasury Department sold a Treasury Bill to the bank on the same day the Telephone Department called on the Treasury for the money, and I submit again, if there was to be any loss of interest, it was the Telephone Department which should pay it. The money was being borrowed for its advantage and the Provincial Treasurer could not be expected to make a sale of lands on any particular date when the Telephone Department might call for money.

There is some criticism of the Treasury Department because it charged the Telephone Department with loan costs. If the Provincial Treasurer sold a bond issue and

sold it under par, the practice was to charge the discount to the Telephone Department and I submit that that is a proper method and that the Telephone Department should pay. There is no reason why the Treasury should bear the costs of selling bonds, the proceeds of which are to be used for telephone purposes. It is true—and this is one criticism—that in one instance bonds sold for more than the face value and in that case the Telephone Department was not credited with the premium but it was charged the net rate of interest. This Treasury Board decision was made some time before I became Treasurer and I do not know for what reason the premium was not actually credited, but, in any case, it made no difference to the Telephone Department in dollars and cents.

The auditor says the rate of interest charged the Telephone Department should be fixed and that this would make it simpler for the Department. I do not think that that should be done. If the Treasury is able to borrow money at 4 per cent. for the Telephone Department then the Telephone Department should pay 4 per cent. or whatever rate it costs the Treasury. It is not a matter of making it easier for the Telephone Department, it is a matter of charging what the Telephone Department should properly pay. No big concern can escape the costs of floating bonds, and they have to take a chance on what the market is. There is a criticism of the Telephone Department repaying Capital advances to the Treasury, and it is suggested that this would ultimately mean that the telephone users would be paying for their own system and handing it over to the Department as a gift. The telephone business requires constantly increasing expenditures, and I do not imagine that the time will ever come when the telephone system will be free of debt and belong to the province without any liability. But that is not very material after all. So long as the Telephone Department is not operated for profit or revenue, so long as it is operated for the benefit of the people who use it, it does not seem to make a great deal of difference whether its surplus is repaid to the Treasury or whether the Department keeps it and buys bonds on its own account. There is something in the Munnoch Report to the effect that the Treasury was using the Department for the benefit of the Provincial Treasury and that is one of the principal points upon which he criticises the administration of the Honourable Mr. Dunning. But if that was the case, it is a strange thing to find in the records of the Department that, at one time when the Treasury converted a bond issue—and it is to Mr. Dunning's credit that some Saskatchewan bonds issued during the War period when interest rates were high, were redeemed at the end of a certain time and the province called in these high rate of interest bonds and substituted others at lower rates for them—the Telephone Department's share in the profit was \$100,000 and the Treasury Department gave the Telephone Department credit for this amount. If the Treasury Department was out to bleed the Telephone Department, to make profits at the expense of the Telephone Department, here was a chance where it could have got away with \$100,000. The experience was this that both Departments were very anxious to look after their own interests and neither was prepared to concede anything to the other that they could possibly avoid.

In the early stages of the telephone system in this province the Government provided Rural Telephone Companies with poles free of cost and the expenditure ran up to \$350,000. It is quite true this was carried as an asset on the books of the Telephone Department. For a while it was carried in "Plant," then we got it straightened around and it has been gradually wiped off as a Departmental asset. The auditor rather criticises that and I imagine is right. But lots of concerns carry intangible assets. In Manitoba, I find, they carry an intangible asset of \$1,100,000, and when you look at Alberta's Departmental Report you find they carry as an intangible asset \$1,500,000. And the amount we are criticised for is \$350,000!

Mr. Godfrey says in his report (and it is quite true, Mr. Speaker) that prior to the year 1913 accounting records for the Telephone Department were not as good as they might have been. As I explained before, this Department was set up and had to be maintained under a heavy demand for construction and expenditure. The men in charge and the engineers did not fully appreciate the importance of the Accounting Branch, and, in the early years the accounting was rather neglected. But in 1913 we got a competent accountant, a Mr. Churchill, and so far as was possible the accounting records were put into good shape. We were not always so fortunate, in the history of the Department in connection with our Accountancy Branch, but I can say the books are in excellent shape now and a study of the Godfrey report will bear that out. Some things (the report refers to an item of \$140,927) were charged to capital which should have been charged to revenue, but these were all finally cleared up and the amount was written off. It was not due to any attempt to hide expenditure but to lack of a proper accounting system in the early years, and I will agree with his criticisms that there is fault to be found in the accounting system at that date.

Then he has something to say regarding the rate of depreciation, but this is a matter upon which experts disagree. I do not suppose any two telephone engineers agree on a lot of things. I am not going to quarrel with Mr. Godfrey about the rate of depreciation and I want to say that the high state of efficiency in which the system is maintained has a great deal to do with the amount of depreciation necessary to reserve and it is also affected by the amount spent on reconstruction. It stands to reason that a building kept in an excellent state of repair does not need to have as large a sum set aside as does a building that is not as well kept. I maintain the Telephone System has been kept in a very high state of repair in Saskatchewan.

In connection with operating expenses, Mr. Godfrey quotes Alberta as spending 38.7 per cent. of the telephone revenue, that is out of every \$100.00 collected as revenue they spend \$38.70 for operating expenses. He quotes Manitoba at 47.5 per cent. and Saskatchewan 52.4 per cent. Now I think it can be quite easily understood why Saskatchewan's operating expenditures are higher than Manitoba's, when you consider the area covered by our system, which is serving many small centres, whereas a large portion of Manitoba's is in one place, the City of Winnipeg. Taking the territory they cover into consideration and all those things which affect operating and maintenance cost, I do not think it is an unfair or unreasonable difference. With regard to Alberta I cannot see how their operating ratio is so small. I am inclined to think there is a mistake, for it seems to me to be too small an operating expense to be accurate.

Now I want the members of the legislature, Mr. Speaker, to note the difference in the manner in which Mr. Godfrey tackles his job and that in which Mr. Munnoch does it. Mr. Godfrey explains why the Saskatchewan operating cost is higher. Mr. Godfrey makes so many favourable comments in his report, so many, in fact, that the Minister was not satisfied to accept it; he used Mr. Godfrey's name and Mr. Munnoch's material. Mr. Godfrey says with regard to the general accounting system:

"The present system in head office is so designed as to effectively check and control all the accounting of the complete organisation, and achieves its object."

That is a very nice compliment. I do not know that an auditor could say much more in favour of an Accounting Branch than Mr. Godfrey has said.

" is so designed as to effectively check and control all the accounting of the complete organisation and achieves its object."

He makes one little criticism, where he says:

"It duplicates in several respects the accounting in the divisions."

The system extending from Gainsboro in the southeast to Vidora in the southwest, from Lloydminster to Hudson Bay Junction in the north and that great territory in between is divided into three divisions with divisional headquarters in Moose Jaw, in Regina and in Saskatoon. Some of the records are kept in the divisional offices and some of the records go to head office in Regina; and Mr. Godfrey suggests there is some duplication.

"This was found to be necessary at one time owing to conditions then existing, but eliminations can now be made with safety."

And he says further on,

"Vouching of accounts is a matter which can well be improved upon by the elimination of some verifications now required."

His comment would indicate we are overcareful about checking accounts rather than undercareful. That is his comment. There are some things he recommends changes in, but he says in conclusion:

"We do not recommend any other changes in the accounting systems of the divisions at the present time."

Then he talks about "A Cost Accounting System." He describes the method followed now, and he says:

"The earnings and operating expenses of each exchange in the province are tabulated monthly and annually so that comparisons can easily be made. The number of messages carried over trunk lines and the earning therefrom for any particular period can at all times be ascertained. Percentages as to the cost of each section of each department to the total revenues are compiled monthly."

Compare this Report with the Weston Report or the Munnoch Report, both of which are nothing but condemnations from beginning to end, and, I submit, if the present Government, by depending on a report of this kind whose fairness gives it some

credence in the eyes of the public, had retained auditors of Mr. Godfrey's calibre, we would have far less grounds for complaint.

He speaks about a monthly statement being used in a different form and he adds, "This recommendation is not intended to cast any doubt on the accuracy of the present statements but to simplify the statements so that they may be more readily understood by a layman."

While recommending a change, the recommendation is to make the statements simpler so that they may be more easily understood, "by a layman." As the Minister who was responsible for this Department at one time, I cannot but appreciate a report from an auditor that shows the fairness this report does. Mr. Godfrey's report says it is not necessary to have a pre-audit. That is something we have been doing in the Telephone Department as in all Government Departments, and I tried to persuade my colleagues in the Government that it was not necessary. I was satisfied that in this department a pre-audit was not necessary, and the Telephone Department officials claim it hampers them in the administration of the department.

On page 29, Mr. Godfrey recommends that a revaluation of the plant of the Telephone Department be undertaken. Strange to say, in the light of what the Minister said, he recommends this valuation be undertaken by the engineers of the Telephone Department. He thinks they can do just as good a job as any outside of the Department.

Mr. Godfrey reports on the fire insurance carried and states that the insurance is in order, but he does make one recommendation and that is that the fire insurance be cancelled on the smaller exchanges or in all except the three large cities. The only reason I mention this is to show that auditors themselves are not always consistent. Mr. Godfrey suggests we cancel the insurance at Prince Albert where we now carry \$90,000, Swift Current \$80,000 and North Battleford \$70,000. Later on he criticises us because we have not got \$1,500 insurance on an automobile. So I say, auditors are not always consistent. He claims that we have too many automobiles for the Department of Telephones in this province. The Department now has, I believe, eight passenger cars and twenty-five trucks, and Mr. Godfrey thinks this is too many. That does not seem to me to be a very large number for a plant having \$13,000,000 invested, with \$3,000,000 revenue per year, with three district superintendents and engineers directing work in all parts of the province. It would not seem to me that eight cars were a great many for a Department of this nature and considering the class of work this Department does. But I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has taken a step to correct the matter and has reduced the number to seven by taking one for his personal use.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: And he dismissed the chauffeur at \$145 a month.

