

NATURAL RESOURCES

AGREEMENT WITH THE PROVINCE OF
SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to confirm the agreement between the governments of the Dominion and the province of Saskatchewan dated 20th March, 1930, respecting the transfer of the natural resources of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. CAHAN: I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that some days ago he laid on the table of the house correspondence between this government and the government of Saskatchewan dealing with the transfer of the natural resources. Copies were ordered printed but up until one o'clock to-day it was impossible to obtain a copy of that printed document. I had expected that we would have the printed copies available before it became necessary to discuss either the principle or the details of such a measure as that embodied in this resolution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry to learn that the correspondence has not been printed. If my hon. friend would prefer that we should not proceed on that account, I am quite agreeable.

Mr. CAHAN: I have no objection to advancing the legislation, but it must be understood that when we come to the second reading of the measure and in committee, we shall be allowed pretty broad scope for a discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh certainly.

Mr. COOTE: Would the Prime Minister be good enough to explain to the committee in general terms what the agreement provides, and particularly as to how it differs, if at all, from the agreements that have been made with the other two prairie provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is only one clause that differs from the agreement with Alberta, and that is the clause which provides for certain questions being referred to the courts. Has my hon. friend not got a copy of the agreement?

Mr. COOTE: No.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They have been available in the distribution office for some weeks. After all, the agreement is the bill itself. The only difference is that pro-

vision is here made to submit for the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada questions agreed upon between the parties to the agreement as being appropriate upon which to obtain the judgment of the said court, subject to an appeal to His Majesty.

Mr. LUCAS: Did the minister say that copies were available in the distribution office?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: I sent down there to-day but could not get a copy.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am surprised. They were ordered printed and I asked my secretary to see that they were available for distribution: I will see that copies are made available.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Is it the intention of the government to turn over to the province the natural resources prior to the decision to be given by the supreme court or the privy council on the questions that are to be submitted?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes. It is the intention to turn over these resources on the date as provided in the agreement, once assent has been given to the bill. The question whether or not the courts might decide that additional consideration be given for the alienated resources would come up later. It was never intended to withhold the resources until the decision of the court had been given.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Section 28 says that the agreement shall come into force after being ratified by the imperial parliament, and that apparently will not be done until after the court has given its decision on these questions.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No. The agreement for the reference to the court is a separate agreement. The agreement with Alberta is for a commission to take into consideration whether or not there are reasons why the province should receive additional consideration to that provided in the agreement for the resources alienated between 1905 and the present day, but that does not mean that the resources will be held until a decision has been given by that commission; nor does it apply in the case of Saskatchewan.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Take for instance section 6, relating to the school lands funds and school lands. It says that upon the coming into force of this agreement such and such will be done, and section 28 tells us when the agreement will come into force. It

looks from a reading of the agreement as though the lands will be turned over only when the agreement comes into force.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Quite right.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: And the agreement comes into force only when the imperial parliament gives its assent?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Quite right, but the decision of the court on the questions submitted may not have been given then, and it may be possible that the commission dealing with Alberta may not have reported at that date.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Does the minister anticipate that the imperial parliament will give its consent to this agreement before the decision of the court?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. DUNNING: Why not?

Mr. CAHAN: The Saskatchewan agreement contains terms which differ very materially from the terms of the Alberta agreement, which forms a schedule to one of the bills. I notice in the press within the last two or three days that apparently since the bill with respect to the Alberta resources was introduced into this house, with a certain schedule attached, an amended agreement has been made with the government of Alberta incorporating new terms, or other terms such as we now find in the Saskatchewan agreement, and I was wondering whether it was the intention of the government to introduce a new bill with regard to Alberta or to amend the agreement.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is nothing to amend in the agreement. We are simply extending to Alberta, if they so desire, the same privilege that we are extending to Saskatchewan, to submit for the consideration of the courts similar or the same questions that may be agreed upon in the case of Saskatchewan.

Mr. CAHAN: Will there be a clause in the Alberta agreement to that effect?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In the bill, yes.

Mr. CAHAN: It will be a second bill?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. CAHAN: So you intend to amend the bill, but not amend the schedule?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Stewart (Edmonton)

[Mr. Carmichael.]

thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 58 respecting the transfer of the natural resources of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MAPLE SUGAR INDUSTRY

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Acting Minister of Agriculture) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the better organization and development of the maple sugar industry, to prevent adulteration, to authorize regulations, and to provide for the payment of fees for registration, analysis and licenses.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, as it is now approaching six o'clock, I suppose we might pass this resolution on the same understanding as we reached in regard to the preceding resolution, that we have ample opportunity to discuss it when it comes before the house on second reading.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister give a short outline of the proposed legislation?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Briefly, the bill provides for regulation of the maple sugar industry by way of registration of the factories where maple products are produced, and of the principal producing woods, and for inspection to prevent adulteration, giving fairly wide powers to the inspectors, and providing penalties for infractions of the act.

Mr. CAHAN: It is a very important measure in my province.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes; and it is brought in on the suggestion and at the request of a considerable number of members from the province of Quebec.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would it apply to the individual farmer making maple sugar in his bush?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, if adulteration was taking place, that is, providing he was putting his product on the market.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Stewart (Edmonton) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 59 respecting the maple sugar industry.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.