the Saskatchewan Government on October 13, 1913, and we recommend that report for perusal by your committee, because it shows that even at that time, agriculture was in a precarious position, largely through an unjust and expensive banking and credit system.

On page 65 of the report it states that: "All thoughtful citizens will regard the present situation as calling for serious attention", and on page 216 we find that in the opinion of the Commission, "The present banking system is inadequate."

We believe that if the recommendations of the 1913 Commission had been carried out by the government, there would have been an improvement in conditions at that time. But again the government failed us. However, after further representations to the Provincial Government, the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board Legislation was passed in 1917, but unfortunately it could not at that time function for the lack of capital.

BANK INTEREST WAS AND IS TOO HIGH

In spite of continued refusals by governments to take the action necessary to meet our just requirements, we nevertheless continued with the task to secure credits at lower interest rates. We recommended amendments to the Bank Act whenever same was before parliament for revision. In this effort, we were ably supported by farm organizations in other provinces. We have repeatedly requested that the Act be amended and the necessary legislation be enacted which would make possible, that municipalities and provinces obtain credit at cost by placing securities with the Dominion Finance Department. Also we requested that the Bank Act should provide a penalty when banks charge more than the interest rate established by law and contained in the Bank Act.

The justice of the need for such penalty action is well proven by a district court judgment given by Judge McLorg in the case of Royal Bank vs. Pete Perapalkin et al. of 1924, which is recorded in the Saskatoon Judicial district as number 528. The bank had sued and obtained judgment; the defendant appealed the case, on the ground of excessive interest rates charged by the bank, and in sustaining the appeal, the judge said in part as follows:—

> Here the plaintiffs deliberately take security, and exact from the debtor two per cent more than the law, under which their charter was granted them, allows; having done that in default by the debtor they sign judgment for this amount to which they are not entitled which is a premeditated calculated action on their part, in defiance of the act. I can see no justification for it, and I am of the opinion that if in such cases the judgment allowed them to amend, it would simply encourage this state of affairs. At the hearing I was not definitely asked to set aside the execution, the defendant's solicitor considering, I expect that the judgment being set aside, the execution must naturally fall, and that I think, is so. But the execution is registered against the defendant's lands, and to obviate the necessity of any further application I think the whole matter should be dealt with now, and I will consequently make an order setting aside the judgment and the executions, with a direction to the registrar to expunge the writ of execution. The defendant will be entitled to his costs of the application.
>
> Dated at Saskatoon this 10th day of March, A.D. 1931.
>
> Signed E. A. C. McLorg, L.D.C.