Mr. Strath: You'd better not go near a haystack!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: No, nor near Happyland either.

Mr. Patterson: So that leaves seven. We have also to consider the ways the cars are used.

When we come to criticise the men with cars and the expense in connection with these cars (not the Minister's car for it is not used to check up construction and that sort of thing) we have to consider what these cars are used for. If a section of line is blown down, the superintendent in whose district the break is has to get the line back in repair as fast as he possibly can. He has to get out the job no matter what the conditions of the roads; his first duty is to get the line back into commission. I say, therefore, a divisional superintendent is justified in having a car, and every minute saved in getting the line back into commission means service to the subscribers and dollars to the department. I shall deal with the car that was burned a little later on.

In connection with the purchase of supplies the auditor criticises some actions that took place in connection with the purchase of poles, and possibly there, he was correct. I do not know from personal knowledge. In the purchase of poles particularly it is essential to deal with firms that can be relied upon, and there are several firms that have been established in the business of furnishing telephone poles for years and have a reputation for absolute reliability. Carney and Company, the Naugle Pole Company and the National Pole Company are all old established firms and if any of these firms undertakes to supply the department with a certain number of poles of a certain kind on a certain day, they will be there on the spot. It is a peculiar thing just about the

time a contract for poles is to be awarded a dozen firms crop up that want to tender on supplies of poles, and no one ever hears of them again until another contract is about to be let. They crop up every year; but it is not wise to deal with any firm that comes along. If you order a car of poles from Carney and Company or any of the firms I mentioned, to be delivered at a certain place on a certain day, you can be sure the poles will be there and that they will be according to specifications. But, if you deal with other firms, the chances are that when you get your gang at the spot where construction is to commence, you get them ready for work but the poles are not there for them. This happened so often in the past that it was found absolutely the best practice to deal with a reliable firm such as those mentioned. It is the same with batteries. The batteries are tested, and the purchase is dependent on the result of the tests which are actually conducted by the department. The question of price is not the only factor in the case; but the batteries were tested, and here again, as with poles, reliability of the goods is a most important factor.

With regard to Mr. Godfrey's comment regarding the destruction of public documents I shall deal with the matter later on.

Now, coming to page 40 of the report, and again I would point out Mr. Godfrey's fairness and sense of sound business. Here he is dealing with stores, the warehouse where the stores are kept and the records kept of jobs and estimates as we call them. The auditor admits there are difficulties in keeping the store books balanced, and that discrepancies are bound to occur through the difficulty of keeping track of the second-hand stores shipped in or where the material is shipped direct to job. He admits this is one of the most difficult places to keep a balance and I think any reasonable man will understand that. As I said a moment ago, we might be shipping a car of poles to some point. The poles would not actually go into the stores, but the record would have to be made in the books as if they had. The same supplies in the case of switchboards. A new board may be built out of three or four old ones, and in the course of a few years many discrepancies would inevitably occur. Mr. Godfrey understands that. He is not critical of that, and the discrepancies he finds he says are quite explicable. His conduct in that respect is vastly different from that of the other gentleman. Mr. Godfrey admits it is difficult to keep a balance right at all times in a store like this. He is also very fair in his comment relative to the repair shop. He says it is a great economy. Imagine this man Munnoch saying anything like that, and at the same time trying to maintain that this department was run for the benefit of the Northern Electric!

He says in another place: "We find the numerical differences between the actual stock (in the stores) and the Head Office records to be so slight as not to be worthy of mention"; but if Munnoch found a discrepancy of one glass insulator, he would write a couple of pages about it in his report!

Mr. Godfrey mentions the fact that the superintendent of supplies is an expert on freight rates and shipping and that "he has effected great economies in this respect," and he suggests that he could advantageously devote his whole time to this work. There is no criticism there. But one criticism of Mr. Godfrey I will take a minute to deal with. He criticises the department for bringing back old material such as old cross-arms, to the warehouse. Mr. Godfrey does not say this; it must have been Mr. Munnoch and if not him, then the Minister (it is hard to distinguish between the Minister and Mr. Munnoch) said that he saw nothing wrong with the old cross-arms lying at the warehouse. He said that the cross-arms were taken down at some country point, shipped in to Regina to the warehouse, cut up there at the expense of the Government and then distributed in hundreds of loads to employees. Well, now, as to nothing wrong with them: If there is a pole line with cross-arms for six wires and it is full and can carry no more wires, and if the need for more arises, the department may send out a gang to take the six-pin cross-arms down and put up a ten-pin cross-arm. So there is nothing to that. I think the department wisely ships all second-hand material back to the warehouse, and you may ask, why? I would answer with another question "why does the C.P.R. do it?" And you might say "But they do not have to pay freight rates" and I would say again that they have to pay the men's time, and that the C.P.R. does it because they have found it good business, just as we have found it good business in the Telephone Department. Just imagine the howl there would be if we had left these cross-arms lying out on the country road! We would have been accused of supplying all our Liberal friends out in the country with firewood!

But as I said before, we have followed the practice of the Department of bringing these second-hand cross-arms back to the yard. The new Minister may change it if he likes, but I warn him that if I find a cross-arm out in my part of the country I am going to accuse him of supplying his Tory friends out in the country with firewood.

On page 45, Mr. Godfrey has this to say in discussing the capital cost of the system:

"We make separate reports as to land and buildings. We find nothing to report respecting plant."

And, as I said before, the "plant" represents \$12,000,000 out of \$13,200,000 and Mr. Godfrey finds nothing to report. Then he goes on:

"Estimates for construction have been passed as required by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and we have examined all vouchers charged to such estimates."

Mr. Speaker, I verily believe that, if the Government had engaged Mr. Godfrey to audit the Farm Loan Board, the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature would never have had to be called into session.

With regard to the expenses of men coming to Regina to vote, I would call your attention to the fact that Mr. Godfrey never criticised the bringing in of men to vote (possibly he foresees the future), but he does criticise the men who did return. I shall be perfectly frank, they come in to vote, but it has been the practice with the department for many years to allow its employees to return to vote.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: But why did they stick two men on who were not on the payroll?

Mr. Patterson: I have not got the records of the department, but if I had I am sure there would be quite a proper explanation. As I said, this was the practice; and it was done before I was Minister and the expenses were paid because the men were on an hour wage basis; had they been on a monthly salary, there would be no criticism at all. The Minister can discontinue the system if he sees fit, but it was one of the conditions of employment.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Would you recommend that it be continued?

Mr. Patterson: If I were Minister I would continue it. However, if the Minister does not want to continue the system, all he need do is to issue an order and it will be stopped. All I would say in regard to these accounts is that the railway fare represents over half of the item and this is refunded.

Now I would like to discuss the payment made to one F. D. MacKay, some \$480, of which much has been made. The Minister did not refer to it, but I can explain this very briefly. Just a month or so prior to the death of the late D. C. McNab, for many years the Deputy Minister (and I am sorry to say I never appreciated how sick he was) a well-educated Scotsman visited him in his office and stated to him that he had had considerable experience in telephone accounting in South Africa. This man approached Mr. McNab, as I say, and persuaded him as to his capabilities, and Mr. McNab engaged him to make a sort of audit. Mr. McNab very shortly afterwards was taken sick and died, and we never knew exactly what MacKay was expected to do. But as I said, Mr. McNab died and we found this man MacKay on the payroll. Shortly afterwards, however, he got into some difficulties and we dismissed him. Mr. McNab is in his grave and it is impossible now for us to ascertain what he had in mind for the man to do, and why he had been engaged.

With regard to the purchase of sites for telephone exchanges, the criticisms made are all in connection with sites which were purchased many years ago and I am not able to give any explanation in regard to them. I may say that, for some years, it has been the practice (we did it in Saskatoon and in other places) to buy a site from the city or town itself, usually tax sale property. I think we purchased two sites in Saskatoon in that way, and I think Cabri was another place in which we purchased the property from the town for the taxes against it. I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing questionable in that practice.

Then there is some criticism of the construction of buildings, and again the cases cited going back over a period of 10 or 15 years; but when it is remembered that these vouchers were taken out of the department by investigators who were looking for charges against the late Government, you will understand that it is not possible for me to track them fully to find the true explanation. When you compare the charges for work, material and so on in 1919-1920, with charges in other years, it is grossly unfair. Everybody knows that prices for building material or labour in these years increased overnight, and you cannot, fairly, compare prices paid in 1919 or 1920 for construction with the prices in other years.

Some reference is made in the report to the reconstruction of the Estevan plant where the department saved \$2,500 by doing the work itself. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this department exists only to provide profits for the Northern Electric Company, why did the work not go to that company? Mr. Godfrey, however, gives credit that the department can do a job like that and thereby save considerable money.

Another section of the Godfrey report deals with the Rural Telephones Branch, but as Mr. Munnoch goes into this in much greater detail, I shall not duplicate by dealing now with Mr. Godfrey's statements in this regard.

I want to deal now with the main criticism, the most serious condition in the Godfrey report.

He says that the depreciation reserve set up is not sufficient, and he suggests that the Department should have provided a reserve of \$6,084,085.57. He suggests there should be changes in the Act and in the Treasury Board regulations and suggests the improvements that should be made, but on the whole, we can say that Mr. Gregory appeared reasonably well satisfied. He suggests something with regard to mechanical bookkeeping. He sees something of the same thing as I did, that the Telephone Department deals with large amounts of money in a great many small accounts and that, as a result, the clerical work is necessarily heavy and it is to improve matters in this regard that he suggests the installation of mechanical accounting equipment, to ensure automatic control of revenue and the accuracy of individual accounts.

Altogether, it is a very fair and just report, which need not give any member of the Telephone Department or anybody in the Province of Saskatchewan any cause to worry as to the management of the telephone business of the province.

As I said a moment ago, the most serious criticism made by Mr. Godfrey has reference to the depreciation reserve which he does not consider sufficient. I would not argue with Mr. Godfrey as to the amount of reserve for depreciation that should be set up, and I am not going to argue here. He says the department should have provided \$6,084,085.77, against depreciation of its assets. He admits that the Department has spent \$1,970,281.02 out of revenues for renewals and replacements, and, if you put in a new switchboard for an old one. I submit that is just as good allowance for depreciation as setting up a reserve. \$1,870,281.02 has been spent in renewals and replacements and, according to his figures, the department should have a balance of \$4,310,045.45 in reserve. It has \$3,433,967.93 or \$900,000 less reserves than Mr. Godfrey thinks it should have. The department has repaid to the Treasury \$3,033,967.93.

Mr. McConnell: Is Mr. Godfrey's criticism sound there?

Mr. Patterson: I am going to deal with it. I agree Mr. Godfrey makes a very good case, and I agree that there are certain things on the books which might be different, but I believe that, had I had the opportunity of discussing certain of these things with Mr. Godfrey before he made his report, he would have seen my point of view.

We have \$900,000 of deficit there according to Mr. Godfrey, but there are many other factors to be taken into consideration and as I said, I believe if I had the opportunity he might have given some consideration to the arguments which I have to offer. I said before, this department was set up at a time when there was practically no telephone development in the province and every time we built a line of long distance telephones with only one or two pairs of wires we were building a line which could not be expected at first to produce sufficient revenue to pay operating expenses and set up a proper depreciation.

We did all that all over the province to give the people service. The auditor admits, as I said, that the department has expended \$1,970,000 from revenues on renewals and replacements. So that is not too bad for a department which, according to its Minister has lost millions and has been fleeced by manufacturers and contractors. When you consider the scattered population of the area which this system serves and many of the unprofitable lines built to give the whole of the province service it is not too bad, Mr. Speaker, for a department that has not increased its rates for twenty years. Though Mr. Godfrey may criticise the difference between the reserve he maintains the department should have and the reserve which the department actually has, under all those conditions I have mentioned this department has been extensively replacing and renewing on a capital investment of \$13,200,000. I may say, too, you cannot buy as much in the way of telephone equipment with your money today as you could twenty years ago. You cannot hire operators, clerks, or engineers, at salaries which obtained twenty years ago. But if you telephone from Regina to any point in the province you

can do so for just the same charge as you did in 1908; you pay the same rate and you have a better service. I think that a Department which has been able to do these things shows the very best proof of its efficiency. We have reserves of 26 per cent. of our capital investment. Alberta has reserves that represent 10 per cent., or perhaps 12 per cent. at the outside. The Bell system has reserves of 19 per cent., Saskatchewan 26 per cent. and Manitoba 30 per cent. When you consider the difference in the conditions: we have a large percentage of our system in towns and villages, we have many long distance lines where the traffic is light, then I say that showing is the very best evidence of good management of the Telephone Department. After all, I am not sure that the depreciation reserve is quite so important where the system is Government or publicly owned. In a private company it is important because a depreciation must be provided for before the shareholders can be paid dividends. Only a certain rate is allowed because a large amount of depreciation might be used to cover hidden profits and increase the value of company's shares. But even if Mr. Godfrey is right—if the department should have greater reserves than it has, I am still going to contend that the record which the department has made is a very satisfactory record indeed, considering all the conditions under which this Telephone Department has been, and is, operating. I am going to contend that, and say again, that the payment of nearly \$2,000,000 from revenue for renewals and reconstruction and the setting aside of a reserve of \$3,500,000 in twenty-two years, in a young province, is not a record that any head of any department need be ashamed of.

The Minister of Telephones, the other day, was kind enough to say there had been a considerable improvement while I was head of the department. Well, I appreciate the compliment but I may say that I do not want any compliments that involve any reflection upon, or accusation against, any of the many hundreds of loyal and efficient employees which the department has had in the past. There are many men, some of them still in the employ of this department, who have played a very fine, upright and helpful part in the development of this system. Their contribution to the development of the province in which they live was great and no compliment from him or anybody else is acceptable if it implies any unfair or unjust criticism of these men. I want to say this, too, that the Department of Telephones from its inception down to the present time has had an efficient and loyal staff and when I say this I mean as efficient and as loyal a telephone staff as can be found in Canada. But I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, whether the loyalty or efficiency of any staff is encouraged by the production of a report such as was produced by Mr. George B. Munnoch. I doubt very much if a report of this kind was ever before tabled in any Legislature in the Dominion of Canada. In laying the report on the Table, the Minister gave personal testimony of the efficiency and all-the-rest-of-it of Mr. Munnoch. We were told he was an accountant, an auditor, an investigator, and everything else and I think the sum total of it was that he was an "efficiency expert."

Mr. Spence: Jack of all trades and good at none!

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Munnoch says exactly what he is on his business card, which I have here. And he does not say he is an auditor. He does not say he is an accountant. He does not say he is an efficiency expert. He does not say a thing about that. All he says is that he is an "Insurance Adjuster" and a "Claims Agent." I wondered, in listening to the Minister's eulogy on Munnoch's qualifications, why the Dominion Government had sent to England for Sir Henry Thornton when re-organising the Canadian National Railway, when Mr. George B. Munnoch was in Calgary and available any day. I have no doubt he could have straightened out that mess, had it on its feet in short order, and handled our Telephone Department as a side-line. This Report of Mr. Munnoch's, which I have in my hand, would indicate that he has taken the Godfrey Report and from it worked out some remarkable arguments. It is the most amazing combination of untruths (and I say that deliberately) contradictions, faulty arguments and improper and unwarranted assumptions I have ever read. And the Minister anticipated this. It is full of gossip just the same as the Weston Report. A lot of the "information" obtained by this "Spotter" (the same kind of man who gets evidence against bootleggers) is made up of misinformation given to him by discharged employees, unsuccessful contractors and a few of the present employees, who hoped by giving information to get into the good graces of the present Minister, knowing the kind of Minister he is.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit that the last remark is not parliamentary.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: It is all right. It's the Member for Pipestone all over.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I would ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. Davis: The honourable member is just suggesting that the Minister has listened to office tattle.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: I am objecting.

Mr. Speaker: I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. Patterson: I bow to your ruling and retract. Anyway, he has singled out various employees on whose statements he says he bases his judgement and the Minister says he has evidence.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I made no statements that he had evidence.

Mr. Davis: The honourable minister has said he has declarations from the night-watchmen.

Mr. Patterson: Now a noticeable thing about this report is that all those against whom a charge is made are dead. Anything referring to any person living is being further investigated by Munnoch, but, of course, he lets us have his suspicions. The Minister tells us that the report of Mr. Munnoch cost \$3,200.00 and that is what his speech cost to prepare, but he forgets that he himself was paid \$3,700.00 some years ago to get a lot of the same information.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would ask that the honourable gentleman be ordered to withdraw.

Mr. Davis: What were you paid for?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I was not paid for the telephone investigation. I was, some forty-four days, Counsel before the Commission and I was paid for that, and the telephone investigation was not proceeded with.

Mr. Gardiner: I understood the honourable gentleman to say the other evening that he had perused some of this material.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: We had perused them.

Mr. Patterson: It does not matter very much. The main thing is that this Assembly got the report. That is the principal thing after all. Now we had a statement completed by Mr. Godfrey about the 21st of December and we have this report completed on the 5th of February. And we might reasonably wonder why Mr. Munnoch was asked to make an audit at all. I say the only reason is that the first report did not fulfill the expectations of my honourable friend. The Minister told us this report was obtained with a view to remedying conditions, but after speaking for two hours or more did not tell us of a single remedy or of one reform he was going to introduce.

I said that the Munnoch Report contained deliberate untruths. On page 6, and these are only examples, he says George Foley was an employee of the Department of Telephones. Mr. Foley was never in the employ of the Government. On page 10, he says no annual report was prepared for 1923. That is not correct. He said, and I raised this point the other night, that Mr. D. C. McNab was a shareholder in the Canada West Electric Company. Mr. D. C. McNab was never, at any time, a shareholder in the Canada West Electric Company. On page 27, of the Munnoch Report it states that Mr. G. A. Bell signed a contract with the Automatic Electric Company in 1927, and Mr. Bell has not been Minister of Telephones for over ten years. Those are just some specimens and they are easily got at. The auditor on page 100 says:

"We checked carefully into the question of sales of junk and we were able to find that many of the matters reported to us in that connection were accounted for."

Three pages afterwards he says:

"We are informed that during the rebuilding of the Saskatoon Exchange a great deal of metal was sold to the junk dealers and shipped to Winnipeg for which the Department received no remuneration, the moneys in payment thereof going into the possession of individuals."

Within three pages he contradicts himself. In one place he says Rurals get too much consideration from the department, and in another place he says they are essential to the success of the Government system. Can you imagine those two statements together. But the beautiful part of the report is what he cribbs from Mr. Godfrey. He takes Mr. Godfrey's figures and gets entirely different results, but I will go into these a little further on. Here is an instance: This gentleman says that the capital cost of the Telephone system was \$13,700,000, adds to this a little less than \$2,000,000 expended on reconstruction and renewals and then says the total capital cost is \$15,600,000. Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear of any auditor who added renewals and reconstruction to the capital investment to arrive at the total investment? That is what this "wizard" did with Mr. Godfrey's figures. And I suppose Mr. Munnoch is the only accountant in the world who ever did that, and for that reason he is well qualified to act as an expert for my honourable friend the Minister of Telephones!

In another case he adds expenditures that were not paid by the department at all, but were paid out of provincial funds for the Rural Branch, to other sums in order to make up a sufficient sum to warrant these headlines "Millions lost by the Telephone Department."

On page 92 this "spotter" says "I am told" and says he has the statement from a responsible party. For gossip or tittle-tattle listen to this:

"When the deceased A. L. Sifton was premier of Alberta, it was current talk amongst the officials that W. J. Harmer, the Deputy Minister, received from the Northern Electric Company 10 per cent on everything purchased for the Alberta Government Telephones,"

This from this expert to whom the Minister gave his highest recommendations. I doubt if I ever read a more glowing recommendation than the Minister gave and this is what this expert incorporates in this report:

" 5 per cent of which was for himself for handling, 5 per cent for A. L. Sifton. The leak occurred through an agent losing on a bid for a year's supply of dry cell batteries. This agent stated that he did not mind giving Harmer 5 per cent commission, but he gagged on 10 per cent. To lend colour to his statement, competitive bidding was stopped by the system, standardizing on the use of N. E. Co. apparatus and equipment throughout."

This is what he has incorporated in his report with regard to a man who filled a position, as Premier of his Province, was Chief Justice of Alberta and who has taken to Ottawa by Sir Robert L. Borden as Secretary of State. This "Spotter," employed by a Government whose watchword is "Economise," makes that statement in his report.

Mr. Davis: And he is dead too.

Mr. Patterson: Well, it would not be said if he were not dead.

"The N.E. Co., quote prices to different people of 25 per cent, 30 per cent, 40 per cent and even 50 per cent plus 10 per cent off list.

"The department, in most cases, can do better and cheaper work, yet wherever possible the work is given to the N.E. Co. on a time and material basis.

"Purchasing Agent (Pratt) has decided that in future he will take his holidays in the summer time. Up to, and including 1929, he has always taken them at Christmas, which he is justified in doing for family reunion purposes, etc. There is a rumour that he calls on the Manufacturers while East, and that his holidays cost him nothing."

Then Mr. Munnoch winds up, and if nothing else is reliable this is.

"The above is, as mentioned before, given for what it is worth and trusting that it will untangle an abstruse subject."

Mr. Davis: How much did this thing cost?

Mr. Patterson: It is not very hard to guess where the information came from. The whole statement refers to "Our Department." The man who prepared that was rather simple, and I think he did it for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the present Minister. All the time he speaks of "Our Department," and Munnoch speaks of receiving his information from a responsible party. Mr. Munnoch has some queer ideas. He believes this Department was political, because in the annual report a great deal of space was given to the Rural Telephone Companies. Well, we have 1,000 or 1,200 Rural

Telephone Companies in this province and it takes a little space in the Annual Report to report their work. We have always considered them a fairly important part of the Telephone system of the province. But that was not the main reason and "politics" was not the reason why considerable space was given to Rural Telephone Companies. The reason was that what we were doing in Saskatchewan was somewhat unique and not being done anywhere else. I was an employee of the department and I know we used to have a great many requests for information about the Rural Telephone Companies from all over this continent. One year we got out a very large report giving free information as to the Rural Telephone Companies, their organisation and operations and copies of this report were sent out in response to these requests. That was the real reason why considerable space in the Annual Report was devoted to the Rural Companies. But Munnoch is satisfied there must have been political reasons for the Rurals being given this space.

One other thing in which the political character of this report is made very obvious is that fact that Hon. Mr. Dunning's name is brought in on every possible occasion and it is quite evident that the purpose is to score against Mr. Dunning. This investigator could not have brought Mr. Dunning's name any oftener into his report except by write "Dunning" twice every time it occurs. You come across phrases such as "In 1924 when Mr. Dunning was Premier . . ." all the way through the report. Mr. Munnoch may be an expert in adjusting insurance claims but when he comes to write a consistent report he is a complete novice for he has made this report so disconnected, so full of repetition and hearsay evidence and altogether so jumbled up that it is almost impossible to follow it. It is the most disconnected thing I have ever seen and for that reason it is very difficult to deal with; but there are certain things in it to which I must refer.

Without attempting to answer all the truly remarkable conclusions arrived at by Munnoch, I have tried to analyse the more important features and will proceed to discuss them as connectedly as his report will permit.

There is a suggestion throughout the report that the files have been tampered with, that documents were missing, that documents had been destroyed, that files were missing and files destroyed—improperly. And he cites the Act, Chapter 17, of the Statutes of 1920, regarding the preservation of public documents, to the effect that vouchers, cheques, accounting records and all other documents may be destroyed after ten years. And yet he says they had no proper authority to destroy the documents! This Act applies to the Department of Telephones as well as to all other departments of the Government, and from time to time the department did take advantage of the Act, otherwise their vaults would have been crammed to the limit with vouchers and files of little or no use. But in saying that, I do not want the House to get the impression that the final records, such as ledgers, are destroyed. Ledgers are never destroyed, but vouchers and other papers are destroyed from time to time in accordance with the Act and with the practice which is general throughout the Service.

On page 74 of his report, Munnoch refers to the fact that original copies of letters are missing though the answers are on file, and he refers to the Haultain Commission. Well, hundreds of files were submitted to the Royal Commission which sat in 1916 and I understand that the present Minister of Public Works and Mr. F. W. Turnbull were consul before that Commission and consequently the files would be subject to examination by them.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, I would inform the honourable gentleman only a few were examined.

Mr. Patterson: That may be true. But a few letters disappeared from those files and I am inclined to think that a few of them have been resurrected and placed in this report.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I would ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Premier Anderson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an insinuation there. The honourable gentleman should withdraw.

Mr. Patterson: I am only saying, Mr. Speaker, that between the time the files were taken from the department on requisition by the Royal Commission and the time they were returned, several letters disappeared from those files.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I want the statement withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Anderson: On the point, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has intimated that when the files were before the Royal Commission certain letters disappeared, and he insinuates that these letters now have been introduced into this report, the inference being that when the Honourable Minister of Public Works was before the Commission they disappeared.

Mr. Patterson: What I stated, Mr. Speaker, did not affect the Minister himself. Other people may have seen them, but the fact remains that certain files did disappear while they were out of possession of the department for purposes of the Royal Commission of 1916.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: For the honourable gentleman's information, I may say the files never were taken away from the Commission. I speak from recollection on the matter and from conviction. I only went over two or three of them. I ask for your ruling Mr. Speaker.

Premier Anderson: In my opinion, I certainly think the honourable member should clear the honourable member for Lumsden.

Mr. Patterson: I accept the Minister's statement, Mr. Speaker. I am going to say this, too, that certain files were removed from the files of the department by a discharged employee. We did not know that he had taken them away, but his guilt is proved by the fact that Munnoch, in his report, on page 13, makes the statement "Among a large file of documents which we recovered from an ex-employee who, on being discharged from the service had taken these documents into his possession." And that is the type of evidence you have all through this report.

Referring to the custom of destroying files of ten years' standing, he says that nearly 700 vouchers were missing on one occasion when they were to be destroyed. They were going to be destroyed anyway, but he has to bring that in.

In this connection I may say that, when the Telephone Department was first established, the funds of the Department were handled in the Treasury the same as other Departments, and the vouchers accordingly were kept in the Treasury just the same as vouchers from other departments. But the department was constantly enlarging and, as it grew, the department set up its own Treasury Department and when they moved from the Legislative Buildings here to their own Head Office, there apparently arose some difference of opinion between the two Treasury Departments as to which should have possession of certain of the vouchers. This was some years ago, and you will notice that everything reported missing is over ten years old and there is nothing reported as missing from files of recent years.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that statement is not correct; references are made to late files—all the references to cost accounting are from the late files.

Mr. Patterson: Here is what Munnoch says:

"We find it impossible to follow out many of the files. The system of filing is such that the individual file does not show the complete correspondence. In many instances we find letters and no answers; in other cases we find the answers but the original copy is missing, and we are informed that between the time the files and vouchers were requisitioned for the purpose of the Haultain Commission and the time they were delivered for examination through the Attorney General's office, that a great deal of correspondence was stripped from the files."

That is what Munnoch says. He also finds there was politics in the department because the decision to purchase from the Bell Company was not completed until after the election in 1908. Well, if Munnoch gets any political capital out of that we should not deprive him of it. But he goes on to say other things for which he has no justification. He says, on page 22:

"We are informed that when the Government system was organised it was not the intention that capital borrowed should be repaid."

I wonder what responsible authority told him that? It could not be Mr. Dunning or Mr. Calder, and these are the only two ex-ministers of Telephones still alive who were in the Government at that time. I do not know how he knows this, and I do not imagine the members of the Government of the day were much concerned about that particular

matter. Indeed, it is doubtful if the matter was ever considered. He takes the statement of Mr. Godfrey with regard to the alleged loss to the department because of Treasury advances and repayments, but Munnoch takes the statement and repeats it every fifteen pages and between that and other matters he figures up a loss to the department of millions and millions. Munnoch goes a good deal further. He says the Treasury should not have charged the Telephone Department for loan costs on loans sold below par and he also wants the Treasury to make no charge to the Department for money borrowed for the department but unused. So, if this gentleman has his way, the Telephone Department is going to have the Treasury Department both coming and going. As I told you, the department has made the practice of making renewals out of revenue, yet on page 43 of his report, we find him adding revenue expenditure on renewals and reconstruction to the capital cost of the system to get the total capital cost.

But perhaps the choicest bit Munnoch, as an efficiency expert, has to offer is his criticism of the Treasury Board because it failed in reaching a decision in 1923, authorising repayment of capital and the interest charges on advances, to take into consideration that these items were still under discussion in 1926.

The Regina Star in the headlines of its report of the speech of the Honourable Minister of Public Works, says "Fraudulent Bookkeeping is Charged," and that headline is based on the statement of Munnoch that we "transferred an over-expenditure and a deficit to reserve as a profit." I would say that any bookkeeper who can do that is not fraudulent. He is a wizard. He would be doing something physically impossible to anyone, except the "efficiency expert" Munnoch. The statement is so ridiculous, that it is not necessary to reply to it but it goes to show what Munnoch's qualifications as an auditor really amount to.

The whole thing is based on the fact that the "actual revenue" frequently exceeded the "estimated revenue" and the same thing may happen to the present minister. It has been the custom for the department to estimate what the revenue would be, say two or three million dollars and the Legislature votes the same amount for expenditure by the department.

A few years ago, business was very good; the Department was perhaps over-cautious and under-estimated its revenue, and in some years took in more revenue than had been estimated. In that way, the revenues were greater than anticipated and consequently the expenditures by the department of its own revenues were in excess of the estimate. That is what is called "fraudulent bookkeeping." As a matter of fact if the revenues of the department this year are in excess of the \$3,250,000.00 estimated, the present Minister will have to do the same "fraudulent bookkeeping" in order to keep the books straight. Take the estimates about 1926-27. Things were going along rapidly, and the expenditures frequently exceeded the estimates: but the revenues also exceeded what was anticipated. If by any chance the revenues of the department for this year exceeds \$3,250,000.00 under the present Minister, he will have to do the same "fraudulent bookkeeping" to keep the Department's books balanced.

Then on page 44, our expert says the department has had tremendous loss but adds that he has not had time to figure it out, but that in any case, it is one or two millions. To get this figure large enough he adds in an amount expended by the department in connection with the rural branch although it was not paid by the department.

With reference to the telephone contractors, Mr. Munnoch says that a lot of them were previously telephone employees, and that they left the Department to get some of the "pickings" that were going by securing government contracts. Now, Sir, there was a great development in Saskatchewan in 1908 and in every line of business men were going out and starting up for themselves. This is a country where men usually want to strike out in business for themselves and many of our telephone employees of the earlier years did go into the telephone construction business. He also says that a number of telephone officials were interested in the contracting companies yet this "spotter" says the Government got such close prices on its contracts and there was so little money in them for the contractors that they turned to the rurals and in some cases organised rural companies, because the "graft" was in the rurals. I shall discuss this matter later.

Coming to the purchase of materials, we find Munnoch makes some serious suggestions in his report. First of all there is the reference to the supply companies in which contractors were shareholders. The funny thing about that statement is that Munnoch contradicts himself shortly afterwards when he tells us that all the business was given to the Northern Electrical Company in which

there were no local shareholders at all. He then follows with some absolute misstatements of fact. He says that D. C. McNab was a shareholder in the Canada West Electric Company. McNab never was a shareholder of the Canada West. He says the Hon. Mr. Bell was a shareholder, too, but Mr. Bell never was interested in any Company during the time he was Minister of Telephones. He refers also to the late S. P. Porter, but Mr. Porter was never a shareholder of the Canada West during the time he was Deputy Minister. Then he takes the Midland Electric and in reference to that company the "efficiency expert" quotes three or four names as shareholders, but is it not strange that, although he mentions Pirt, Taylor and Foley who are all Tories, he leaves out the name of F. Somerville, formerly president of the Conservative Association in the city of Regina? Then he refers to Mr. McNab's association with the Regina Cartage Company. As a matter of fact, Mr. McNab was a small shareholder but when his estate was settled, his shares sold at forty cents on the dollar! R. E. Leach, also mentioned as a member of the Cartage firm, was manager of it at one time but resigned and sold out his interests when he became a member of the Liquor Commission. Munnoch does not mention this at all. He leaves the impression all through that they continued to be members of the firm. Now, here is a peculiar thing. The Minister, it will be remembered, did not mention the Regina Cartage Company in his speech, but, behold the *Regina Star* apparently can read his mind, for there is a whole paragraph devoted to that company in the *Star's* report!

Munnoch makes reference to the fact that Mr. Sharon, the Provincial Architect, was a shareholder in the International Clay Products concern, but he does not tell you that the minute the Government learned of the fact, International Clay Products were advised that, until Mr. Sharon disposed of his shares in the concern, they would get no business from the Government. That's how we dealt with that situation. With regard to the Consumer's Supply Company, a brother of the purchasing agent was manager of that concern, but the total amount of business with that firm amounted to \$400.

I want to say that, when you come to buy telephone equipment (and I am dealing now with Central equipment) it is an entirely different thing from buying cement or sugar or any standard article. You cannot go in and say, "I want a thousand line switchboard," because every large board has to have its own particular specifications and you cannot compare a 1000 line switchboard for Saskatoon with a 1,000 line board for Swift Current, unless you know all the details. You might just as well say that every eight-roomed house in Regina is worth the same amount of money. It would be just as reasonable. During the war years, prices of material and labour jumped from day to day. We know that. Copper used to be six cents a pound, but it jumped to 23 cents. Iron wire used to be two cents, now it is six or eight cents. A pole that used to cost 65 to 75 cents, today is \$1.75. That shows the difference in prices, and yet with all that increase in cost this department is still charging the people of the province on the same rate schedule as at the beginning of its operation.

With regard to the installation of automatic equipment in Regina the Minister, either deliberately or ignorantly mislead the people of this province, when he stated that a saving of \$75,000 would have been effected if the Government had purchased its equipment from the Canadian Independent Company. In quoting the prices for this equipment he forgot to mention that the Canadian Independent tender was for manually-operated equipment; he says there would have been that saving if we had accepted their tender, and he leaves the impression with the people that favouritism was shown. At that time there was only one automatic equipment which had proved satisfactory and that was equipment manufactured by the Chicago company, — The Automatic Electric. The reason why no tenders were called was because there was only one automatic system of proved satisfactory operation. The question of operating costs was the prime factor with the department in having automatic equipment installed and the installation has resulted not only in saving on operating costs but also in increased efficiency of service for the people of Regina. In that again our judgment was justified. If that is not a sufficient argument, I may say, Sir, that so far as the Canadian Independent is concerned much of the equipment they manufactured was not up to standard. Some of our Rural Companies, altogether against our advice, did purchase equipment from the Canadian Independent and have been sorry for it ever since. In some cases it had to be scrapped—and yet the Minister says we should have saved \$75,000 by buying from the Canadian Independent!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I would like to ask the honourable gentleman a question: Is he certain that the Canadian Independent Telephone Company were not dealers in automatic equipment?

Mr. Patterson: My statement, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely correct. The Canadian Independent Electric could not supply automatic equipment. There was only one Automatic Company at the time and that was the firm we made our contract for automatic equipment with. It is quite true that in this contract made with the Automatic Electric Company, there was a provision that, in the future, they would supply us with material at a rate not to exceed a certain fixed price; and it is quite true the Government did agree to a cancellation of that agreement. But I am going to say that in doing that they did exactly the same thing and for exactly the same reason that Mr. Meighen abrogated the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement under extremely unexpected conditions. We were as justified in cancelling that agreement as Mr. Meighen was in cancelling the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement under the conditions.

Now there is some criticism of the Northern Electric Company. It is much the largest firm manufacturing telephone equipment in the Dominion of Canada. It is a company that has been giving, and can give, the Department of Telephones in this province the best of service. As a matter of fact, the Province of Alberta decided some years ago to buy only Northern Electric equipment. The Manitoba system also is a large user of Northern Electric equipment, so apparently Mr. Bracken and Mr. Brownlee are not afraid of this firm. This is a big Company, Mr. Speaker, it has engineering services that this department cannot hope to provide for itself. It can give us assistance and help in many of the technical problems that we encounter. The Northern Electric helps us in solving our technical problems as they help all the other systems in Canada. It is a common practice in big business, and in every telephone system. We purchased largely from the Northern Electric because they could give an engineering service which few of the companies in Canada can give.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Do you mean to say that the manufacture of telephone equipment is a monopoly on this continent?

Mr. Patterson: No, not a monopoly. I say the Northern Electric understands conditions in Canada and can give us better and quicker service. We can buy in Chicago from the Automatic Electric but then the duty—

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Do you mean to say that the Government is forced to buy without asking for tenders at all?

Mr. Patterson: No, no, not at all! If you do not like the price, you can buy from Siemens, or from the Automatic of Chicago, but there is only one company in Canada that makes automatic equipment. You cannot call for tenders when you wish to enlarge a switchboard in an exchange where the existing equipment has been purchased from one company. The extension must be of the same type as the board already in use.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Does our own Power Commission follow that plan?

Mr. Patterson: I do not know anything about the Power Commission. In Saskatchewan we have four exchanges equipped with Siemens' equipment and Manitoba has but one. All the equipment in an exchange has to be of the same type. Every large board is especially made for the purpose; it is designed to fit the exchange in which it is to be used.

May I say that we have no prejudice against the British firm. Manitoba has one Siemens installation, as I have said, and we have four. I think that is the best proof that we are not prejudiced. I do not wish to cast any reflection on the Siemens' firm or even to suggest that their goods are not quite as good as the Northern Electric's. They are handicapped a little in that they have not the same engineering service in Canada and their deliveries are rather slow. I think I am not being unfair when I say that. After all, as I have tried to explain to my honourable friend, the question of price is not the main thing. If my honourable friend had been in charge of the Telephone Department and had put Canadian Independent equipment in the exchange in Regina, he would have scrapped it within five years and the last loss would have been greater than the first saving. As far as this phase of the department's activities is concerned, it is rather difficult to explain to a layman, but I am prepared to submit the department's record in connection with this matter to any impartial authority.

I think I spoke before about the employees who voted; and we heard a lot about a car that was burned. It is true that a car caught fire while in charge of one of the employees and we did not do anything about it except reprimand him. I am going to leave it to the Honourable Minister to decide what he would have done. Employees,

like other people, make mistakes and I venture to say they are a little better servants of the Province of Saskatchewan today because of the reasonable treatment they got in connection with that happening. We are told that one of our engineers took a motor car for a trip through Alberta. He is one of the men, a native of Saskatchewan, who has been trained by this department along with the training he got in an engineering college, and now occupies a responsible position in the department where he is in charge of construction. I am not making any apologies for him. There is nothing in the report to say he is not a capable engineer, not a thing to say that he is not a capable engineer. There is no complaint that the plant under his control is not in a high state of efficiency. This criticism of a man who has responsibilities involving millions of dollars, who took a trip to examine the telephone system in another province, seems paltry. I feel safe in saying that on the trip he learned many things of value to an engineer, which would not have been possible had he not had the use of a car and it is probable that the department gained many times over the small expense involved.

Then we have a divisional superintendent who took a car to British Columbia. This gentleman has been with the department a good many years, and is superintendent of Division No. 1. That means he has one-third of the province under his control, and is responsible for the operation and maintenance of telephone service in that area. The report does not say that service in his district is not satisfactory. It does not say the plant in his district is not well maintained. It does not say anything about that. But it says he took a Telephone Department car and went over the Windermere Highway. It is a criticism of a man who has some three or four million dollars' worth of plant under his charge and whose division collects annually for this department around a million dollars of revenue. That is the criticism of this employee. No criticism about the plant; no criticism about the service; no criticism about accounts—but he took a departmental car for a three weeks' holiday trip, and I venture to say that the man stopped twenty times in travelling through Saskatchewan west from Moose Jaw to look at our plant, and stopped at least fifty times in Alberta and British Columbia to look at telephone construction there.

Then we have another gentleman who is said to have taken a taxi from the C.P.R. station in Regina to his home a few blocks away.

Hon. Mr. Bryant: That's just a sample of the kind of thing that was going on all the time!

Mr. Patterson: Just a sample of the kind of criticism of this department.

This man has been chief inspector since 1908 and during that time he has been responsible for passing on 65,000 miles of rural telephone construction built at a cost of approximately \$18,000,000, and neither Munnoch nor the Minister of Telephones makes even any suggestion that he ever took one dollar improperly. Yet \$18,000,000 worth of rural telephone construction passed under his jurisdiction, and the criticism that is made of him in this House is that he took a taxicab to his home from the station one night when it was raining!

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Will the honourable gentleman say it was just one night?

Mr. Patterson: Supposing he did it a dozen times! After he had been out on the lines all day.

Furthermore, this man had only to take \$1.00 a mile from the contractors (those "crooks" referred to in this report) and he would have had some \$50,000 in his pocket today. But this man, R. Fuller, is known and well known all over this province, for his ability and for his integrity. Do you know what his total expenses are for the last five years? Only \$2,770! And the whole criticism is that he took a taxicab or rode in a parlor car—he has not even got a departmental automobile, though we did think of giving him the one the Minister took!

There is a considerable amount, indeed a special section, with reference to the rural telephone system of the province in the Munnoch report, and I may say it is nothing new to this House and it is not the first time this subject has been under debate in this Legislature. Those who are interested can look up the Sessional Papers of 1923 and on page 122 they will find the report of a speech made at the time in which I dealt with the whole question of costs very fully. The statements I made then have never since been refuted or contradicted and those who take the trouble to look up that speech will get a good deal of reliable information in that connection.

To get a proper viewpoint of the situation of the rural companies in 1930, you have to go back to the year 1908 and take into consideration the situation prevailing then. You must remember that in 1908, the Legislature decided in favour of public ownership of telephones in Saskatchewan. There was very limited development of telephones at the time, and the Government undertook to provide the long distance service and the urban service, the rural telephone companies supplying the rural service. The thing that actuated the Government in that decision was that there was no rural development and the Government probably felt that, with the work they would have on their hands with the development of urban and long distance lines, they could not undertake also to look after the rural lines. The question of how to provide for rural needs was investigated by Mr. Dagger in 1908 and he recommended in his report a system of rural telephone service whereby the people in any local district could organise local companies. In view of that report The Rural Telephones Act of 1908 was passed providing for the organisation of local companies. There are three Government-owned telephone systems in North America and they are in the Prairie Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In Manitoba and Alberta, the Government owns the rural as well as the urban plants, but Saskatchewan decided to leave rural development to the local companies. Now, if the whole object was to give telephone service to the farmers and residents in rural areas, we can unhesitatingly say that the Saskatchewan system is by far the best, for, after 22 years, Manitoba has 16,000 rural telephones including private lines, Alberta has 22,000 rural telephones and Saskatchewan has 70,000. If the development of rural telephones is the main factor, the Saskatchewan system has been by far the most successful. But other factors must be taken into consideration.

Outside of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, there is practically no place where any of the large commercial telephone companies try to give rural service. The Bell and other large companies in the United States have tried it, given it up and have turned it over to small companies. The large companies were never very anxious to get into the rural business, and there is a reason for that. The rural telephone is more a community affair than a business concern. It is used largely for local service and the regulations and routine of a large system do not operate very well under the conditions that exist in rural communities. Rural service demands a great deal of flexibility, there is wide variation in the service required, and rural lines are very expensive for a central organisation to operate and keep in first class repair. For instance if a Government operates the rural lines and there is a broken insulator on a line, the Government lineman may have to drive 50 miles to repair it. There are many expenses that can be saved by having the lines locally operated and maintained. The real reason why large companies do not go into the rural business is the heavy cost when operated by a large organisation. I admit the rurals do not give quite the same service, nor quite so good a service as the large company might give, but the average rural subscriber is not prepared to pay what it would cost large companies to operate rural lines. We all know that in Manitoba and Alberta the cry is raised that the rural subscribers have never paid for their rural telephones; the complaint is made that they do not pay their proper share of the cost . . .

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Does the honourable member mean that the city subscribers pay for that service?

Mr. Patterson: Yes. Not a doubt of it!

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Is Alberta the same?

Mr. Patterson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McConnell: Is consolidated revenue not drawn upon to help pay for it, too?

Mr. Patterson: It may be in Alberta, on some of the local lines. The whole thing is that rural lines cannot be operated economically by a large central organisation, whereas rural companies can operate at less cost, and the communities can have just the kind of service they are prepared to pay for. I know of rural companies in this province coming into the same central, some of which are prepared to pay for night service while others are not; and some keep their lines in better repair than others. Then there are some which contribute to keep a night operator, while in others none of the subscribers will contribute. In the rural districts, the system can be large or small—anything you like, to meet the local interest and the local conditions and requirements—the matter is arranged to suit the community of interest.

The Department of Telephones while primarily built to construct and operate the long distance and urban lines, was never forgetful of the rural interests and has given encouragement and assistance to rural companies. It has built in order to give inter-connection for the rural companies and so develop rural service. I say we did attempt and, I think, successfully to assist in developing rural service, and I think that, having in mind the situation throughout the years the department has been in operation, we can say that the Saskatchewan rural system has proved superior to Government ownership in this regard. If the farmers in any community were anxious to have local service, and provided that local service, then our department gave them long distance service, and every possible assistance otherwise, and so, Sir, we did our share to assist this rural development.

This investigator, Munnoch, refers to a statement in the annual report for the year ending April 30, 1924, where the then Deputy Minister points out that the policy of the department was to co-operate with the rural companies to get our long distance lines into the rural centres. The Deputy Minister in that connection states that policy was a policy of co-operation; but Munnoch is suspicious of it, to say the least, and it is to be remembered, too, that this is public ownership just as much as the Government system. Munnoch continually refers to the members of the companies by the term "shareholders," and argues that the municipality pays the cost for private owners. But this is a *community* enterprise, and any taxpayer can become a shareholder merely by subscribing for one share at \$5.00 a share, which entitles that taxpayer to membership and service. Yet Munnoch (or the Minister) says that there is a danger that one man may control a company by getting the majority of shares into his own hands. They forget that the Act specifically prevents any such thing by providing that a man can only have four shares! As I said before, a share really is in the nature of a membership entitling the holder to service.

The first Act we had in 1908 provided for the organisation of rural companies and under it, the Government undertook to supply free poles and the rurals had to find the cash for construction. A Rural Branch for the supervision of rural companies was created, the cost of the branch being borne by the Treasury. Quite a number of companies took advantage of this legislation and organised—I forget the number, but I think a total of somewhere in the vicinity of a million dollars was invested in the rurals under this Act. In 1913, a new Act was passed; the system of granting free poles was abandoned, and a new principle was introduced whereby the companies were allowed to tax the lands adjacent to the line for their construction costs. In the Munnoch report and in the Minister's speech, there is an accusation that the department favoured certain contractors and that plans were often altered to suit the contractor. Well, Sir, this is what happens when a rural company is organised. Some group of men in a community come to the decision that they would like to have a rural telephone system in that community, they write in to the department and the department sends out a supply of forms and full instructions outlining the organisation of a company. In the course of this preliminary work every man in the district is usually canvassed to see if he will subscribe to the telephone company. This is the first intimation in the district that a telephone company is being launched, and if 30, 40 or 50 men in the district are canvassed the proposal is pretty well advertised throughout the community. Yet Munnoch suggests that this organisation might be kept secret until a certain time! Well, the application comes forward to the department and if everything is in order the company is incorporated and the department prepares a plan of the line showing how it should be built, the road allowances to be followed and the type of construction to be used. In the early years of the department we also estimated what the system would cost, but later changed that for reasons I will shortly explain. The company sent the plans back to the department with any changes or corrections and now Munnoch says that the plans frequently were changed to suit some contractor. The specifications were never changed to suit any contractor, Grit or Tory. The plans were then bound in a book and were accessible to every contractor in the province who could then figure on the system proposed. The plans frequently were changed (not the specifications), far oftener than we liked because it made trouble for the department. Frequently the promoters would find this condition: Some men in the district would be opposed to the company and would not sign up but just when the company was about ready then men would change their minds and want to come in. So the company would write in for permission to add this or that subscriber to the plan and we had to accede to their request. So changes were frequently made in the plans at the request of the company. We sometimes found, too, that after a plan had been prepared with the line shown to be built along a certain road allowance, it would be found that a shorter line would serve by following another route, or by building a line in a certain place half a mile would be eliminated and

the plan would be changed accordingly. But to say these plans were changed to suit the contractor is absolutely untrue. The plans were prepared by the company in the first place and sent in to be completed by the department. After a company was organised and its plan authorised, the plan was placed in a book on the counter in the department where it was available to any contractor who liked to come along, whether he was friend or otherwise of the Government. This was a benefit to the company because it made for competition when letting a tender for construction of the system. These plans were put on file and they were available to whoever wished to see them. The contractor could prepare his tender from the plan and submit his price to the company.

Now, what assistance was given by the department? In the first place we helped to organise the company, we supplied them with specifications, and we did everything we possibly could to assist them in getting the best value for the money. The plan prepared by the department showed exactly how the line was to be built, the type of construction and full particulars. We supplied a form of agreement to use with the contractor. We advised them to advertise for tenders for the total cost of the line, for the construction alone and for the material alone, and I am sure every member in the House has seen advertisements for construction of rural telephone companies in this province. We aided them in every way. We did everything we possibly could to insure that the company got all the assistance we could give them in the construction of the system and we did everything we could to see that they got competitive bids. Then when they called for tenders we made an estimate of the cost, and set the amount which the company could borrow. We supplied them with specifications and asked them to come to us if they needed help of any kind. When the line was built, to insure that the company had got satisfactory workmanship, we advised the company to report to us on any inefficiencies and if there was anything wrong the contractor was forced to go back and put the line into proper shape. And, finally, when it was passed the company was linked up with the Government system.

Now, during the years they have been in existence these rural companies have had troubles and the department has, by advice and otherwise, assisted them to overcome these difficulties. Mr. Munnoch criticises the cost of the inspection system in Saskatchewan last year on the grounds that only 100 miles were inspected. But those inspectors did hundreds of other things, and did much for the rural companies besides inspecting new lines. It is nothing unusual for an inspector to visit a rural system where they wanted to link up two systems, or amalgamate two systems, or take them into one central, to go there and plan for them the best construction methods to be followed. I sincerely hope the Minister will not take too seriously Munnoch's recommendation that the Rural Branch should be abolished. I believe that, in view of the number of companies in Saskatchewan, the money invested and the amount of material they have in the province, there is ample scope and reason for the Rural Branch continuing to function.

As I have said, we checked construction, we assisted the rural companies in every way we could. In his sweeping condemnation of rural companies, Munnoch says that the local directors knew nothing of good business methods. I would like to tell him that a man does not need to be a scientific telephone engineer to be careful and business-like in awarding contracts for a telephone system. I will admit mistakes were made. Some of the companies may have overpaid for their plant, but I submit that the great majority of the directors of the rural companies use their best business judgment in making decisions in connection with the company's work, as they do in connection with school districts, municipalities, agricultural societies and other similar organisations. If they act in the best interests of these different organisations, I do not see why their capacity should be doubted when they become directors of telephone companies. Munnoch refers to a case where the department did not accept the lowest tender. This was the North Forres Rural Lines, and in connection with that particular case, the situation was brought about by very peculiar circumstances. The North Forres Rural Company is the largest in the Province of Saskatchewan with a central at Forres and one trunk line running to Hatton. Owing to a series of crop failures in that part of the country, the subscribers got behind in their payments and last spring the line was blown down. Last year was a good year in that part of the province, and they would have caught up with their payments, but this calamity was the last straw. The directors came to Regina to see us about getting some help with financing their replacements, as they could not float the necessary debentures, and the Local Government Board said that they would need special legislation. But the Government did not think it necessary to call the Legislature into session for this particular purpose, so we took the responsibility and agreed to help the company

rebuild its lines. In the meantime, they are to repay us a specified sum each year. Now, Sir, I submit we did the best thing under the circumstances.

The thing Munnoch criticises is that one contractor put in a tender for less than the one who received the contract to rebuild the lines. I want to say this about this particular contractor: He is the man who supplied Munnoch with most of the information embodied in this report, and that is significant of the type of man he is. He is a man who received several contracts from rural companies, and he did not complete any one of them satisfactorily. His reputation is such that, as long as I was Minister, he could not get a contract from the department—no, not if he had offered to do it for nothing! The man who got the contract on that occasion, was a reliable and trustworthy man, who pays his workmen, does excellent work and fulfils any contract he makes.

Another thing this department did for the rurals was to provide schools of instruction at which local men from any rural company could be trained to act as trouble men for their particular company. Munnoch says these schools were not much good, but we have hundreds of letters from companies thanking us for those schools at which instruction was given free of charge by the department. Usually young men came in from the rural companies and got instruction from our staff on how to deal with the common troubles on rural lines. Today many farmers and farm boys are "trouble men" for their local companies, and so help to keep down maintenance expenses on the rural lines. Some of them graduated into a wider field of electrical work and some are now in the employ of the department as linemen.

Munnoch says that a great deal of money was wasted on inspections, but says he had no time to check on the expenses. Apparently it was only the dead men he had had time to check up on!

What is the result of the co-operation between the Government and the rural companies? As a result of the assistance that has been given by the department, we have 1,200 rural telephone companies with 62,000 pole miles serving 70,000 subscribers, and the investment in rural companies aggregated the huge total of \$17,750,000. We have more rural telephones in this province than in Manitoba and Alberta combined.

Another thing, Munnoch, this financial prestidigitator, says is that the capital invested in rural telephones amounts to \$24,000,000 but to arrive at that figure he adds the interest to the capital investment, which, as I stated a moment ago, is \$17,750,000. Now, Sir, that means this: If the people built a school in your part of the country at a cost of \$4,000, according to Munnoch's reasoning you would be foolish indeed if you thought that it was a \$4,000 school. It would be much more than that because he would add all the interest on the debentures to the \$4,000, and you would have a \$5,000 or \$6,000 school. The companies are "over the hump" so far as debentures are concerned, for more than half of them have been paid off.

Munnoch says, further, that the companies were tremendously overcharged, but if you look up the average cost of installation per subscriber since 1923 and compare the average cost with that in the provinces on each side of us, you will find that the Saskatchewan rate, averaging \$250 per subscriber, is very reasonable. Manitoba does not show rurals separately from urbans, but you will find that the rural costs are lower in Saskatchewan than in Alberta. The cost has come down in Alberta, but even today the average cost in Saskatchewan is less than that in Alberta. Yet Munnoch says the companies are bled! Here is how you can use statistics if you want to.

In 1929 Manitoba added thirty-seven new rural subscribers and the capital cost was \$14,000. That would be \$375 a subscriber against \$250 in Saskatchewan. In the same year Alberta added two hundred and fifteen, or something like that, and the average cost was \$600 a subscriber. Well, that is so outrageously unreasonable it cannot be used as a fair test. The fact of the matter is that both provinces took out a number of rural telephones and put in a number and the figures quoted are based on the net increase. You cannot go on those figures, but I will say that, by and large, rural companies in Saskatchewan get their systems installed at just as reasonable a rate as any in western Canada and are getting as good service as any rural system in Canada.

About these contractors, who are accused of putting in "fake" tenders or bids: I wonder if anybody in this House who knows Mr. S. L. Ross would seriously believe he would do a thing like that. I wonder if anybody in this House who knows Mr. Fred Somerville would seriously believe it of him. But Munnoch makes the statement and these men are all implicated. There were twenty or thirty prominent telephone

contractors who did contracting work and they were not all Liberals—they were about fifty-fifty; and I can name a Conservative contractor for every Liberal. One of them, Mr. Speaker, has been offered the position of Deputy Minister

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The statement is not correct. There has been no discussion at all about the present Deputy Minister, and there is none in the report. He is an efficient Deputy Minister.

Mr. Patterson: I think this report is a fine way of showing it then! When we remember that he was an engineer during the early history of this department that the system was bought largely on his representations and that he had, for a long period, the plant under his control, this is a fine way of showing appreciation of an efficient Deputy Minister!

Munnoch says in this report that only a few friends could "break into the contracting game." Mr. Munnoch himself reports 32 contractors—as a matter of fact there were about fifty. Every season there were new men coming into the game, just as the Minister of Highways will find in connection with his highway contracts. There was the keenest competition and there is no sense in any responsible man getting up and suggesting that only a few could "break into the game" when the work was distributed amongst forty or fifty men. In regard to the Ponteix case which is referred to, I shall discuss the matter later. This investigator says that the contractors made profits of 40 or 50 per cent., and that "fabulous sums were made"—yet there was no competition, 40 or 50 contractors, and if there had been that much money in it, it is only logical to expect that hundreds would be going into the business. He says, further, that big profits were made on the purchase of material paid for by the companies but ordered by the contractors. I believe it was the practice of the supply houses to allow a discount on the material purchased in some instances. Take a man like W. D. Craig (incidentally, a life-long Conservative) who was in the business in Manitoba before coming to Saskatchewan. He would buy thousands of dollars worth of equipment from the supply house dealt with and, because the supply house could trust him and knew there would be no difficulty about collecting its money, and I presume, in consequence of his credit and standing, they thought it good business to give him a discount. I think, possibly, Mr. Somerville, too, would be allowed a discount on the material that he purchased. In the Ponteix case I believe that a full investigation of the facts of that case would only confirm me when I say that the people of this province have good business judgment and usually exercise it. In the Ponteix case, the company thought the first tenders too high, advertised again and awarded the contract to a man who cut the price (because, as is admitted, contracts were scarce that year) and lost \$4,000 on the job.

Reference is also made to the fact that there is no association of rural companies. Well, Sir, there used to be an Association of Rural Telephone Companies back in 1919, 1920 and 1921, but it went out of existence because there were no serious complaints and that hardly indicates that the companies were in "open rebellion," as the Minister suggests. We had complaints, of course. One of those (and I hope the Minister will accede to the request) is in regard to a commission on long distance accounts. Personally I have always been favourable to that idea, although I admit it is not strictly in accord with business principles. They have also complained that the switching fees are too high. Then we have some companies urging that the cost of operating the systems should be collected through the tax roll and not directly from the subscribers. Personally, I do not think that it is a practical scheme. I think operation costs should be collected directly by the companies. Other than these there have been no serious complaints, and I would say it is a significant fact that there is not an association of the telephone companies. We have 1,200 of these companies in the province, and if they had grievance of a serious nature, it is safe to assume that they would find some means of giving voice to their complaints.

Munnoch also condemns the rural companies because their annual reports are not in "apple-pie" order; and I think it is possibly true that some are not, but I may say it is rather a joke on the auditor that some of the forms he criticises were sent in by chartered accountants who audited the books of the companies. The only way in which we can ensure that the rural companies send in their annual reports properly is to prosecute them, and as we pay them no grant it is doubtful if we can do that. But the Minister, if he so desires, can take legal proceedings.

Munnoch also condemns the companies on another count. He says that there are 4,000 quarter sections which are not taxed although published in *The Saskatchewan Gazette* as liable for taxation. I do not know how to get the information for there is

nothing on file and the only way to prove that statement is to make a survey of the tax rolls of every municipality in the province. I am quite sure that was never done by this special investigator. It merely goes to show that this man is not always careful in the statements he makes. I am not going to argue that certain quarter sections are taxed that should not be taxed, or vice versa. As I have said, there are 1,200 companies in the province and I would be quite surprised if some mistakes had not been made. As a matter of fact, we were finding them from time to time, but as quickly as they were found they were corrected. But I want to say this, that not a single quarter section published in the *Gazette* as liable for taxation has been exempted from taxation by any action of the Department of Telephones. Of course, secretaries may make mistakes; but, because of the impression left on the people of the province by this statement of Munnoch, I repeat that there has not been one quarter section published in the *Gazette* as liable for telephone taxation that has been exempted by the Telephone Department. We have transferred some from one company to another. We have made special provision for special circumstances, but of the lists appearing in the *Gazette* we did not exempt a single quarter. Sometimes, a company may add a new subscriber without reporting to the department. If any are exempted that should be taxed, I am sure they are not sufficient to make it as serious as this special investigator would have us believe. As I have said there is no way by which he could get the information definitely except by making a survey of the tax rolls of every municipality in the province.

However, the Minister is pleased to present to this House a report prepared by this "efficiency expert," and joins in the general condemnation of all the rural telephone companies in the province. He says the directors know nothing of good business methods. He says they allowed the contractors to "gyp" them! He says they were cheated and grafted upon, first, last and all the time. He brands 6,000 directors of rural telephone companies in Saskatchewan as the worst kind of incompetents! They were led as lambs to the slaughter, and the Minister says that what cost \$25,000,000 is only worth \$8,000,000. One thing that has struck me forcibly in connection with the people of this province is the business ability they show in the management of their organisations, agricultural societies, pools, municipal councils, school boards and hospital boards. In these activities the people have proved their capacity to do things in a business-like way, and it is the same kind of men (in some cases the same men) who are successful school trustees, councillors, executive members of various community organisations, who are also running the rural telephone companies. The Minister may condemn these men if he likes, but in my opinion they are just as capable, and have proved themselves just as capable, as any Minister of any of the departments of the present Government.

My honourable friend says that there is a great agitation to have the rurals and the government system sold to a private corporation.

Premier Anderson: That is wrong!

Mr. Patterson: I do not think that was what he meant to say, but he said the agitation is on; he said the rurals are up in "open rebellion" but it is a strange thing that there is nothing of all this in the platforms of the political parties in the province. Usually at least one of the parties takes up the matter when there is any sweeping demand for reform. I know there is nothing of the kind in the Liberal Platform. There is nothing of the kind in the Tory platform; the only reference to the Telephone Department in the Tory platform is plank 22, which says that the receipts and expenditures of the Telephone Department should be printed in the Public Accounts. Apparently the Tories knew nothing of this "rebellion" for that is all that is in their platform with reference to the Telephone system. Oh, yes! There is another plank which states that tenders should be called for all contracts over \$500, and I suppose they will call for tenders so that the Northern Electric may bid against itself when the department wants to put in additional automatic equipment in the Regina exchange. The Progressive platform does not mention the Telephone system at all. So there is nothing in any of the platforms to indicate there was any agitation or "rebellion" of the kind mentioned by the Minister.

I have here a copy of an article which appeared in "Telephony" dealing with the rural telephones of Saskatchewan, and which was reproduced in the *Financial Post*. It is written by a man who signs himself "Financial Investigator."

Premier Anderson: What is his name?

Mr. Patterson: I do not know. He writes under the name "Financial Investigator"—and he knows whereof he speaks. He says this, with reference to the Saskatchewan rural system:

"The success of the scheme is the measure of its usefulness to the community, and the following figures are eloquent testimony to its success."

Then he quotes the number of rural telephones in Saskatchewan, taken from the annual report, and compares it with other provinces, notably Manitoba and Alberta. This article winds up as follows:

"The rural telephone systems in Saskatchewan are a wonderful achievement—an achievement which has fully justified the policy of the Government in placing the costs of giving service up to those persons who receive the benefits of that service."

That is what "Telephony" says.

We listened the other night to a long rambling of criticism of the system; but condemnation is the usual practice of the Minister and what we have come to expect since the new Government took office. But we did not hear a word from the Minister about the future. He did not tell us if he is going to raise or lower the rates; he did not tell us what development was planned, where he was proposing to build or extend. He did not tell us whether any of the smaller cities, such as Weyburn, were going to be equipped with the automatic system, and he did not tell us what progress had been made in getting automatic equipment suitable for small exchanges. I may say that this equipment at the time I was Minister was prohibitive in cost, but the department was working on the problem and trying to get suitable equipment at prices within reason. He did not tell us what improvements in the service we might expect under his regime, whether or not we are to have monthly billing in Regina; if the system is ready for the expected service demands, and whether or not Regina requires a new sub-exchange. We listened for an hour and a half to condemnation and criticism, but heard never a word of future plans—not a word! Last, but not least, he did not tell us whether or not he is going to adopt the "comic" sliding scale of rates proposed by the Provincial Treasurer!

We heard no outline of future plans, but we heard lots of suggestions of graft and corruption, of maladministration, of money stolen. Lots of suggestions! But when it comes down to actual statements of fact, Munnoch is not so decided. You remember what he said with reference to the sale of junk which he said was not accounted for, and which he also said was accounted for? He says he heard a great deal of innuendo (we have heard a great deal from him, too!) but he is not able to find any evidence in support of it—he says he has not had time! One of the men who gave him much of the information in this report was a discharged employee of the department. In another place he says:

"We have heard many rumors and there seems to be a general impression that graft has been general. We have not as yet been able to establish the point whether the operations of the contractors could be classified within the meaning of the word 'conspiracy,' we propose to seek legal advice and will, if you desire, report further on the matter."

That's his statement. He is going to find out from some legal authority if some contractors can be said to have "conspired"!

The effect of this report, the effect of the Minister's speech and the effect of the report as published in the newspapers (though in my mind not serious as criticisms of the department) have tended to create an impression in the minds of the people of the province, that there has been wrong-doing in the department. In fairness to the employees of the department, in fairness to the directors of the rural companies in the province, in fairness to the contractors who have done work for the department and in fairness to members of the former Government, I am going to move, seconded by Mr. Clinch, that those allegations, those innuendoes, those rumors and "all matters regarding the Department of Telephones referred to in the reports of O. J. Godfrey and Company and G. B. Munnoch and Company of Calgary be referred to the Royal Commission which this Legislature has humbly petitioned His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint."