

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
28th Day

Tuesday, March 18, 1952

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

ON ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference to an editorial contained in the Leader-Post, entitled, "They Made a Mistake — So What." One statement in this editorial was:

"Mr. Brockelbank suggested that, as a private fish dealer and a former Liberal candidate in Manitoba, Mr. Johanneson had an ulterior motive in conveying the fish to the wrong destination."

The Leader-Post objected to Mr. Johanneson being mentioned in such a way — as they say — "singling out" Mr. Johanneson for the "full treatment." Well, I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have some sympathy with the Editor of the Leader-Post in this. Maybe it was too rough to mention the record of the past; for example, the fact that he was a Liberal candidate previously, and perhaps I should not have mentioned that.

SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER DAM PROJECT

Moved by Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley), seconded by Mr. James Gibson (Morse):

That this Assembly regrets the unwarranted delay in proceeding with the South Saskatchewan River Dam Project, in the face of ample evidence of its practical feasibility, and urges that, in view of its economic and social value to the country as a whole, the Government of Canada proceed with the project without further delay.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the motion which stands on the Order Paper in my name, I want to say something about the principal industry in Saskatchewan, which is agriculture; and I want to try to indicate some of the reasons why I think the unanimous passage of this motion is important to the future prosperity and stability of agriculture, in Saskatchewan.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I do not speak on this matter of farming from any direct personal connection with the industry at the present moment, but in the 35 years that I have spent in this province, the greater part of that time has been spent in being actively engaged in the farming industry. I may say that . . .

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Where were you the rest of the time?

Mr. Walker: — Well, as I think my hon. friend well knows, I served my stint with the R.C.A.F., but prior to that I was more directly connected with agriculture than I think my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has been, in the last 25 or 30 years.

March 18, 1952

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled, in this Legislature, to make some observations about the practice of agriculture in Saskatchewan, and the events which have overtaken it in the last 20 or 30 years. Those who are old-timers in the farming industry of Saskatchewan will remember that there has been a terrific change — almost a revolutionary change — in the way farming has been carried on.

You will recall that the old-timers believed that, when they came to Saskatchewan, they had found a veritable agricultural paradise. They were convinced that Saskatchewan held a future for hundreds of thousands of self-sustained, economic quarter-section farming units. The old-timers will tell you about the experiences which they had here in the early days; about the tall grass that grew on the western plains, about the myriads of lakes and sloughs which dotted the landscape; and it seems a little hard, to those of us who do not remember those days, to appreciate the transformation which has taken place in our western plains during the last 30 or 35 years.

It is instructive, Mr. Speaker, to read some of the speeches and some of the books and articles that were written in those early days, to see something of the vision that the old Empire builders of 50 years ago had for the future prospects of this Province. Today, we see a country which has been described — in fact, maligned by many — as being a semi-arid desert, or wilderness. What a transformation has taken place is only apparent to those old-timers who remember our western plains as they were at the turn of the century.

So the pattern of farm settlement has been changing progressively from those early days; changing from a pattern where one self-sufficient family occupied a quarter or half-section, into a number of vast grain ranches. Those are changes about which we are to have a Royal Commission, to find some facts about. But those changes have been made necessary by a number of technological improvements in the farming industry over the past half-century. They have also been made necessary, to no small degree, to the fact that we did not truly appreciate the potentialities, or the capacity, of our prairie land, at the time this land was first settled.

It soon became apparent, Mr. Speaker, to the people who broke and tilled these vast areas of prairie, that the soil, the land and the rainfall were not adapted to intensive farming such as it is known in central Europe and in the rich farming areas of Ontario. It is not adaptable to that kind of farming, because of the lack of rainfall during the growing season, which characterizes these prairie plains.

Many people, during the early part of the present century, were under the impression that something had taken place — some change had taken place in weather conditions. It was regarded by many of the pioneers that we had commenced a period of relative drought early in the 'twenties, and that, surely, sooner or later, the abundance of the rainfall during the early part of the century would return. As a matter of fact, the rainfall statistics do not support the theory that Saskatchewan is drier, today, than it was 50 years ago. They do not support the theory that we are enjoying less rainfall than was enjoyed by the early settlers. Yet, what is the explanation of the drying up of the lakes and sloughs, and the falling of the water table?

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the moisture reserves of our soil can be likened to a bank account, in which the falling rain replenishes the balance, and the evaporation into the air, the moisture used by the growing crops, depletes the balance on hand. Since the rainfall statistics show that the amount of rainfall has not materially altered in the last 50 years, the inescapable conclusion is that the loss of moisture, through evaporation, has increased to a much higher rate than existed in the days when this land was all covered with grass.

It is obvious to anyone who is familiar with farming, and the operations of farm land, that a bare surface or a bare field will radiate its moisture much more rapidly than a soil covered with grass or trash cover. In the early days, when the knolls and the higher land were put to the plough, the evaporation rate increased so fast on those newly cultivated acres, that there was little or no run-off to replenish the lakes and the sloughs, and as the water disappeared from those lakes and sloughs, they too were put to the plough, until, in the early 1930s, it was possible to drive for hundreds of miles in Saskatchewan without seeing water lying anywhere in the fields or on the roads.

Such a contrast to the spectacle that met the eye in the early days, of 50 years ago! And the reasons attributed to that fact were that we had not skilled ourselves sufficiently in the control of moisture — modern farming practices are overcoming that problem of high evaporation. However, we must not let ourselves be kidded that the good old days of heavy rainfall are to return to us. There were no long periods of heavy rainfall prior to settlement. Our average annual rainfall, today, is approximately the same as it was in the 1910s or in the 1880s.

As a result of mismanagement of our prairie soil, this region earned for itself the title of a semi-arid desert, and was, as I say, much maligned not only by people living in this prairie area, but by people who were not familiar with it. There were those who said it was wasteland, and that the people had better be moved out. Well, those of us living in Saskatchewan, and who know Saskatchewan, have confidence that this prairie area will continue to produce untold quantities of wealth if it is given the proper care and the proper chance.

We realize that there are really two moisture problems affecting the prairies. First of all, there is the fact that rainfall is never as great here as it is in, let us say, Ontario, or in southern Quebec, and our farming methods have been adapted to meet that problem. There is another problem, Mr. Speaker — a rainfall problem, and that is the whole variability from one year to the next, in the amount of precipitation falling during the growing season. We have one year that is extremely wet and then it is followed by a year that is extremely dry. I think, Mr. Speaker, that both these problems can be illustrated by reference to rainfall figures in Saskatchewan and in the provinces of say, Ontario or Quebec.

I have taken the rainfall figures for Sherbrooke, Quebec, and have compared them with the rainfall figures at Outlook, Saskatchewan. At Sherbrooke, Quebec, during the seven years from 1943 to 1949 inclusive, we find that in the wettest year there was 23.4 inches of rainfall during the

March 18, 1952

growing season. Comparing that with Outlook we find that, during the wettest year, there was 13.99 inches, and in the driest of these years, 4.85.

So there you have the problems indicated statistically. First of all, we have about one-half the rainfall that Sherbrooke, Quebec, gets during the growing season. But you will note that the other problem is even more sharply focused, Mr. Speaker. In Sherbrooke, Quebec, the wettest year was 23.4 and the driest, 14.55, which is not a very wide spread. Outlook, Saskatchewan, during the wettest year was 13.99; and the driest year, 4.85, during that period. So you see the sharp contrast between one year and the next that afflicts us here in Saskatchewan. The risk attendant upon farming in Saskatchewan is even more apparent, if you take a longer period.

I find, upon reviewing the rainfall statistics in the Outlook area, that there has been five years when the total precipitation, during the growing season, was less than four inches. In 1914 – 2.63 inches; in 1918 – 2.23; in 1922 – 3.95; in 1924 0.88; in 1934 – 3.63. Anyone who is familiar with farm operations in a loam district such as Outlook knows, that in each of those years, the farmers were visited with disaster and devastation. Each of those years was a complete crop failure, apart from, possibly, a few scattered spots where a shower fell.

To appreciate the seriousness of those five disaster years — five in a period of twenty years — to appreciate the magnitude of the famine of those years, just notice that none of those years occurred after 1934, and yet from 1934 up to date there have been many years when the farmers of that area received crop-failure bonuses.

The seriousness of that situation, Mr. Speaker, is not so much that the farmers of that area had no income during those years. The seriousness of it comes mainly from the fact that a great part of their operating expenses went on just as if there had been a crop. And when you have a complete disaster in one year out of four, the plight and the problems of those people in building a solid and firm, prosperous agricultural community can be appreciated. You just calculate by rule of thumb, that the farmer should earn at least 20 per cent of his income for profit, or reward for his own endeavour, but if that 20 per cent is wiped out by one failure in five, then you have no net returns to those people in a twenty year period.

Mr. Speaker, if we go back and read some of the early reports of the explorers and engineers who first explored this country, you wonder whether such stories are complete. I want to just refer you, Mr. Speaker, to a couple of extracts from the report of Captain John Palliser. Many of us are not aware of the detailed study which Captain Palliser made within the limits of his botanical knowledge (and it was considerable) of this prairie region. In 1857, he was sent out to explore these Canadian plains by the British Government, with a view to reporting whether it would be wise to link eastern Canada with the Pacific Coast by rail, and he wandered in these western prairies for some four years, and during that time he gathered considerable information. On page 16 of his report, he says as follows:

“The fertile savannahs and valuable woodlands of the Atlantic United States are succeeded on the west by a more or less arid desert, occupying the region on both sides of the Rocky Mountains, which presents a barrier to the continuous growth of settlements between the Mississippi Valley and the States on the Pacific Coast.

“This central desert extends, however, but a short way into the British territory, forming a triangle, having for its base the 49th parallel (that is the U.S. boundary) from longitude 100, (which is a point just south of Portage la Prairie) to 114, west longitude, (the point just where the U.S. boundary meets the foothills of the Rocky Mountains), and with its apex reaching to the 52nd parallel of latitude, just south of the north Saskatchewan River.”

That, Mr. speaker, is how the Palliser Triangle was first described. He goes on, in the report, to describe a survey which he conducted along the south Saskatchewan River, from a point near the foothills to its junction with the north Saskatchewan River, near Prince Albert, and this is an extract from his report on that exploration:

“The South Saskatchewan River, which, in its upper part, is called the Bow River, resembles the North Saskatchewan in size, volume of water, and its general direction, but it passes through a very different description of country — through a region of arid plains, devoid of timber or pasture of good quality; even on the alluvial points in the bottom of the valley, trees and shrubs occur only in a few isolated patches. The steep and lofty sides of the valley are composed of calcareous mounds and clays that are baked into a compact mass under the heat of the parching sun.”

He goes on to say:

“The sage and cactus abound; and the whole of the scanty vegetation bespeaks an arid climate. Towards the confluence of the Red Deer River and the South Saskatchewan (that is at a point near what is now called Empress), there are extensive sandy wastes. For 60 miles to the east of this point, the country was not examined by the expedition, but at the elbow the same arid description of the country was met with, and it seems certain that this prevails throughout the entire distance. Below the elbow, between the elbow and Prince Albert, the banks of the river and also the adjacent plains begin to improve rapidly as the river flows in a north-easterly course.”

March 18, 1952

That was his report. Twenty or twenty-five years later the railway explorers, surveyors and engineers traversed much of that same country, and they came back with optimistic reports, as I have already indicated.

The judgment of today, looking back on both those sets of reports is, Mr. Speaker, that this area is neither an arid wasteland or desert, nor is it a potential agricultural paradise. It is somewhere between those two extremes, and what is more, it varies from one year to another. The year 1937 undoubtedly was a year similar to the year which Palliser was familiar with. Undoubtedly was a year similar to the year which the explorers and the surveyors for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Saskatchewan has fluctuated between those two extremes.

So, it was little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people who lived along these banks of the South Saskatchewan River did speak, from time to time, about harnessing the flow of that mighty river, to bring nourishment to the parching, scorching crops on the table lands above its banks.

Investigations were made by the Department of the Interior as long ago as 50 years, to examine the possibilities of irrigation along the South Saskatchewan River. Earlier reports, such as the Pearce report, proposed a very complex and costly programme of irrigation, which would divert the waters of the North Saskatchewan river in a south-easterly direction, to irrigate eastern central Alberta, and the area around Elrose and Kindersley, and then syphon it across the South Saskatchewan river to irrigate large areas in southwestern Saskatchewan. That project was abandoned because the cost of the project was prohibitive.

And so, in more recent years, greater attention was given to the possibility of building a dam between Saskatoon and Empress. During this exploration a suitable site was found near the mouth of the Coteau Creek, flowing into the South Saskatchewan river, near Elbow. During the recent World War, the Federal Department of Agriculture, under the P.F.R.A., appointed a Commission to examine into the feasibility of such a project, to examine into the question of the availability of irrigable land in that vicinity, and to examine the other aspects of such a project.

The Committee gave an interim report in 1949, and it was generally favourable to the project. Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Gardiner, speaking in the House of Commons, have both claimed the paternity of that project. Mr. Coldwell goes even further and says he suggested it in the House of Commons, in 1935 or 1936, and that Mr. Gardiner threw cold water on the idea at that time. However, I do not think the issue, Mr. Speaker, is who sired the infant — the issue is, is the infant going to survive?

The South Saskatchewan River Committee did an excellent job of examining the feasibility of the project, and I want to just refer briefly to some quotations taken from its report. They say, first of all:

“Thorough engineering investigations show that the construction of a dam on the site selected, will not involve any difficulties that modern engineering skill cannot solve within a reasonable cost.”

In reference to the soil, and its suitability to irrigation, they say:

“On the whole, the soil is suitable for irrigation — as suitable as that successfully farmed under irrigation in Alberta.

And the report also says:

“The average productivity of this area could be raised from \$4 million to \$10 million per annum.

“The number of farms in the area could be increased from 1,245 to 2,700, thereby providing for the re-settlement of 1,450 dry-land farm families.

“A maximum of some 700,000 acres could eventually be brought under the ditch.

“Some 400 million kilowatt hours of electricity could be produced by the project, in addition to the irrigation, which would provide an annual surplus of \$1,300,000 out of its sale.”

The Committee also finds that the project would solve the water supply problem of Moose Jaw and Regina. It also reports that the level of Qu-Appelle, Manitou and Long lakes would be restored, in addition to providing a new lake in the valley of the South Saskatchewan, 140 miles long, with a shoreline of over 500 miles.

There are also, Mr. Speaker, several secondary benefits referred to by this Committee, in its report. Among them is that, by proper regulation of the flow of water over the dam, additional power could be produced at Fort a la Corne. Some 100 million kilowatt hours more could be produced by that project. They also point out the value of the project as a flood-control measure in the Pike lake and Moon lake district, and further down stream in the Carrot River area.

That report, Mr. Speaker, gave rise to a great fanfare of publicity, made by the press of Canada, and encouraged by the Federal Minister of Agriculture. The Star Weekly (I have February 9th Toronto Star Weekly here, Mr. Speaker) carries a full-page article entitled “The World’s Largest Earth-fill Dam” covering the South Saskatchewan project. In that article they say that it would contain 35 million cubic yards of earth. “The next biggest earth-filled dam is on the Red river of Texas, and it is only half as big”, the article says.

Well I do not now where they get their information, Mr. Speaker, but less than 200 miles from here is an earth-filled dam on the Missouri river which is not only as big, but five times as large as the proposed dam on the South Saskatchewan. An earth-filled dam that has more than 130 million cubic yards of earth, compared with 35 million — that is 4½ miles long, compared with 1½ miles for the South Saskatchewan. I think that

the press has overlooked, also, the Garrison dam on the Missouri river, in North Dakota — a dam which is the same height as the proposed Saskatchewan dam, but twice as large in volume of earth, which is two and a half times as long. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is rendering a distinct disservice to the future of this project, when the press carelessly and recklessly describes this dam in superlatives, and describes it as the largest in the world. Surely they are judging its size by the labour pains that the Federal Government is enjoying at the present moment.

I do not want to pass this reference to the P.F.R.A. committee, Mr. Speaker, without commanding the people who drew up that report — the people who examined into the engineering data, with skill and care. That committee was not asked to decide whether the Canadian Government should build the dam — they were asked to decide whether it was feasible and practical, from an engineering point of view. That committee reported that it was feasible and practical from an engineering point of view. That committee had the benefit of the studies which had been made in the Provinces of Alberta, the costs of irrigation, the value of irrigation, and, in the view of that committee and in the face of those observations, that committee brought in a favourable report.

Mr. Speaker, among the benefits that accrue to the people of the area in the project, is the assurance that it will support a larger population, with a higher standard of living. I find, on analyzing the population of that area today, the following facts, and I would like to place this on the record:

**POPULATION OF RURAL MUNICIPALITIES IN
THE DEVELOPMENT AREA**

		<u>1926</u>	<u>1931</u>	<u>1936</u>	<u>1941</u>	<u>1946</u>	<u>1951</u>
193	Eyebrow	1942	1607	1265	1126	1021	917
194	Enfield	1759	1665	1412	1260	1016	868
195	Vermilion						
	Hills	1233	1283	1235	1151	1006	755
223	Huron	1307	1201	832	843	750	612
224	Maple						
	Bush	1499	1562	1161	938	817	664
253	Willner	1284	1284	996	973	741	743
254	Loreburn	2399	2323	1579	1466	1265	1077
255	Coteau	1628	1739	1444	1218	944	879
283	Rosedale	1789	1683	1385	1205	1040	881
284	Rudy	1918	1940	1548	1415	1129	869
285	Fertile						
	Valley	2383	2270	2034	1678	1327	1154
286	Milden	1597	1419	1322	1163	1000	817
314	Dundurn	1244	1343	1498	1056	844	761
315	Montrose	1450	1434	1162	1022	839	767
316	Harris	1517	1333	1247	999	822	643
343	Blucher	1965	1953	1853	1672	1386	1179
345	Vanscoy	2133	2089	1890	1684	1410	1060
373	Aberdeen	<u>2642</u>	<u>2732</u>	<u>2640</u>	<u>2398</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>1722</u>
		<u>31689</u>	<u>30860</u>	<u>26503</u>	<u>23267</u>	<u>19778</u>	<u>16368</u>

I have examined the census records for the 18 municipalities situated within the project area, and I find there has been a continual decline of population during the last 25 years, in that area. The total population in these 18 municipalities declined, between 1946 and 1951, by 3,410. Between 1941 and 1946, it declined by 3,489. From 1936 to 1941, it declined by 3,236; and from 1931 to 1936, it declined by 4,357 — the largest decline, by far, in that area, occurred between 1931 and 1936.

That, Mr. Speaker, contrasted with the situation, in Alberta, where irrigation is progressing, is very startling. Irrigation, in Alberta, has been found capable of supporting a population, on 100 acres, of nearly 20, including the industrial population that serves the irrigated area. Their standard of living has also been more secure.

I want to refer to a statement from the Meek report, where it stated that the Federal Department of Agriculture estimates that the gross value of production, in 1940, including the revenue from livestock of an irrigation in Alberta — of all the irrigation areas in Alberta — totalled \$1,200,000, or an average of \$24 per irrigated acre. The most significant thing, however, about that fact is that it is dependable income. It is not income which depends on a lucky shower — it is dependable.

The P.F.R.A. report on the South Saskatchewan project also recognized, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to rehabilitate the drought area of Saskatchewan, we must look, not only to the problem of settling new families on irrigation land, but that we must alter the pattern of settlement on the dry-land areas of the southwest part of this Province. They suggest that there are two possible ways of improving the stability of dry-land farming in that area. One is to move families out, and increase the size of community pastures. Another way is to thin out the population, and make larger areas available for those who remain there, so that they could add to their farming operations a fairly substantial ranching side line.

As a matter of fact, if the project is completed on that basis, it will succeed in re-establishing, not only 1,245 families who are now living in the area, but it will also re-establish 1,450 families that it is proposed to settle in the area; and those 1,450 families will abandon enough land in the drought area to add 300 acres to the holdings of each of 2,900 other farmers remaining in the drought area, making a total of some 6,000 farm families that can be effectively re-established by the completion of this project. Six thousand farm families is something around 4 per cent of the farm population of Saskatchewan, and that is almost equivalent to two constituencies in this Province. That, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is a substantial gain for our agricultural economy.

Now, I have referred to the Meek report of the St. Mary's project; I have referred to the P.F.R.A. report on the South Saskatchewan project, all of which provides evidence of the merit of the project. We have, of course, the statements of the Federal Minister of Agriculture to fall back upon, to support the merits of the project. The Federal Minister of Agriculture has made quite a variety of statements in this matter. He has said, some years ago, that the development of this project would mean that industrial and agricultural development in western Canada would compare

March 18, 1952

with the Esson country of Germany. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, was a speech that he made for election campaign purposes. He was reported, on January 23, 1949, in the 'Leader-Post' as saying:

"I think we have made a fairly good start. Now send us back to complete the job."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any more favourable comment by anybody, than to suggest that he was holding it out as an election inducement, and that is precisely what he was doing. As far back as 1946, he was speaking even more confidently about the project. In 1946 — April 27 — he made a statement at the City Hall, in Regina, about this particular project, and this is the 'Leader-Post' report on that address:

"Mr. Gardiner emphasized that the Federal Government did not need to wait for suggestions or pressure from municipal governments, municipalities, societies, or any other groups, before proceeding with its water conservation plan.

"The Dominion Government had already mapped out a programme, and it was a programme costing \$110 million. This would be used, largely, in providing for the storage of water, and partly for the distribution of this, where needed.

"The Dominion Government thus did not need the endorsement of the South Saskatchewan Development Association to begin work on the South Saskatchewan river. It had already decided to go ahead with it."

I suggest there is a testimonial in support of the project, which is entitled to some notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Howe (Kelvington): — That would be an election promise, would it not?

Mr. Walker: — I sometimes am doubtful whether it was used as a testimonial for the project, or whether it was used as election bait, but I propose to use it as an argument in favour of the project.

Then, of course, we have the lesser lights of the Liberal party, speaking about this thing. We have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) making his usual kind of statements for election purposes. My mind goes back to the 1948 Rosthern by-election, when I ran into my hon. friend occasionally, travelling around the country, and he made a speech in the town of Hanley. He made this statement — "that if the people of Rosthern constituency did not approve of this project by supporting the Liberal candidate, they would not need to ever expect to get it."

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I never made such a statement at all.

Mr. Walker: — I will just quote what my hon. friend is reported as saying, in the ‘Saskatoon Star-Phoenix’, and then if he wants to repudiate it, let him do so. On October 20th, at Hanley:

“The fact that two Federal Cabinet Ministers have expressed favourable attitudes towards the South Saskatchewan river irrigation and power projects, in the Rosthern by-election, has contributed to make this one of the main campaign issues, Walter Tucker declared at a public meeting here on Thursday night.”

Here is what he said:

“It is up to the people of Rosthern to give their endorsement by electing William A. Boucher, Liberal candidate, if they want the project proceeded with.”

He added:

“You certainly will not get anywhere by sending C.C.F.ers to Ottawa.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Walker: — Here is his final threat to the good people of Hanley:

“The election of Mr. Makaroff would be a repudiation of this great project.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Walker: — I suggest that it ill becomes my hon. friend to get up in this House . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the statement that “a vote against the Government programme, as laid down by two Cabinet Ministers, would be a repudiation of that programme”; that was not a threat. It was just pointing out the facts. My hon. friend is just misleading the people when he says that.

Some Hon. Member: — Just intimidation, that is all!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I will change the word to “intimidation” if that is what he wants. I suggest that it was an inducement held out to those people, that if they did not vote Liberal, they need not expect to get the dam. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, some of them voted Liberal, and now they are asking me if I can do anything to needle the Liberal party into carrying out its policy.

Mr. Tucker: — We have not got to that state yet, where we are relying on you.

Mr. Walker: — Well, I have talked to the people of Hanley constituency since my hon. friend has, I am sure, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that that campaign paid off for the Liberal party in terms of votes, but did it

March 18, 1952

pay off for the people of Hanley constituency, and of Rosthern constituency? Like a mirage, Mr. Speaker — the prospects of the dam have been diminishing and fading away.

I would remind this House that it was not until after that election that Mr. Gardiner pulled out of his hat, the trick that the Province was going to have to pay one-third (approximately) of the cost of this project. He pointed out . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That is not true.

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Did you say the cost of the dam?

Mr. Walker: — I said the cost of this project.

Mr. Tucker: — Do you suggest that the Dominion Government should build a power plant?

Mr. Walker: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is abundantly clear that that statement was made not until after the election of 1949. I do not ask you to take my word for it, but I think my hon. friend should take the word of Mr. Gardiner for it. Here is what Mr. Gardiner had to say: (Nov. 12, 1951; page 937 of Hansard)

“About two years ago there was some discussion as to whether or not the Federal Government would assume the whole cost of the project.”

That was the time when the Province was first informed that it was expected to foot part of the bill — about two years before November, 1951.

Mr. Tucker: — Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he suggesting that anybody thought that the Federal Government would build a power plant and turn it over to the Province, free of cost?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the power plant only involves \$8 million. We are asked to pay \$33 million.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask another question then? Does he suggest that it was ever thought that the Dominion would build a whole subsidiary system to take the water to the farmers?

Mr. Walker: — My hon. friend will probably make a number of questionable statements when he gets up to speak himself, and then I will deal with them in my reply.

So far as these various projects are concerned, the Government of Canada said that the St. Mary's project established a pattern, but they did not say that until after 1949. It was after 1949 that an agreement was negotiated with the Government of Alberta, by which the costs of the project were partly borne by the Government of that Province.

Then, after Mr. Gardiner thought that would not provide a stumbling block, he began to throw some doubts on the feasibility of the power project. He began to suggest that there was not sufficient evidence that the power project — the power portion of the project — was feasible. Well, Mr. Speaker, he had his own P.F.R.A. report which said it was feasible, but then the P.F.R.A. thought it wise to make further investigation as to the feasibility of the power project; and, as a result of that decision, a sub-committee of the P.F.R.A. named an engineer, Professor Cass-Beggs, to make a study of the power aspects of the South Saskatchewan project, and that study was made, known as the Cass-Beggs report, on the Coteau Creek dam power project, and was duly sent to Ottawa early in 1940; duly sent to the P.F.R.A., from whom it was received by the Minister of Agriculture (Federal), and by whom it was tabled in the House of Commons a year ago last fall.

And so that suggestion — and, I may say, that report does not do what my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition tried to pretend that it does. It does not condemn or undermine the prospect of success of the project. I have here a copy of that report as it was tabled in the House of Commons a year and a half ago, and one paragraph of that report states as follows:

“Thus it appears possible, on the basis of these arguments, for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to undertake to build the necessary power stations. If the dam and the water is available without cost, the Power Corporation could allocate the necessary steam plant capacity, valued at \$2 million, required to insure a firm output.

“Though physically located, say in Saskatoon, the plant, of about 15,000 kilowatts, would be subtracted from the capacity available for the future expansion, and so the equivalent investment would be made at a later date.

“The total contribution of the Corporation would, therefore, be approximately \$10 million.”

Cass-Beggs says that the investment of \$10 million in power development, together with some main transmission facilities, would be warranted by the power produced out of that product. Now, Mr. Gardiner has never suggested, at any time, that the power and the distribution of water was not a provincial responsibility. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when he sprang that \$33 million joker on us two years ago — that \$33 million was to cover the distribution of the water and the power development — and they would both be provincial responsibilities. Professor Cass-Beggs says, in his report, that it is feasible for us to develop that power out of the project, and we are warranted in investing enough money to provide the necessary power plant. He does say that the total cost of the project would be more than the power development would be worth, but nowhere has the Federal Government stated that the entire cost of the project should be charged to power.

March 18, 1952

Mr. Gardiner, speaking on this subject, has often said — this is the grounds on which he proposed the project — and I repeat:

“The putting of a lake 135 miles long and 185 feet deep at the dam, in the middle of the best farming section of the prairie provinces, will do something which nature has done in other places.”

Speaking in the House of Commons, on this project, he says:

“I say that the placing of a lake in the centre of Saskatchewan could have nothing but good results, no matter what else may be considered in relation to it. That was the position taken by the P.F.R.A., and that is the position taken by myself as Minister.”

He is proposing to build this project, not for the purpose of reimbursing himself, out of the electricity profits; not for the purpose of placing the financial cost upon the farmers in the irrigation areas, but as a general work for the betterment and benefit of Canada.

That has always been the basis on which he has put this development. In fact, he says — speaking in the House of Commons — that:

“It quite conceivably could be demonstrated that the project would not be self-liquidating.”

He also said:

“Any number of people could get up and demonstrate that the cost of the main works would not be self-liquidating.”

The Cass-Beggs report merely confirms the view that the cost of the main project should not be expected to be self-liquidating out of the production of power, or the sale of water for irrigation.

Dr. McCusker recognized the value of this project, when he said, in the House of Commons, on April 16, 1951:

“In the report which was tabled, all phases of this project were dealt with — climate, soil, engineering feasibility, economics of irrigation, power, recreation and other benefits.”

As I say, the Minister had the information from his own Committee. He also had the correspondence between the P.F.R.A. and the Minister of this Government, who is in charge of power (Hon. Mr. Darling). Correspondence, dated February 4, 1950 and February 27, which was tabled in the House of Commons last June, was available. The letter of the Minister of Public Works is as follows:

“Our study of the power aspects of the project leads us, at this point, to suggest that the Province would be justified in making the necessary capital investment.”

Then the letter, back from the P.F.R.A.:

“I wish to thank you for your letter of February 4, in which you indicated the intentions of the Government towards the use of power in the purpose of central Saskatchewan development.”

Now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) has tried to lead the people of this country, and of this House, to believe that, somehow, certain pessimistic conclusions contained in the Cass-Beggs report are the reasons for the stalling of the Federal Government in this matter. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a typical ‘red herring’. First of all, because the Cass-Beggs report has been in the hands of the P.F.R.A. since March, 1950 — nearly two years ago. The P.F.R.A. did not raise that objection.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that it did not get to them then — it was not sent to them by this Government until June, 1950.

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is almost two years — a year and nine months — I will stand corrected for three months. It also comes with ill grace from the Liberal party to try to place the responsibility for the delay upon this Government, because the engineers of Mr. Gardiner’s own department — the men in whom he has, or presumably has, confidence, have given a favourable report to the project, including the power portion of the project.

Furthermore, my hon. friend could have looked before he raised this ‘red herring’ at the correspondence which was tabled in the House of Commons, last June; and he would have found there correspondence relating to the Cass-Beggs report. He would have found there not one shred of evidence that either the P.F.R.A. or the Government of Saskatchewan regarded the Cass-Beggs report as an object for discouragement of the project.

Mr. Tucker: — That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. Walker: — If he had examined that correspondence he would have found, Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I referred, written by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) to the effect that this Province was ready and willing to proceed with the power project just as soon as the main project was cleared.

Then, of course, you have Mr. Gardiner’s own statement that the Cass-Beggs report was their report. He tabled it in the House of Commons. I am surprised at my hon. friend being in the dark about the . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Read it all! That is misrepresenting it again!

March 18, 1952

Mr. Walker: — . . . fact that the Cass-Beggs report belongs to the Federal Government. Mr. Gardiner, speaking in the House of Commons, on November 12, 1951, speaking in the House of Commons on November 12, 1951, spoke of all the reports which he had made in relation to this problem, and he stated that the Cass-Beggs report had been tabled as part of the P.F.R.A. Commission's report. On Page 937 of Hansard, November 12, he said:

“It has been tabled as a part of the Commission's report.”

Never, at any time, did he suggest that he disowned the authorship, or the ownership of that report.

When this subterfuge fails, I do not know what new ideas and fantastic notions my hon. friend will embrace, in order to try to let the Federal Government out of the responsibility for this delay.

Then we had the false issue raised as to whether the Province was willing to pay its share of \$33 million of this project. That did not last very long.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. member has misrepresented the position of Mr. Gardiner. Now here is what the Premier of this Province (Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas) read to this House . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, it is. He has misrepresented the position, and Mr. Speaker, you have permitted others to make corrections when we have been speaking.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member may only rise on a point of privilege where it affects himself.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, it affects me in this way, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member said that I misrepresented the position. When I say I did not misrepresent the position, and I want to read to you the proof that I did not — from the records of this House.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to you that you have let the members of the Government correct statements made by people on this side, over and over again. I want to correct a statement made by the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) from a statement made by the Premier, in this House, on March 4, 1952 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition will have the opportunity, during the evening, to bring forward all his arguments.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, with reference to this question about whether the Province . . .

Mr. Tucker: — One rule for one side, and one for the other!

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition withdraw that remark.

Mr. Tucker: — I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that over and over again you have let members of the Government correct statements made by members on this side. Now, I want to correct an obviously false statement in regard to myself, made by a member of the other side, and you will not let me do it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! You have made a specific charge that I am using one rule for the Opposition, and one rule for the Government. Now, that is not so, and I ask you to withdraw it.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to you that, in one way, you have, and you know it yourself.

Mr. Speaker: — I ask you to withdraw it.

Mr. Tucker: — It has been the case over and over again, Mr. Speaker. You have let members of the Government correct statements that were made by people on this side — over and over again. Everybody knows that.

Mr. Speaker: — I am asking the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that direct statement, or else proceed by a substantive motion.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if I may . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I am asking the hon. Leader of the Opposition . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I am stating what I believe to be true — based upon your repeated permission of the members of the Government to correct statements made by members on this side, and you have permitted them to do it over and over again. I want to correct a statement by the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) who said that I misrepresented the situation . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — . . . And I want to read what the hon. Premier said, in this House, on March 4th . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Will you . . .

Mr. Tucker: — . . . and you said I could not do it. I said that was a different attitude to what you take to the members of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! You have made a specific charge against my conduct in the chair, and I ask you to either withdraw it, or else substantiate it by a motion — a substantive motion. I am not going

March 18, 1952

to remain in this seat under the charge — a specific charge — that I am acting with bias. I refuse to accept this.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just drawing to your attention that over and over again you have permitted members of the Government to make corrections of statements made by members on this side. I wanted to exercise the same right, and you would not let me do it. If you think you have not been acting in a biased way — I do not say that I think you have been acting in a biased way, but you have anyway.

Mr. Speaker: — I am asking you to withdraw that specific charge.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, whether you think you have been acting in a biased way or not — in my belief, you have been.

Some Hon. Members: — Chuck him out!

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has no part in this debate. This is not a question of a debate at all, so the hon. member for Arm River will kindly take his seat. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) has made a specific charge against me and my position as Speaker in this House, and I have asked him to withdraw this charge, or else back it up with a substantive motion.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, if you want us to make a substantive motion, pointing out that you have permitted members of the Government, over and over again, to make corrections to statements made on this side, we will give you your substantive motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to proceed. I understand the susceptibility of my hon. friend, that the truth hurts sometimes, and he just cannot take it.

Mr. Tucker: — I have not criticized anyone for putting the truth before this House.

Mr. Walker: — The allegation that the Province of Saskatchewan would not share in the cost was put to rest by a letter written by the Premier on February 10, 1951, to the Federal Government — a letter which is on the record, in which the Premier agreed to the allocation, under protest, and the letter concluded with these words:

“My colleagues and I are most anxious that the South Saskatchewan River development shall be proceeded with at the earliest possible date.”

Mr. Speaker, if we are to judge by the antics of the Federal Minister of Agriculture, in this matter, we would come to the conclusion that he is

very anxious and desirous to proceed with this project, but there are insurmountable obstacles in his way, that he is labouring, and the Federal Government is labouring, manfully, to overcome.

In the meantime, however, the Prime Minister of Canada has announced that now he is going to have another enquiry into the wisdom of this project. In the Speech from the Throne, which was read in the House of Commons, at Ottawa, on October 9, 1951, we find this passage:

“You will be asked to enact legislation to provide for an appropriate agency of the Federal Government to deal with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaways. The proposed agency would be empowered to proceed, either with the Canadian share of an international undertaking, or a wholly Canadian development.”

There is no proposal there, Mr. Speaker, to enquire into the feasibility, to enquire into the political wisdom of the project. There is no proposal there to enquire whether the returns will justify the investment.

Premier Douglas: — And it will cost ten times as much!

Mr. Walker: — I refer you to another project — another extract from the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Canso Causeway, a project, again, which is much larger than the one which is before this House, today. In reference to that, the Speech from the Throne had these words:

“The Government has decided to proceed with the construction of a causeway to bridge the Straits of Canso for rail and road traffic, as recommended by the engineers.”

There is no proposal there, Mr. Speaker, to set up a Royal Commission to see whether it is politically wise to go ahead with the project. Then, when it comes to the South Saskatchewan, we find these words:

“That a Commission be appointed to consider whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people would be commensurate with the cause.”

That from a Government which has a surplus, this year, of over \$700 million!

Premier Douglas: — They have promised it in every election for 15 years.

Mr. Walker: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House are alarmed by the obvious reluctance of the Government at Ottawa to honour the campaign pledges of Mr. Gardiner and the Leader of the Liberal party of Saskatchewan.

March 18, 1952

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the question of whether or not Canada should invest \$100 or \$120 million into a project which is for the general welfare of our national economy, is a question which is a political question. I use the word "political" in the broadest sense. I believe it is a question which ultimately must be decided by the Government of Canada. I believe it is a question of the same magnitude and of the same relationship to the Government of Canada, as for example, the construction of the C.P.R., of the Hudson Bay Railway, and other great national undertakings. I believe that on that basis the Government of Canada should approach this question.

If the Government of Canada has confidence in the report of its own engineers, if it has confidence in its own Minister of Agriculture, then it ought to proceed with the project without waiting for a report from the Royal Commission. To suggest that the Government of Canada ought to await this report is to suggest a monstrous proposition, Mr. Speaker, for it is to suggest that the Canadian Cabinet is completely irresponsible for the management of the public funds of this country. Surely the fact that it has been referred to this Royal Commission shows that we are justified in inferring that the Government of Canada has not got confidence in the project, and it is hoping, secretly, for an unfavourable report.

If the Government of Canada believes that the project is feasible and sound, and in the interests of our national economy, surely it would not then refuse to proceed with it in the face of an unfavourable report. If they refuse to proceed with a worthwhile project just because a Royal Commission brings in an unfavourable report, then they are abdicating their responsibility to the Canadian people. If they believe the project is bad, but go ahead with it because they get a favourable report from the Royal Commission, then they are undermining the constitutional practices of this country, whereby the Parliament of Canada shall have control over the spending of public funds.

Surely that leaves only one alternative, and that is that the Government of Canada is opposed to the project, and they are hoping for an adverse report from the Royal Commission, so that they can wash their hands of the whole thing.

I think it behooves us, in this House, not to make our demands, contingent upon a favourable report, but to make our request that the project be proceeded with, independent of the report of the Royal Commission. If we make it contingent upon that report we are, I believe, rendering a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that every allusion that I have made to partisan politics, in this debate, was simply a direct quotation from speeches made by the Leader of the Liberal party. I think it would be deplorable, Mr. Speaker, if we allow this project to become a political football. The Liberal party at Ottawa has been trying to make it a political football, and the Leader of the Opposition has been trying to do the same, in the Rosthern by-election.

What a shameful sight, a week or two ago, of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) rushing madly to the defence of the Federal Government, with a trumped-up issue. I think it is a deliberate case of dragging this project into a political partisan arena. I think it is deplorable that the Leader of the Opposition should so drag politics into a consideration of this kind.

I think, however, that the people of Saskatchewan are capable of judging the political manoeuvrings of the Leader of the Liberal Party. I suggest that he would be better advised to join in with this motion, urging that the project be completed at the earliest possible date; that he join in support of the motion, and not waste his time trying to protect Jimmy Gardiner; that he come out on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, who are interested in getting this project going, and support this resolution.

For that reason, I am optimistic and hopeful that this resolution will meet with the unanimous approval of this House, and I am hopeful and optimistic that this resolution will have a direct effect in jarring the Federal Government out of its lethargy on this question, and provoking them to some constructive action, this year, on the project.

I therefore have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in making the above motion.

Mr. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) has made a very able and thorough presentation of this motion. So much so, in fact, that it seems there is little left for me to say about it, other than to nod my head in approval. I would be certainly happy to do that, but I have a few things left to say that he has not touched on, especially matters pertaining to my constituency. I do not think, though, that I could talk for more than about ten minutes without repeating much of what the hon. member for Hanley has said. I think he has pointed out that the creation of this dam — or, rather, the construction of this dam — will create a lake or reservoir down the Saskatchewan river, extending some 140 miles; and that it will also back down the Qu'Appelle valley for some 30 miles to another dam, which will be erected on the third meridian.

This is of particular interest to the residents of Morse constituency, because this lake, it is estimated, will have a shoreline of 500 miles, and some 100 miles of this shoreline will be within the boundaries of Morse constituency. Mr. Speaker, this lake will provide excellent recreational facilities — boating, fishing, swimming, etc., and it will bring to the doorstep of the many thousands of people living in that south-central part of the province those facilities which, for the most part, those people have had little or no opportunity, in the past, to avail themselves of. I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this project serves no other purpose than to provide those facilities for the many thousands of people in that part of the province, if it serves no other purpose than to do as the hon. member who has just spoken said, to raise and maintain the Qu'Appelle and Assiniboia rivers, and the Little Manitou and Last Mountain and Buffalo Pound Lakes, this project will be well worthwhile.

March 18, 1952

Speaking of Buffalo Pound lake — as the hon. member pointed out — this lake raised and maintained, as it will be with the construction of this project, will provide for the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw, a convenient and plentiful water supply, which will be the very best mountain water.

As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, the growth of any city is determined almost entirely by the extent of its water supply, and with the completion of this project, both Regina and Moose Jaw, and some other towns in that part of the province will be assured of a plentiful water supply, and as a result will no doubt show immediate and extensive expansion.

If this project were to serve no other purpose, Mr. Speaker, then to provide complete flood control for that large area, and it is estimated that it will do this — if it does nothing further than to provide those many benefits which I have outlined, I am sure that its construction will be fully justified. But in addition to this, it will provide irrigation for from 500,000 to 700,000 acres. It will bring into being, in that area, an entirely new type of farming. Thousands of acres of the land will be given over to sugar-beet production, and a sugar-beet factory will be required to take care of this. Thousands of acres will be given over to the growing of canning crops, and a factory will be required to take care of this. Thousands of acres will be given over to the growing of potatoes, and they will need sorting and storage sheds. Hundreds of acres will be given over to the growing of fresh vegetables — something which we need very much in this province, and something that is becoming more and more important in our daily diet. At the present time most of those vegetables — tomatoes, celery, lettuce, carrots, etc., have to be imported into the province; and with the completion of this project, this should no longer be necessary.

Thousands of acres will also be given to the growing of alfalfa and other forage crops, and this, of course, will allow for great extension in the livestock industry. Another important project that can be gone into is the growing of field crop seeds. Thousands of acres will be given over to this.

In addition to this, farm units in the area will, as a result of all this expansion and this different type of farming, more than double and the population will show a similar increase. Also, as the hon. member pointed out, the P.F.R.A. have estimated that the water at the dam site will be sufficient to provide a power potential of some 450,000 kilowatt horsepower electrical energy, and that will provide an annual surplus of \$1,300,000.

Something that is probably of more importance than all of these things, Mr. Speaker, is, that in this area, the rainfall is slightly less than it is in some other areas. It has been sometimes described as semi-arid. Relief costs have been exceptionally high, up to date. The Provincial and Federal Governments have provided, in direct relief and agricultural aid, in the area that will be served by this project, a sum of \$4.29 per cultivated acre, and in addition to that, the P.F.A.A. have provided the sum of \$3.26 per acre, or a total of from over \$6 to \$10 per acres for the individual municipalities in that area — a total cost of some \$57 million, some 80 per cent of the total cost of the erection of the dam,

Mr. Speaker. Eleven million dollars more would have built the dam.

I do not know whether I can carry on, Mr. Speaker, without repeating some of what the hon. member for Hanley has said, and so I am going to draw to a close. But I do want to say that surely I do not have to sell this project to this Assembly. Surely all hon. members will agree with me that it would be much better and more business-like to have spent this \$57 million on construction of this dam, than to have paid it out in relief. This dam, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Hanley, will bring in cash and other dividends, but to pay it out in relief is a more or less negative policy. It does not solve anything, and especially when we remember, as I say, \$57 million has been paid out in relief in this particular area in the last 20 years, and the Federal and Provincial Governments are still saddled with the responsibility to provide further relief if the need arises; and, with the increased mechanism on the farms, it could very well be that the cost of this relief will require much greater sums than has heretofore been required for that purpose.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a short quotation taken from an address by the President of the South Saskatchewan River Development scheme, as follows:

“We must turn the muddy waters of the mighty Saskatchewan river into a flow of gold that will build a citadel of wealth and security.”

Mr. Speaker, I second the motion.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — In view of the fact that this project is one that could affect, very favourably, the economy of Saskatchewan, and is something on which there has been unanimity, regardless of political Party, on the part of everybody in Saskatchewan, it is most unfortunate that an attempt is being made to make political capital out of this matter, as has been done so brazenly by the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker), this afternoon.

I could not help but think, when I was listening to the hon. member for Morse (Mr. Gibson) dealing with this question in a reasonable way, in a way in which every one of us could concur, as to the desirability of this project, how unfortunate it was that he had not been the one chosen to move the motion, and be given a chance to put his reasoned arguments over the air, instead of the twisted and distorted misrepresentations of the hon. member for Hanley.

It was indeed a travesty on the use of language, after the speech of the hon. member for Hanley, for him to get up and make an appeal that we should forget politics and deal with this in a non-political manner. It is difficult to believe that anybody, after his statements, loaded with politics, loaded with political venom, that he should then get up in a way of arrogating to himself a non-political attitude and exhort the members on this side of the House to forget politics! I do not think I have heard a more ridiculous performance than I heard, this afternoon, on the part of the hon. member for Hanley!

March 18, 1952

Referring to the point he attempted to make of pretending that the Canadian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) had taken the attitude that this Cass-Beggs report, which was mentioned, was his document — a P.F.R.A. document, I wish to put before the House a telegram that the Premier laid before this Assembly in regard to that matter, on March 4th. Here is what the Premier read to the House — a telegram from the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner, and I merely sought to bring that to the hon. member for Hanley's attention, when he was trying to make out that I was taking a different attitude in this matter than the Federal Minister of Agriculture. I was trying to point out what my position really was, Mr. Speaker. Here is what the Premier read to this Assembly, no longer ago than March 4th — he said the Minister of Public Works wired Mr. Gardiner, asking for permission to table this report. Mr. Gardiner replied as follows:

“Do not consider Cass-Beggs report a P.F.R.A. document, but one secured by P.F.R.A. from your Government.”

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — That was after you had got out on the limb.

Mr. Tucker: — This was laid before the House by the Premier, and then when the member for Hanley gets up and attempts to make out that I am taking a different position than the Federal Minister of Agriculture, that in some way I am trying to mislead the House and the country — when I tried to put this very thing that was laid before the House by the Premier himself, on March 4th, I am prevented from doing so.

Premier Douglas: — Who is misrepresenting now?

Mr. Tucker: — Oh yes, everybody is misrepresented but you! This is really something! We will get the truth before the people in regard to this matter, in spite of the efforts of two or three on the other side.

I must again compliment the hon. member for Morse (Mr. Gibson) on his presentation of the matter, as compared with that made by the hon. member for Hanley.

When I consider the fact that ever since there has been a Liberal representation in Ottawa that I have been associated with, since 1936, we have, from the very first time this project was suggested, been sincerely and honestly supporting it in every way possible . . .

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — Before elections!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — If the hon. member for Canora wishes to say something I would be very interested in his words of wisdom.

Not the least of those who worked sincerely in order to get this project forwarded, and did more, I think, than from the past actions of the hon. member for Hanley, he will ever do, was the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture of this country. He has worked consistently and persistently in supporting this project. He had the P.F.R.A.

begin to work on it, items were put in the estimates to investigate it, and I believe, last year, it was to the extent of \$1 million. I have not totalled up the amounts that have been put in the estimates in regard to examining into this field — finding out where a dam could be put, looking into all aspects of the matter — but it is recognized, no matter what the members on the other side of the House may, in their desperate desire to blacken up the Minister of Agriculture and the Liberal Party, all over this country how consistent and since the Federal Minister of Agriculture has been in his support and advocacy of this scheme. It really is something — to have a young member of this House, who has just entered public life, get up and question the sincerity of purpose of a man who has served western Canada for over 35 years, in public life.

If anybody had seen the struggle that was put up on behalf of western Canada over some of these things that we believe in, to convince the country as a whole — of which we are a very small part — of the desirability of some of these things, it would not be so lightly assumed that, because we believe in something, therefore the rest of the country is going to accept it at once. And, amongst the people that have been in the forefront, and the most effective, in getting things that we believe in accepted by the rest of the country, has been the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner. In this matter, the study started about five years ago, and, in 1949, I believe it was, according to the last summary report by the P.F.R.A., the investigations have been going on for five years, in exploring the feasibility of the development; but early in 1949, it was realized that very detailed examination had to be made of the project from many different aspects, and all the money necessary to carry out those investigations has been readily voted by the Parliament of Canada, under the leadership of the present Liberal Government.

Something has been said about my advocacy of this scheme. My suggest is that, in view of the fact that I have worked for it with all the energy that I have, and all the sincerity, and that I have seen Mr. Gardiner doing the same — and then when we went before the people in a by-election in Rosthern, when we explained that we were favourable to this scheme, that we believed in it, and we would like to have their support in going on to fight for the scheme, and that if we were voted down, it would be regarded as a repudiation of what we tried to do, we were sincere. Is there anything wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? Apparently the people of Rosthern did not think there was anything wrong with it, and it doesn't look as if the people of Canada, later on in the general election, thought there was anything wrong with it. When we suggested that an account of the tactics of the C.C.F. — playing politics with everything, just as they are doing with this — would lose at least ten of their members in the House of Commons, (and I well remember, in 1948, telling them that, that I expected, in the next Federal election there would be ten Liberals elected and ten C.C.F.ers defeated) I can still remember the jeers and the sneers that went up. But what did happen, Mr. Speaker? Well, as I remember the count, I think 14 Liberals were elected, not 10. I think 18 C.C.F.ers were defeated, out of 21. And, Mr. Speaker, it was just because of playing smart political tactics, as they are trying to pull off on the people of Saskatchewan, today.

I want to tell them that the people of this province are not as easily fooled as they think they are; and I am just going to go into some of the facts here. They are so transparent that it will not be hard for the people of Saskatchewan to see through them — not hard at all.

March 18, 1952

In the first place, I think it may be taken as absolutely certain that every Party in this province is favourable to this project. I think it may be taken for granted — and I would not question for a single minute — the sincerity of the members opposite in being in favour of the project, but, of course, they question our sincerity, always. Nobody can be quite as sincere as the C.C.F.er when he is questioning the sincerity of others! This idea that everybody else is insincere except themselves — well, the people of Saskatchewan are getting heartily sick of that assumed superiority. And, when we get it in a thing like this — talk about playing politics! If the member really had been desirous of getting the unanimous support of this House, without any acrimony, all he needed to do was move a resolution that we regretted the delay that had taken place, and urged (as he could have done) that, in view of its economic and social value to the country as a whole, that the Government of Canada proceed with the project without further delay. Had he moved a motion like that, Mr. Speaker, I think it would have received unanimous support of the members of this House. Why didn't he move it? Why didn't he move it, Mr. Speaker? Because he wanted to play politics with the matter! He wanted to take a slap at the Federal Government!

If he had wanted to show that Saskatchewan was united behind this thing, all he had to do was move a motion like that; but the fact that he did not shows that that was not his primary object, because he introduces this idea that the action of the Federal Government was unwarranted, and that the feasibility of the project has been proved. Well then, is that going to advance the scheme any further? Does even the hon. member for Hanley think, that to suggest the people who are going to have to vote the money to pay for this scheme, have not been proceeding bona fide in the matter — that he is going to advance this cause one whit?

On the other hand, if he had seen fit to move a motion that would have shown that Saskatchewan stood united for this project, regardless of politics, then that would have advanced the project, but he rushes onto the order Paper just as quick as he can — I think he got this on the Order Paper on February 18th — he has to give notice of it. He gets it on the Order Paper to say that the delay is unwarranted, or asking the Legislature to say that; and to say that this occurred in the face of ample evidence of its practical feasibility.

Well, of course, the idea of that is being smart — laying smart political tactics. We, who can see why the Federal Government may have decided to take another look at this proposition, through a Royal Commission, in view of the report put in their hands by an engineer appointed by this Government, that they employed both before and after he made this report — a man who is an outstanding C.C.F.er in Ontario, known more for that than for his engineering qualifications . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Shame!

Mr. Tucker: — I don't care — you can say "Shame" all you want. I am just stating a fact.

Premier Douglas: — You wouldn't know an engineer if you saw one across the street.

Mr. Tucker: — Well I would certainly not be any different from you in that regard. After you made such a demonstration of picking an engineer and picking this gentleman, you should be the last one to talk in any way like that.

Premier Douglas: — He is one of the best engineers in Canada.

Mr. Tucker: — Well that is your opinion, but it is a strange thing that you find you, yourselves, have got, later on, to disavow his findings.

Premier Douglas: — No, we never did.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I suppose it is all right for the Premier to sit in his seat and correct me, as long as he doesn't stand up, Mr. Speaker. Is that the state of affairs?

But in any event, there were two possible methods of approach to this question. One was to approach it in a non-political way; to simply bring forward all the reasons why we wanted this scheme proceeded with as quickly as possible; to show that we are behind it unitedly. And the other was to introduce something that would condemn the Federal Government for what it had done on account of the fact that it felt it should take another look at this proposition. And I suppose the thought was, "well that will put the Liberals in a very difficult position. They will either vote to condemn what the Federal Government has done, or else we have jammed them into the position of voting, in some way, against this proposition." It is very smart, but let me tell the hon. members, the people of this province are not so easily fooled. They see through these manoeuvres. What conceivable good is there in introducing into this resolution a condemnation of the Federal Government from whom we must get the money and the leadership to have the money voted by parliament?

Mr. R.A. Walker: — But we are not getting it!

Mr. Tucker: — Well I think that the way to get it, the way to get progress, the way to get co-operation, is to use persuasion, rather than to make this approach; and I think everybody realizes that. If they take another attitude it is quite clear what they are trying to do.

I said, and I think I will deal with this at the start, just what happened in regard to the Cass-Beggs report. When it was stated that the Government had decided to have this matter looked into, there was some question of a report that had got into the hands of the Government, that had been submitted by an engineer by the name of Cass-Beggs. At least I understood that that was the case. It didn't really come to a head in any way until the Crown Corporations committee was meeting in regard to the Government Finance Office, and in considering the report of the Government Finance Office, period April 1, 1950 to March 31, 1951, there was an item in there, "Payment for Special Services", and I asked the Provincial Treasurer what that item covered. He told me that part of it — \$3,716 — was to pay Cass-Beggs for a report on power from the proposed South Saskatchewan scheme. Well I, at that time, said, "Well if this is this report that has affected this scheme, it may turn out to be a very costly report for Saskatchewan — very costly." Then this question was taken up, and I

March 18, 1952

said that I understood one of the reasons why the Federal authorities had decided to take another look at this proposition was because of the report by Cass-Beggs. And that report, as I stated it, was taken up with the authorities in Ottawa, as to whether it was true or not; and I have here a report in the "Leader-Post" of February 27, 1952, and I will read from it, Mr. Speaker:

"The Cass-Beggs report of the South Saskatchewan River Development project undoubtedly influenced the Federal Government in its decision to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the feasibility of the project, Government sources said here Wednesday.

"They were commenting on a statement by Saskatchewan Liberal leader, Walter Tucker, in a Provincial Legislature Crown Corporations committee, that adverse findings in the report resulted in the appointment of a Commission.

"The report which deals with the power aspect of the project was made by Professor David Cass-Beggs, University of Toronto, at the request of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Copies of the report became available to the Federal Government through P.F.R.A. which received them from the Corporation."

And the item goes on to say:

"The report was made in March, 1950, and throws some doubt on the value of the river project from the point of view of power services to the province. It points out that power will not be available till 1965; that steam or other generating plants will have to be built to meet demands until then. As the irrigation project becomes fully operative more and more the power developed at the dam will have to be used for pumping water so that the cost will go up, the report claimed.

"Professor Cass-Beggs also states in his report that should major natural gas fields be found within the province, these would be more significant in the production of power than even the greatest economy to be obtained from the river project."

Now then . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask my hon. friend to who these statements are being attributed?

Mr. Tucker: — It is attributed to Government sources.

Premier Douglas: — Aha!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I had heard it also from reliable sources, and I think I could rely on the people I got it from. I was not surprised that it was confirmed — that this Cass-Beggs report, throwing so much cold water on the scheme, had made the Federal Government think they should take another look at the project. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, isn't it really something? That this Government's engineer that they hired — and I will prove that they hired him — makes a report which throws so much cold water on this scheme that, when it is brought to the attention of the Government of Canada, they decide that they had better take another look at the proposition, and right away the C.C.F. pounces and says, "The Liberal Party in Ottawa is not in good faith in this matter." They throw the monkey-wrench and then, when it begins to stop the machine from running, they begin to scream and howl about it.

Political trickery! That is all it is.

Now let me deal with what happened when I said that this report was made by Cass-Beggs who was working for the Provincial Government, there was an attempt made to confuse the issue by saying, "Oh the Federal Government paid him" . . .

Premier Douglas: — Which they did.

Mr. Tucker: — The Premier says "Which they did." The Federal government did not pay him. The Provincial Government paid him and the Federal Government refunded some of it to the Provincial Government.

Premier Douglas: — A nice distinction!

Mr. Tucker: — Oh, it is a real distinction! It shows who he was working for. That is exactly what the Premier tried to create — that impression — because here is the report marked the 5th of March, in the "Leader-Post":

"The Cass-Beggs report and hydroelectric aspects of the proposed South Saskatchewan River project was paid for by P.F.R.A., Premier Douglas said."

I will read what the Premier said (quoting from the Legislature report) because we should have it. Perhaps I should read the whole thing because it is only fair that I should do so:

"This is a rather complicated matter and I am not going to weary the House with a lot of discussion . . ."

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Who is speaking?

Mr. Tucker: — This is the Premier:

" . . . but there is some argument as to who this report belongs to. We will have to go back a bit to the initiation of this report. It came about as a result of a meeting with the economic

March 18, 1952

representatives of the Dominion Government, Provincial Government and the University of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, meeting in Regina April 19 and 20, 1950, when they discussed the whole question of water allocation, and particularly the South Saskatchewan River project.

“Minute No. 4 says there is a pronounced lack of information in the work of P.F.R.A., which P.F.R.A. has already undertaken, and a lack of co-ordination in assessing and appraising projects. There is need of a strong working contract between agencies, where jobs and projects are assigned to definite individuals who would be in a position to gather and assemble the necessary information pertaining to the project before commencing construction operations.

“The P.F.R.A. wants to be guided by as much information as is available.

“Minute No. 11 says it is Dr. Thomson’s belief (Dr. Thomson is head of the P.F.R.A.) that a governmental organization, both Dominion and Provincial with a joint approach, is essential for the future well-being of the project.

“Minute No. 90 set up a committee to study this matter . . .

“It says at the bottom of Minute No. 88 — further to this decision, Dr. Thomson assured the meeting the P.F.R.A. was prepared to supply the necessary funds for the hiring of additional help.”

And here the Premier goes on:

“Now out of that committee came the decision to secure the services of Mr. Cass-Beggs, who is on the staff of Toronto University and who is a well-known authority in hydroelectric power, to secure his services to make the necessary study, and that study was made and was forwarded to the P.F.R.A.

“Here is a letter dated June 23, 1950, to Dr. L.B. Thomson, Director of P.F.R.A., and I quote from this letter:

““I have been instructed to send you these copies of Professor Cass-Beggs power report, by the Cabinet.””

Who had control of the report, Mr. Speaker? Here they got this report in March of 1950, and they kept it, apparently, under the control of the Cabinet of this province, until June 23, 1950. During all of April and May and three weeks of June — then the Cabinet directed that this report be sent to the P.F.R.A. I think you can pretty well assume from that who had real control of that report. If they had the right to keep it for nearly three months and then direct that it be sent to P.F.R.A. then I think it is pretty clear whom the report was made to.

That is right in the letter which was sent, on behalf of this Government, remitting the report. The letter goes on to say:

“. . . This report is sent to you without comment or endorsement by the Government. Please excuse the rather lengthy delay in the completion of this report.”

And yet it was supposed to be made because the P.F.R.A. hired it! If the P.F.R.A. had hired it, Mr. Speaker, would it not have been made to the P.F.R.A.? And would this government have had the right to hold it for three months, and then authorize its release?

And then the Premier went on to say that, on August 14, Mr. Thompson sent \$1,036.35 to pay for it, and said the Premier:

“I understand now this report, as I say, was paid for by the P.F.R.A. The appointment of Professor Cass-Beggs came out of a joint committee. The report was forwarded to the P.F.R.A., and my information is (I have not had the time to check it) that a motion was brought down in the Federal House about six months ago that the Cass-Beggs report had already been tabled in the Federal House.”

And then the Premier stated that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) had asked for permission to table the report. He read the telegram of Mr. Gardiner pointing out that he did not consider the Cass-Beggs report a P.F.R.A. document, but one procured by the P.F.R.A. from your Government, which was the literal fact and truth.

Now, the question was asked by Mr. McCormack:

“Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the report was originally made to the Power Corporation — to Mr. Tomlinson. Is that not correct?”

And the Premier said:

“No, my understanding is that the report was made for the P.F.R.A.”

He did not answer the question. He said it was “made for them”, and that Mr. David Cass-Beggs operated under this committee. Well, if he operated under that committee, why did he not report to it? What right had the

March 18, 1952

Cabinet to hold that report for three months? Mr. Tomlinson, Chairman of the Power Corporation, was chairman of that committee that supervised this particular subject. And Mr. McCormack said:

“Did he not make this report to Mr. Tomlinson?”

And Premier Douglas said:

“No. (And I am going to deal with that in a minute.) He made his report to this committee of which Mr. Tomlinson was chairman,, and on that committee there was also Mr. Scamell of the Water Rights Branch, and Mr. Clipsham, chief engineer of the Power Corporation. He made his report to that committee, who, in turn, were securing the report for the P.F.R.A. who paid for it.”

They haven't paid for it! They paid for it after the thing was turned over to them and this Government asked them to pay. And they paid \$1,036 and this Government paid over \$3,000 for that report. Now what are we to think of answers like that. Take the Cass-Beggs report — the letter of remission; and this is from Professor Cass-Beggs. It is addressed to Mr. J.W. Tomlinson, General Manager, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Regina, Saskatchewan. Is it suggested that a man of Cass-Beggs' intelligence did not know who he was working for?

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to tell us, now, that Cass-Beggs was working for some P.F.R.A. committee! He doesn't think so, because he reports to Mr. Tomlinson, the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And here it what Professor Cass-Beggs says:

“In accordance with your request, I have examined the proposals of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation and Administration with respect to the proposed irrigation and power project in the South Saskatchewan river.”

He says, in effect, “In accordance with the request of the head of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, I have examined the proposals of the P.F.R.A.” But, because they managed to persuade P.F.R.A. to pay part of the cost of Cass-Beggs, they then try to pretend he was really working for it all the time.

I want to go into that just a little bit, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there can be any doubt about this report of Cass-Beggs which was tabled, which the Crown Corporations paid \$3,600 for, being the very same report that is in question here. It was tabled as a result of a resolution in this Legislature, asking the tabling of a report for which we paid that \$3,600, and the report is this report that was turned over to the P.F.R.A. There was an attempt made to make out that it was a different report, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Would the hon. member permit a question? I wonder if he

has found any record of where Mr. Cass-Beggs received payment for the much more extensive report that he made for the Power Corporation?

Mr. Tucker: — I am not referring to the more extensive report . . .

Hon. Mr. Darling: — No, you aren't. That \$3,000 is the payment for that report that covered the entire development . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was going to ask a question. Here are corrections again that you are permitting.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! How do I know what he is going to say?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I asked a question, and then a speech is made by the Minister — a correction. I would point out that we asked for a return in regard to the report made for which the \$3,600 was paid. Well, there was \$6,553.37, and we asked for those reports that were covered by that payment, and one of the reports tabled is this very report. There is no use trying to tangle the thing up with previous reports. The Government was asked to table this report for which they paid this \$3,600, and it is now tabled, and it is this report . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a point of privilege, my hon. friend I am sure does not want to . . .

Mr. Tucker: — There is another correction, Mr. Speaker. Are you going to allow it, Mr. Speaker?

Premier Douglas: — I am rising on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member wait until I hear it. How do I know what he is going to say?

Mr. Tucker: — Well you wouldn't let me say.

Premier Douglas: — I am rising on a question of privilege, and my question of privilege is: That the motion called for the tabling of the Cass-Beggs report. It did not call for the report as a result of this certain particular expenditure. The motion brought in this House called for the tabling of the Cass-Beggs report, and another one called for the tabling of the Hendrix report. The hon. member did not differentiate as to which Cass-Beggs report he wanted. We took it for granted he wanted the one on the South Saskatchewan.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, it was pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer to me that the \$3,600 referred to this particular report.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, may I apologize to the House, because I am sure that I made an error. I did not know that there was another report. I have since learned that there is another report.

March 18, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — Well then, if there is any misunderstanding it is the result of the Government themselves. They have been asked over and over again to table this report for which this money was paid, and . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, again I rise on a question of privilege. That is not what the motion called for. It called for the tabling of the Cass-Beggs report and that is what was tabled.

Mr. McCormack: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I definitely — and the Provincial Treasurer came across here to see me and he withdrew part of the motion because of the fact that it dealt with some Dunn & Bradstreet reports. But the \$3,716, I believe I was definitely told that that referred to the Cass-Beggs report which they were going to table, and the reason that copies were not made was because they only had the one copy available, and it was left in the Clerk's office.

Mr. Speaker: — As I understand it, the . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I just have this to say: That I believe there is another report which was paid for at the time, and I had not received the vouchers at the time the question came up in the Crown Corporations committee; and when the motion came in I had not even had a chance to see it. I have learned that there is another report. I did not know, though, until just a day or two ago that there was another one.

Mr. McCormack: — On a further question of privilege. I had the same conversation with the Provincial Secretary and his staff, discussing whether we wanted the actual report, because it covered eighty some pages, and that was the only report that he had.

Premier Douglas: — It may have been the only report he had, but may I point out that that was the report turned over to the Secretary's office by the Power Corporation — and that was the only one turned over.

Mr. Tucker: — We are having plenty of corrections, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you take note of them. I have pointed out to you over and over again that you have permitted this sort of thing to go on whenever we are speaking; and when I wanted to make a correction, you found fault with me. Now we have just experienced it again.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Apparently you cannot control the other side. I suppose you want to . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) asked me a question, and I was courteous enough to answer it . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Are you going to make the Premier sit down and keep his seat and behave himself, Mr. Speaker? Are you going to? I ask you.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I do not propose to get down to the billingsgate of the Leader of the Opposition . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Oh, you are a goody-goody little fellow, aren't you? You are making a statement here of correction . . .

Premier Douglas: — If I make these statements for my hon. friend's sake, I am very sorry; but the member for Souris-Estevan asked me a question and I was endeavouring to answer . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You were rising on a question of privilege, again, to make a correction. Nobody is slicker at sliding out of a position than the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I point out that the hon. Premier rose on a point of privilege and it brought forth a question from the member for Souris-Estevan which he was answering.

Mr. Tucker: — On the question of privilege he was making a correction of what I said.

Some Hon. Member: — You weren't listening.

Mr. Tucker: — You said that wasn't a question of privilege when I raised it . . .

Premier Douglas: — I was trying to straighten you out, but you are so tangled now . . .

Mr. Tucker: — All right then — you were going to straighten me out. I am going to read from the records of the House . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! When the Premier of this province makes a statement, he is speaking for his own group and for his Government, and it is a question of privilege to correct a statement . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That isn't the way it is, Mr. Speaker. On the floor of this House the Premier of this province has no more rights than any other member, and that is what I have been pointing out to you, Mr. Speaker, because you seem to think he has, and that is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, I will read from the records of the House:

“The Order being called for the motion for return to be moved by Mr. McCormack, respecting copies of the reports made to the Government Finance Office, for which the payment of \$6,553 was made.”

There was the motion. There was no doubt about it. Here is the Government Finance Office. We asked them, “What did you pay that money for?” They said — to begin with — “It was the Cass-Beggs report on the South Saskatchewan River.” Then they began to wiggle around and say it was another report, so we said, “Then table the other report”; and then they tabled the report and it was the very same report, Mr. Speaker. Now

March 18, 1952

they say, Mr. Speaker, that it was all a mistake. And then, when I bring it out they say I am misleading the House. Could you ever imagine anything more ridiculous! Here is the Provincial Treasurer of this province trying to make out that there was another report. And then we said, "All right, table it." and then, when it is tabled, it is the same report.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. I never said there was another report, until today, and this is the first time I ever said it.

Mr. Tucker: — And, of course, this is another correction that you are permitting, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Tell the truth, it is all right with me.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I made the same plane of appeal — that I would like to ask the hon. member to state exactly what the facts were, and I was told to sit down, that it wasn't a question of privilege. But when it is done on that side of the House, it is. Now it is hard to understand these things, Mr. Speaker, I must say.

Now then, there is the question. A motion was made to table this report for which this money was paid — for which the \$3,600 was paid — and on their own admission, this Government paid \$3,600 for that report. Now then, that is consistent with the other facts. This report was tabled and it is just exactly the same. You can go through it, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that Cass-Beggs was paid \$1,000 for it by the P.F.R.A., the same report tabled by the Provincial Secretary, for which they say they paid \$3,600. Well let them explain it if they can.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It is very easy.

Mr. Tucker: — Now then, . . .

Premier Douglas: — When are we going to hear why you haven't . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Another interruption!

Mr. Tucker: — Now the hon. Minister in charge of administering the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (Hon. Mr. Darling) wrote a letter dated February 4, 1950, and this letter is in the preliminary summary of the P.F.R.A. at the page following page 20. And here is what this letter said:

"When your urgent request for our power study was received . . ."

Here was the P.F.R.A. trying to get the power studies from the Provincial Government!

". . . Professor David Cass-Beggs, our consultant, was immediately contacted in Toronto, and an effort was made to secure all the available information from him. Unfortunately, the complete study will not be available for

our consideration for another ten days or two weeks.”

Look at the wording of that, Mr. Speaker. “Our consultant, Mr. Cass-Beggs.” “His complete study will not be available for our consideration.” And then they try to make out that Cass-Beggs was working for P.F.R.A! Here are the documents written at the time.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the date of that letter?

Mr. Tucker: — The date of this letter is February 4, 1950. Just a month before this Cass-Beggs report was finally sent to you, and a month before this report was finally sent to you, you said, “He is our consultant.” And he was immediately contacted, and an effort was made to secure all the available information from him, and unfortunately, the complete study “will not be available for another ten days or two weeks.” It was then forthcoming, Mr. Speaker — March, 1950. What becomes of this story of trying to put it off — and why do they try to put it off on the P.F.R.A.? In February, David Cass-Beggs was their consultant — now, suddenly, he is the P.F.R.A. consultant, when they want to condemn the Federal Government. But the amazing part of this Cass-Beggs report which, apparently was not satisfactory to them, but yet, apparently, he was such a good friend of the Government that they went on hiring him in 1950, even although later they sent, through their Power Corporation manager, a letter indicating that they did not agree with his report. Even although they must have known that this report had done tremendous damage, they still went on hiring him. Why, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Member: — He is a good C.C.F.er.

Mr. Tucker: — I figure I have to shout pretty loud to get anything into your head.

Premier Douglas: — You cannot give anything you haven’t got.

Mr. Tucker: — That’s right, and you cannot put something where there is no place to put it.

On April 2, 1950, L.B. Thomson — who is the head of the P.F.R.A. — (it was March when the Provincial Government got this Cass-Beggs report) and on April 2, 1950, when Dr. Thomson sent the P.F.R.A. report — the summary report — he stated that it did not include the completed report on the power by the Saskatchewan Government. That showed what his understanding was! But everybody was wrong apparently! That is what we are told now. Cass-Beggs thought he was working for the Saskatchewan Government. L.B. Thomson thought that Cass-Beggs was working for the Saskatchewan Government — but now, suddenly, it is all transformed, and that is the thing they think they can put over the people of this province; and then, as I said before, Dr. Thomson says:

“I still haven’t got the report so I cannot include it. I haven’t got it from the Saskatchewan Government.”

Then the Government, which was sitting on this report that they had got and that they had paid for, decided they would send it to Dr. Thomson, and I

March 18, 1952

have already read the letter indicating that this report was sent June 23, 1950, on the instructions of the Cabinet. The whole cabinet took responsibility for sending it forward! It is quite true they very carefully sent it without endorsing it: "We are just sending it to you." "We are throwing it out, no matter what good or bad it may do." I submit that when they were asked to look after this power end of it, that when they had had three months, almost, to look into it, and when this was such an important feature of this project, the least they could have done was to look into it a little bit, and if they thought it was going to do a tremendous amount of damage they should have had further investigations made, and not turned loose this report. But this Government, that professes to be so concerned about this matter, sends this report — and I will deal with it in a minute. Talk about throwing a monkey-wrench! Did they know what was in the report? I wonder! If they knew what was in the report, then it was too bad they sent it. It is hard to believe that they were so disinterested in this matter that they would send that report forward without having it properly examined and getting an opinion on it. It is one or the other.

Then, having remitted the report, which they had not taken the trouble to look into, to see whether it was right or not, they did not take much time to try to cash in on the promise that the Federal Government should pay part of the cost of it. Oh, no, they were right on the job there, because on June 27 — 4 days later — Mr. Shoyama takes it up with Mr. Hartnett, so that he can take it up with Dr. Thomson, and Shoyama, who is head of the Advisory and Planning Board, says:

"With reference to your memorandum of May 3, 1950, in which you advised us of the possibility that the P.F.R.A. might pay expenses incurred by the province in payment of Professor Cass-Beggs for its power investigation of the South Saskatchewan River project, I am attaching the statement of the account."

You will note, Mr. Speaker, it was referred thereto as a "possibility" that they might pay it, and then they try to make out that it was all arranged. And listen to this:

"We thought it best to hold this matter up until the Power report had been forwarded to the Dominion."

You see they were not going to ask for part of the payment until they had sent the report forward — the Provincial Government.

"It would be appreciated if you could take this question up with the P.F.R.A. at this time."

Now, as I pointed out originally to the Provincial Treasurer, this money paid to Cass-Beggs I was quite satisfied would not pay for this entire report. It must have just been sent — the payment by P.F.R.A. must have been made on a basis of paying for some extra work done. The Provincial Treasurer tries to make out now that he did not understand. It was because he would not listen. I was trying to tell him that.

Now I think there is no doubt about that situation. The Premier can try to laugh it off — you cannot laugh off facts . . .

Mr. Danielson: — It won't last long.

Mr. Tucker: — You cannot laugh it off, when you try to create one impression, and when you get the facts like this, well a laugh is not going to change the situation very much.

I have already pointed out that if this man was not working for the province, why did everybody say he was working for the province? Why did the province think it had a right to hold the report for nearly two months? Why did it, then, send the report forward at the express instructions of the Cabinet? Why did they then say, "Will you pay us part of the cost of it?" And say at the same time that it was thought "they might pay for it." Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

And then, I asked the Minister — I said, "Here is a report which I will show, Mr. Speaker, was the most damaging report that this man could possibly have sent from the standpoint, in any way, of this project being voted over \$100 million." I asked the Minister if any steps had been taken to make independent studies to see if Cass-Beggs' report did truly represent the situation. Well the Minister quite honestly said — and I do not know whether it was right or not, that is, the right attitude, this matter was supposed to be so important, according to the hon. member for Hanley, and I think it is very important, this matter that transcends everything else — they were so busy they did not get around to it. They had had this report since March of 1950, and they were so busy that they did not get around to examining this report, or making any observations on it, or making any suggestions that it did not cover the situation properly, he said, until October or November. This vitally important question for this province — and nothing was done by this Government, according to the Minister, himself, until October or November. That is a matter of 6 or 7 months later!

A letter was sent to the Government by the P.F.R.A. on October 3, 1950, and then the Economic Planning and Advisory Board — this Board that is supposed to be so good for the people of this province — sat on this thing for all this length of time. This all-important matter, and they didn't do anything about it, even in October, Mr. Speaker. All that they did then was to send a Table of the South Saskatchewan trends and power consumption, a map of the power system, a map of the proposed 66 K.V. transmission line from Coteau Creek, and certain other material. But no disapproval was expressed in that letter of the Cass-Beggs report.

When do we get to the time when disapproval was expressed? Well, I understand that about the time they had a Water Board meeting, just before Christmas in 1950, objection was taken. This meeting was held in Winnipeg, and objection was taken to this Cass-Beggs report as to its not truly setting out the situation . . .

Some Hon. Member: — By whom?

March 18, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — By the Manitoba representatives, and then, for the first time, did Mr. Thompson learn that that Cass-Beggs report did not have the endorsement of this Government. It was sent forward by instructions of the Cabinet. The Cabinet had not done anything to indicate that they disagreed with it, and nothing was done, in any way, until it was brought up at the Water Board meeting. And then it was found out that the Provincial Government was not altogether satisfied with the Cass-Beggs report. Did they do anything then, Mr. Speaker, on this most important matter, this matter so vital to us all? They did not get around to doing anything, with all their experts, and all their people to advise them — their economic advisory and planning boards and all the rest of them. They did not get around to doing anything yet . . .

Mr. Danielson: — They didn't know anything anyway.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . until February 1, 1951, and then the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) enters the picture; and he writes a letter, and he enclosed a report from Mr. Tomlinson. Now it is very interesting even then, Mr. Speaker, what happened at that time.

On February 1, 1951, the Minister of Agriculture wrote a letter. This is in reference to a report made in March 1950 — 11 months before. What action! What speed! You know when I think of these posters up, "Vote C.C.F. and get action" I will always think of this. On this most important matter it took them 11 months to getting around to sending forward a study in regard to the Cass-Beggs report — more or less gently disavowing it; and I think their disavowal is worth bringing before the people of this province. And I am going to read you what our friend, the Minister of Agriculture wrote, in part. It went to Dr. Thomson to whom the Cass-Beggs report had been sent.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What was the date?

Mr. Tucker: — February 1, 1951.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Did you say September?

Mr. Tucker: — February 1st — 11 months after this Cass-Beggs report.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask, has it been tabled in the House here?

Mr. Tucker: — No, in Ottawa.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend will place it on the table, I presume, when he is finished.

Mr. Tucker: — I have no objection to placing it on the table at all. It is just a copy, and some of my notes, and underlinings, for the edification of anyone who wants to look at it, but I have no objection at all to putting it on the table. Here is what the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) said in his letter:

"Dear Dr. Thomson: I am enclosing herewith a brief report submitted by J.W. Tomlinson, general manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, on the value of power coincident with the

irrigation project of the South Saskatchewan River, Coteau Creek.

“Mr. Tomlinson has had considerable experience with hydroelectric power development and use in Manitoba, and while we are not in a position to endorse his opinion . . .”

Isn't that amazing, Mr. Speaker? Here they profess to be so interested in this scheme. They get a man like Cass-Beggs to make a report which throws a real monkey-wrench into the thing. They do not do anything about it for months and months. They get a report of their own general manager, and they are so cautious about giving a good boost to the scheme that they won't even endorse Tomlinson's report! And now they are not afraid, though, to say it is a good thing — but when it is a matter of bringing forward evidence that would help to advance the scheme — oh, no, — they would never take that chance. But if they can create a situation as to why the scheme is held up, well then they can go out and talk about it to the people. Now he goes on:

“ . . . And while we are not in a position to endorse his opinion (that is 11 months after they got it) . . .”

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Where does that 11 months come in? What dates?

Mr. Tucker: — From March, 1950 to February 1, 1951.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — March 9, 1950 to February 1, 1951?

Mr. Tucker: — Well it may be seven or eight days out.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Or a month and eight days out.

Mr. Tucker: — I said 11 months; but you are supposed to be a great mathematician. I said March, 1950 . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is a month and 9 days out.

Mr. Tucker: — February 1 to March 1 is one month. I believe, and I said 11 months, so I could not be out more than 9 days. I thought the Provincial Treasurer was a very great man on figures. But I think he should go off and get some assistance from his experts and so on — his treasury Board and so on — they can probably, between them, figure this out. But in any event, the manager of the Power Corporation made a report — now this is a wise attitude:

“The management of the Power Corporation are the logical persons to assess the value of the power since it will be used in their transportation transmission networks serving the province.”

Now there was a wise observation by the Minister of Agriculture! These were the natural persons! If these were the natural persons, why did they go off to Toronto and get Cass-Beggs? But, according to the Minister of Agriculture, they are the logical persons to assess the value. That was

March 18, 1952

a true statement, and he goes on to say:

“It is estimated that 75,000 farms in Saskatchewan can be economically reached by power lines from the South Saskatchewan Power Corporation’s network.

“An abundant supply of low-cost power would add impetus to the farm electrification programme. If our farmers are to maintain their volume of production in competition with other farmers throughout Canada, it is most important that power be made available to them.”

And I say, Hear hear to that.

“Electricity on the farm not only means a better standard of living but it proves efficiency and makes diversified farming more attractive and profitable.”

And I also say Hear hear to that.

“The benefits of irrigation in stabilizing the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan are beyond question. In addition excessive P.F.A.A. payments in the South Saskatchewan River development area will be avoided.”

And I say Hear hear to that.

“The Coteau Creek dam will be of primary importance for flood control; will make it possible to save the drainage reclamation development of the Carrot River Triangle for future agricultural settlements.”

And I say that is very good. But the trouble is — if you believed all these things, why didn’t you get busy and have a look at that Cass-Beggs report and have it examined by Tomlinson and have it modified in accordance with what Tomlinson thought was right, before you released it — to have the Federal Government think that there was doubt about the project. That is not the end to it. If the Minister of Agriculture had believed so strongly, why did he not endorse Tomlinson’s statement? But he throws it out, as much as to say: “Here is our general manager, he is the logical person to believe, but we are not undertaking to ask you to believe it.” They wouldn’t even stand behind Tomlinson!

This is the Government that is supposed to be so interested in this thing!

Now then, this is the report of Tomlinson, and this is very interesting, having in mind the fact that Cass-Beggs, after doing this job, which they find did not properly cover the situation, was hired

to do still more work. But anyway, here is what Mr. Tomlinson said, on January 31, 1951:

“To Hon. I.C. Nollet, Chairman of Irrigation Committee, Legislative Bldgs., Regina, Saskatchewan.

“Dear Mr. Nollet: Re Coteau Creek Hydro Development.

As requested, after consideration by the Executive Committee, I submit a report on the value to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation of the hydroelectric power that would be made available if the Dominion Government, under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, built a dam at Coteau Creek in the South Saskatchewan river.

“Power Available — As you know, in 1949, Professor David Cass-Beggs made a comprehensive study of water flow, storage, where the power would likely be used, etc. He reported to us that the P.F.R.A. were too optimistic as to the reliable power available . . . “

Here is this Government that was so passionately desirous of forwarding this scheme! And this Government sends for Tomlinson’s opinion, that the P.F.R.A. (and that is the opinion of David Cass-Beggs) were too optimistic!

Premier Douglas: — Well finish the sentence.

“. . . He reported to us that the P.F.R.A. were too optimistic as to the reliable power available . . . ”

Premier Douglas: — That is different.

Mr. Tucker: — Oh, is it? Tomlinson said that Cass-Beggs said that the P.F.R.A. was too optimistic.

“. . . The P.F.R.A. have also made detailed studies . . . ”

and listen to this:

“. . . on available water (and here is Mr. Tomlinson) . . . and while their estimates appear optimistic . . . ”

Tomlinson said the P.F.R.A. are too optimistic! This is the Government that is trying to help . . .

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Mr. Speaker, would you expect an engineer to give an inaccurate report, or a scientific report?

March 18, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — Well that brings up a question. If this Government gets engineers to pour cold water on the scheme so that the Federal Government thinks they had better have another look at it, they should not, then, condemn the Federal Government for playing politics and being insincere — when it is their own engineers!

Some Hon. Member: — That is the worst yet!

Mr. Tucker: — Let me read that again. Here is a report sent by the Minister of Agriculture, on February 1, 1951, that the P.F.R.A. reports are still too optimistic. Is that helpful? But he goes on, and he is very generous:

“Their wide experience in these studies must be considered . . .”

Perhaps they might be right?

“. . . and this problem of actual water available will be between the two estimates.”

He says that Cass-Beggs is probably entitled to as much consideration as P.F.R.A. That is right — because he says it will be between the two estimates. They had to uphold Cass-Beggs.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, could I . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Now . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I rise on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Can you find out if it is a correction, Mr. Speaker, or a real question of privilege?

Mr. Erb (Milestone): — Don't be ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Tucker: — No, I would rather — all right, ask your question then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I wonder if the hon. member would tell the House if he knows that the water studies were complete on the stream flow of the South Saskatchewan river when that correspondence was written?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, if that is so, why wasn't it possible for you to say, “We endorse this report”, if you know that all the studies had been completed? Why did you hide under cover and say: “We do not endorse it.” Answer that will you? Answer that if you want to.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We gave the kind of reply and wrote the kind of letter consistent with what knowledge was available on stream flow up to that time, but there was some doubt in regard to it. We asked the P.F.R.A. to supply us with the stream flow.

Mr. Tucker: — I understood you to say the studies were all complete at this time. Now you say they were not complete. Well, it is very hard to know just what it is. One minute they are complete — the next minute they are not complete.

Premier Douglas: — The one thing there is no doubt about is that we offered to put up \$33 million.

And Mr. Tomlinson's report goes on:

“ . . . It is probable the actual water available will be between the two estimates and the resultant power available will be in the order of 325 million kilowatt hours per year.”

They knew the P.F.R.A. were doing some very close figuring here, to show that this scheme would pay its way. By whittling that down like this they also undermined what the P.F.R.A. were doing, and this was as late as January 31, 1951. These are the people that are so anxious to back this scheme, and so ready to pretend that the Liberals — because they are looking into it with engineers — as the Minister said, “They are guilty of sinister motives.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Of course a different rule should be applied! Always a different rule should be applied to the sincere and absolutely . . .

Some Hon. Member: — God-fearing!

Mr. Tucker: — No, I would not say God-fearing — the sincere and absolutely above-board C.C.F.ers as compared with the Liberals! Well if the Liberals do the same thing, then they are guilty of all kinds of double-dealing and so on.

The Minister gets up and says: “Is it all right to get engineers? Isn't it all right to pay attention to their reports?” My answer is: “Isn't it all right for the Federal Government to listen to the engineers that you bring forward?” That amuses the Minister of Agriculture. Well, if he can see a joke, I must say . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can see a pretty big one in front of us.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not think that this manoeuvre — this political manoeuvre — will turn out to be a big joke for you anyway!

Now then, “The Value of Power to the Saskatchewan Power Commission”, and they go to deal with it. They say:

March 18, 1952

“However, during 1950, an extensive analysis of the present and future power requirements of Saskatchewan were made, and indicate that power loads are growing so fast that Coteau Creek power could all be used in the southern part of the province in a reasonable period after development.

“This would reduce the transmission costs and losses. We interpolate the Fort a la Corne hydro power would have been absorbed in the northern part of the province, and that the lowest cost alternative would be steam power or imported power from Montana.”

Well, apparently the Fort a la Corne project was being considered a year ago. We have been told since this Session started that they are not so concerned about Fort a la Corne.

“The cost of power from Montana, based on present prices would be 3.6 mills, plus approximately 2 mills for transmission, totalling 5.6 mills . . .”

And they go on to do the figuring and they say, at the end of it:

“The cost of operating this type of hydro plant, including capital charges, is approximately 9 per cent of capital cost, and preliminary estimates indicate that the power facilities of the dam would cost approximately \$10 million. About \$900,000 of the above would be cost, and from \$475,000 to \$700,000 per year would be available as surplus.

“Since power demands of the province vary with general economic conditions, those putting up capital in advance for power facilities are entitled to a margin of profit to offset the risk of losses due to reduced markets by the time the power site is developed.

“However, the power authority could contribute annually in proportion to the kilowatt hours generated, and it seems safe to forecast that average contributions would be in the order of \$700,000 per year, which could be used to support irrigation.”

So that from the report of Mr. Tomlinson, all that could be used out of this money — out of this development — would be about \$700,000 to support irrigation. And when I come to the report of P.F.R.A. you will see what an effect that must have had on their report. It goes on to say:

“In later years the water used for irrigation reduces the amount of power generated, and this, as it is developed, would decrease the revenue from power. As more power is used for pumping, this would constitute a part of the contribution power can make to irrigation.”

And Mr. Tomlinson says to the Provincial Government:

“We therefore urge that the Provincial Government give as much support as possible to the South Saskatchewan river scheme, using the above as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation contribution.”

Mr. Tomlinson makes this report to the Saskatchewan Government, and asks them to support the scheme. But of course he, as I say, threw doubt on the P.F.R.A. calculations.

The next thing that I want to deal with — and incidentally, here was the extent of the disagreement with Cass-Beggs — they said: “Perhaps the truth lies someplace between Cass-Beggs and the P.F.R.A.” That is what it says in this report.

I am going to deal with Cass-Beggs in a minute to show just how devastating even that Tomlinson report was. This report was made on January 31, 1951. Now then, the Cass-Beggs report is there — this report is sent to P.F.R.A., and then people began to examine it in Ottawa. And what happens? On May 31, 1951, or about that time, it was said that there was going to be a commission appointed to have a look at this thing. The disagreements between the Provincial Government, or their advisers, as to whether this thing was as good as it was made out to be by P.F.R.A., and so it was felt that it should be looked at.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, there was never any disagreement between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government as to the advisability of this, as proven by the fact that we were prepared to go ahead fully with putting up our share.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, is this a correction or not?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, it was a correction of your statement.

Mr. Tucker: — I see. And when I want to make a correction on the member for Hanley’s statement, I am out of order. Was I out of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — Well I am glad the Speaker has taken that attitude . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would like to point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there is a distinct difference between

March 18, 1952

political propaganda and questions which deal with actions of a government. You were stating a fact which affected both Governments.

Mr. Tucker: — And the hon. member for Hanley was representing the attitude of the Federal Minister of Agriculture, which affects the Federal Government. It is the same thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — It did not affect you.

Mr. Tucker: — It certainly did affect me, because I was said to be misrepresenting the situation.

Mr. Egnatoff: — What a Speaker!

Mr. Tucker: — In regard to what the Premier said, here is what the Provincial Government sent forward. This report says:

“That Cass-Beggs had reported to us (meaning the Power Corporation) that the P.F.R.A. were too optimistic. It also says the P.F.R.A. have also made detailed studies and ‘while their estimates appear optimistic, their wide experience in these studies must be considered. It is probable the actual water available will be between the two estimates.’”

I said, Mr. Speaker, that both their consultants indicated that the P.F.R.A. estimates in this matter could not be taken at its face value; and the Premier gets up and tries to correct me — on a question of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the date of that statement?

Mr. Tucker: — I have already given the date to the Premier. January 31, 1951 — that is the last report. Tomlinson, in effect, says: “P.F.R.A. are entitled to a lot of consideration, so probably the truth is something under what they say.”

And then on May 31, 1951, the Government decides to look into the matter, at Ottawa. And then the C.C.F. have got the chance they want. Right away there is a hue and cry against the Liberals! And I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that it is my considered judgment, and my honest opinion that the attitude forwarded by this Government, in the form of the Cass-Beggs report, had more to do with the Federal Government deciding to take another look at this thing than any other single thing that happened.

Well you can laugh at that, but can you wonder, because I will now deal with the Cass-Beggs report . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would just like to draw to your attention that it is five minutes to six, and if you want to continue after recess we can call it six o'clock.

Mr. Tucker: — That is all right, Mr. Speaker, I can go on or I can call it six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: — All right, go ahead then.

Mr. Tucker: — I just want to deal with one choice bit before I sit down, in regard to Professor Cass-Beggs, because it shows just how far he was going to throw a monkey-wrench into this machinery. On page 47 of this report — I will just read part of it — I will read the rest afterwards:

“Nuclear energy cannot be dismissed as a source of power within the period considered. At the present time nuclear energy is considered to be able to compete with expensive coal. It would be reasonable to assume that both gas turbine plants and nuclear energy plants will be well established in ten to fifteen years time.

“The adoption of the hydro project at that time, following a decision made now would preclude the adoption of these alternatives for a further ten years or more — at least as far as the area accessible to hydroelectric energy is concerned.”

In other words, if they went ahead with this scheme, it would preclude taking advantage of nuclear energy.

Mr. Danielson: — Sounds like Dyson Carter!

Mr. Tucker: — The report goes on:

“In the event that major natural gas fields . . .”

Get this, Mr. Speaker!

“. . . are developed in Saskatchewan, the resulting reduction in fuel costs could make a considerable reduction in the cost of the all-steam case used for comparison.

“If natural gas were to become available, say at Saskatoon, at 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, it would halve the fuel cost by nearly two mills per kilowatt hour. This would be more significant than the greatest economies to be obtained from the hydro project.”

In other words, if natural gas is made available at Saskatoon, it would provide for more economies than you could possibly get from the hydro project.

March 18, 1952

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What is wrong with that?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, if that is the case, then . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — . . . doesn't he, in effect, say: "We are taking a big chance of losing — losing the chance of getting very cheap power — by going ahead with this power scheme at Coteau Creek." That is what he is saying, and when that was made available to the Federal Government, is it any wonder they decided they had better take another look at it.

I will now call it 6 o'clock.

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Tucker (continuing): — At 6 o'clock I had started to deal with the Cass-Beggs report submitted to Mr. Tomlinson, General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, March, 1950, and which was transmitted to the P.F.R.A. in June of the same year.

I have already pointed out that Professor Cass-Beggs, in submitting this report, wrote a letter stating that he was transmitting it to Mr. Tomlinson in accordance with his request and says he has examined the proposals of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration with respect to the proposed irrigation and power projects in the South Saskatchewan river. He has taken the proposals that were worked out by the P.F.R.A. officials and examined them, and in the course of the letter of transmission — there are two pages and I will not read it all — it is single-spaced and I will not weary the House with it, but I will read a couple of excerpts from it.

In the third paragraph he says:

"An examination of the result of operating the combined hydroelectric and steam-electric system formed essentially out of the Coteau Creek Hydro Plant and the Saskatoon Steam Plant (as it would be in 1965) indicates that the cost of power at Saskatoon and at other points to which the hydro power would be delivered, may be expected to fall appreciably within the first ten or fifteen years and thereafter to rise towards the cost of steam generated power alone."

He goes on to say:

"However, if the particular hydroelectric development were not undertaken, somewhat similar savings could be secured by equivalent development of existing resources. For example, the Fort a la Corne site could be developed as an alternative about 1968-70 and by 1975 would provide savings as great as those to be anticipated from the Coteau Creek project."

Now then, it might be thought that by saying the Fort a la Corne site would begin to give just as many savings as the Coteau Creek site by 1968, it is putting the date very far back, but all the engineers take the attitude that it will take at least 10 years before power can be generated from this project. I was very interested in the — I have wondered often about that period of 10 years, and I was very interested when I looked at the Fort Peck Dam this spring, to find that it was 10 years from when they started building on that site — during the period of the ‘thirties, when they had ample supplies of labour and material, that it took them 10 years from the time that they started to build that dam until any electricity was generated. Even in the United States, in the ‘thirties, when they could work at it full blast.

The member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) spoke about the Garrison dam as if it were in existence this afternoon. Now, I visited that site and you can hardly see where they have started to work to build it yet. I do not know where he got the idea that it already exists as the largest dam in the world, because I was at one side of where the dam will run to and you can see that they are working there, but that is about all . . .

Mr. Walker: — It was Fort Peck I was referring to and that the other one was under construction.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I did not hear you then, because you spoke of the Garrison dam as well as the Fort Peck dam but it may have been that I did not hear you properly.

In any event, I was told when I visited the Garrison dam that now available labour and people to operate the machines are so scarce that they are not making the progress on it that they were able to make on Fort Peck. They were not able to work the full 24 hours on the project. So when they say it will take 10 years to get the Coteau Creek project in operation, apparently it is not unreasonable and that brings us to 1962, which is not far off from 1968 — a time when, according to Cass-Beggs report, a Fort a la Corne scheme could be in operation and be just as good ultimately. If you can imagine anything that is designed to throw doubt on anything, it is to suggest that within about 6 years of the time when we would get power from this project that the Fort a la Corne proposition would be just as effective in giving of savings, it certainly condemns the scheme.

Premier Douglas: — Would you mind reading the next paragraph?

Mr. Tucker: — This is the next paragraph, the one you ask me to read. It says:

“Nevertheless in the period 1965 to 1975, the Coteau Creek project would show economies over any available alternatives.”

Now then, he is speaking — and that is what I said — that there is only a small period of time when he suggests there would be any economies. He goes on to deal with that, and he says:

March 18, 1952

“These and the long-term savings appear to justify capital expenditures in the period immediately prior to 1965 of some \$12½ million more than would otherwise have been required.”

But, later on in his submission he goes on to say that even this is subject to the consideration of other competing sources of power and development. Even that small favourable submission — he says here on page 5:

“A study of the effect of developing the site at Fort a la Corne and combining it with existing steam plant in a manner equivalent to the Coteau Creek case, shows that after 1975, the a la Corne site offers economies just as significant as those of Coteau Creek and that it could be economically developed by 1968-70 (five years after this other thing is going to come into production). Coteau Creek has no long-term advantage over a la Corne except in the other aspects of the scheme, in irrigation, etc.”

In other words he says that Coteau Creek has no long-term advantage over a la Corne . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — For power.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . except in regard to irrigation. Now then, in other words, it is no advantage to the Province from the standpoint of power. Now that sweeps the ground from under this scheme. Well, if it is of no advantage in regard to power, then of course, one of the main things that we held out to the rest of this country as the advantage from this plan, that it would be a cheap source of electric power, and that has been at least thrown in doubt by this report.

He sums it up on page 4 — even what he says is favourable is subject to this consideration. And I ask you to note this, Mr. Speaker:

“The costs of all-steam system used from comparison are those assumed for 1965 and do not take into account the effect of possible technicological developments, nor the effect of alternative schemes such as the Fort a la Corne site as it now stands. While the combined hydro and steam system considered shows a significant margin of cost in favour of the hydro project, it should be noted that this margin must be greater than the saving that could reasonably be expected from alternative schemes for the hydro development to be justified.”

In other words he is saying there, Mr. Speaker, that when he is comparing the Coteau Creek site with alternative schemes, whereby the electricity is generated from steam, it must be remembered that there may be technological developments which will put down even the margin he says

does exist in favour of Coteau Creek. And he goes on to deal with that later on. In other words, even a small benefit that he says is subject to the fact that there may be technological development that will wipe it out.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, look the Premier says, “hear hear.”

Premier Douglas: — Why sure.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, now then, if that is true, if there is no real advantage in this thing from a power standpoint then one of the worst blows has been struck at the scheme that you could strike at it. I never would have expected this Government to say “Hear hear” to that proposition because I do not believe it is true and I doubt very much if the Minister in charge of the Power Commission believes it is true. I think that Cass-Beggs was making out a case to try and prove that this scheme was no good from a power standpoint in order to have this whole scheme sabotaged and then . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Nonsense! Aw, rate . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Why is it then — why is it that you come along yourselves and say that the situation is better than he makes it out? Why did you take so long to make that submission?

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Mr. Speaker, the reason is — the hon. gentleman speaks as if Mr. Tomlinson could accept this report in March, and over the weekend or so make a statement on that report and check all the data, when there were developments proceeding all through the summer which provided information that was not available to Mr. Cass-Beggs and Mr. Tomlinson’s criticism came in the Fall on the basis of that information that he had gathered in the meantime.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I understood that Cass-Beggs has been examining this record of the flows for the last seven years. We were told by the Minister in charge that Cass-Beggs had made a report on the Saskatchewan river and examined the flows and everything else and when he came into the Department he had some examinations and reports of Cass-Beggs and is it to be said that the engineers under the Power Corporation did not have the flows of the river available and did not have a chance to thoroughly examine those things and that it would take them until January 31st to indicate to the P.F.R.A. the Cass-Beggs had taken a pessimistic view of this thing? Well then, they were not on the job very much, that is all I can say. Here, they were asked in the spring of 1949 — the Power Corporation — they were told that they were going to be the ones that were going to look after the question of bringing a report in about the cost. They knew early in 1949. And they referred it to Cass-Beggs. Then when Cass-Beggs makes this report in March, 1950,

March 18, 1952

minimizing the value of this development from a power standpoint, of course, I understand the result of this was that this Government went into conference with the Dominion Government and said: "We do not think we should pay very much of the cost of this report because actually from a power standpoint it is not worth very much."

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, does my hon. friend know that this Government ever said that in conference with the Dominion Government?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I understand that that was the basis of the Cass-Beggs report.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I asked my hon. friend a question. He made the statement that this Government went into conference with the Federal Government and took the position that this power is not worth very much. Does he know that this Government ever made such a statement?

Mr. Tucker: — I understand that was the attitude you took.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that statement is absolutely erroneous and incorrect and my hon. friend, unless he can produce some proof, had better withdraw it.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not intend to withdraw it. That is what I understood.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I say the statement is untrue.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, say it. And I say that is what I understand.

Premier Douglas: — And I know the people of the province will know it is untrue.

Mr. Tucker: — You can say it all you want but I say that I understand that on the basis of the Cass-Beggs report your Government took the attitude that this, from a power standpoint, was not worth very much. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what Cass-Beggs says.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I say then, on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Is he rising to correct me, Mr. Speaker? Is he in order or is he not?

Premier Douglas: — I am rising, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — He is rising to correct me, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not rising on correction. I am rising on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — . . . is now presuming to speak for the Provincial Government, which he has no authority to do. He said the Provincial Government . . .

Some Hon. Members (Opposition): — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — . . . He says the Provincial Government took the position, in conference with the Federal Government, that we did not consider this power was worth very much. I say he has no authority to make that statement. The thing is completely incorrect and if he can produce any evidence to the contrary I will be glad to hear it, but the evidence will all prove that there was no such statement ever made to the Federal Government, at any time, in our conference with them.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, has he got a good point of order or not?

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member made a categorical statement that that is what they did, then he must withdraw it; but I understand him to say that that is his opinion as to what did happen. That is, a supposition, that you supposed that is what happened.

Mr. Tucker: — Based upon the Cass-Beggs report which your Cabinet submitted to P.F.R.A. and which says that very thing. How can you try and wiggle out of it? Does the hon. Premier think that if he gets up here and positively says black is white that that makes it so? Well, I don't know. Here I have read from this report which makes that case, and the Cabinet authorized that to be sent to P.F.R.A. which makes that case.

Premier Douglas: — It doesn't make that case.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, all right, I will read some more of it.

Premier Douglas: — Go ahead.

Mr. Tucker: — And then the Premier gets up and wants me to withdraw it. Did you ever hear of such a thing, Mr. Speaker? Who in the world does he think he is? I am quite aware that the Premier thinks he can just make things vanish by saying, "tissue of lies", "innuendoes", "pooh"; and that is the end of it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, as you know, after all in the face of established fact it does not have the same magic effect as it used to have.

Now then, I will just go on to read from page five, roman numerals, of this report:

"The maximum contribution that the power aspect can make to the project is considered to be . . ."

And I ask you to bear in mind it is subject to all these other considerations, subject even to atomic energy, that are thrown in just to throw even

March 18, 1952

more doubt on the scheme. It goes on to say:

“The whole cost of generating plant estimated at \$8 million. The cost of additional transmission facilities estimated at \$4½ million. The allocation of auxiliary steam plant from existing capacity, valued initially at \$2 million.”

Now, just listen to this . . .

Premier Douglas: — It is page 6, not 5, isn't it?

Mr. Tucker: — No, 5, according to the one I have got. It may be different. This is the conclusion in it . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Conclusion? Ha!

Mr. Tucker: — “An annual” — (I suppose you have got the one that was presented that we were told was different.)

“(d) An annual or lump sum over the period 1965-75 representing savings as compared with any alternative now in view, total not more than \$2½ million.”

And that, subject to possibly very great savings, if they get gas. This is the report of Cass-Beggs. Then he goes on to say:

“(e) An occasional sum in respect of possible extra water after 1970 up to a maximum of about \$350,000 in any one year.”

“(f) Power required for pumping at very low cost.”

Now, there is the conclusion of Professor Cass-Beggs. But, Mr. Speaker, it is subject to these other considerations and anybody looking at these considerations would say: “Well, if under the most favourable considerations this is the most that could be brought out of this, a little bit of an advantage between 1965 and 1968.” — Then, he goes on to say this:

Page 47 on the copy of the report I have:

“However, it would not be satisfactory to argue that, therefore, the province could pay out in respect of the dam the present equivalent of either the capital saving of (c) or the annual saving of (b).”

You see, he is whittling even that down!

“In the first place substantial benefits must be left to accrue to the Power Corporation to justify its undertaking the project. In the second place the savings indicated are in relation to the hypothetical all-steam system based on maintaining costs and efficiency as of 1965.”

And I ask you to note this, Mr. Speaker:

“It is probable that the efficient development of the provincial system on lines that did not include the South Saskatchewan River project would, in fact, show economies, compared with the all-steam system considered, that might be as great as, (or possibly even greater) than, the economies now shown in favour of hydro.”

In other words, there may be much improvements, much technological improvements, that you will be able to generate electricity from steam by 1965 cheaper than from hydro. Well, again this whole claim of the limited trends of this scheme is based upon leaving out of account these considerations.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What did you want us to do?

Mr. Tucker: — Now, he comes along and says it is subject to these considerations.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is right.

Mr. Tucker: — He goes on to say:

“It is not possible to estimate these factors with precision since in part they depend upon technological advances, but it is clear that a margin must be shown in favour of hydro and that it must be of such a magnitude that it is not likely to be exceeded by any alternative that might reasonably be expected to arrive in the period under consideration.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Right.

Mr. Tucker: — “Right”, the Government says. Apparently they are in support of this Cass-Beggs thing now, apparently so.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What do you want, a Board of Trade report?

Mr. Tucker: — They are not prepared to go as far as Tomlinson, that is why they did not indorse Tomlinson because they agreed more with Cass-Beggs. Now the, it goes on:

March 18, 1952

“A brief reference to some of the alternatives to the all-steam system considered will serve to emphasize the above argument. The Fort a la Corne site, as it now stands (unregulated) could be developed soon after 1965. It would provide sufficient pondage to accommodate daily peaks and so it could be used for peak loads as in the case of the Coteau Creek plant, up to a relatively large capacity at low plant factor. In the summer it would provide a great deal of secondary power. Fort a la Corne is somewhat more favourably situated as to local loads and would be in competition with generally higher fuel costs. Sufficient information exists regarding Fort a la Corne to make a study of this alternative quite feasible.”

I ask you to note this, Mr. Speaker:

“Further development of the lignite resources of the south of the province might lead to significant reductions in the cost of fuel-generated power, particularly from the gasification of lignite and the use of gas turbines. Whatever the fuel, the gas turbine promises to be a much simpler plant than steam and should be cheaper, both in capital and operating costs. No boiler plant is required, nor is a condenser and cooling water.

“While any cost estimates would be largely guesswork at this stage, it should be noted that the costs taken for the all-steam system considered were 16.5 per kilowatt per year plus 3.5 mills per kilowatt incremental energy cost. Suppose the incremental cost remains the same (that is, the same fuel cost and efficiency — the plant might thus be in Saskatoon) a reduction of about one-third in the fixed cost per kilowatt. For example, to a hundred dollars capital cost per kilowatt, instead of \$150 for steam and \$4 per kilowatt instead of \$6.00 per kilowatt per annum for the fixed part of the operating cost; . . .”

Premier Douglas: — What is wrong with that?

Mr. Tucker: — “. . . would remove the advantage that the combined system shows over all-steam in the middle period up to say, 1980.”

It would remove that advantage, if there were these technological advances so there would be no advantage from the scheme from a power standpoint.

Now he goes on:

“(3) Nuclear energy cannot be dismissed as a source of power within the period considered. At the present time nuclear energy is considered to be able to compete with expensive coal. It would be reasonable to assume that both gas turbine plants and nuclear energy plants will be well established in 10 to 15 years time.”

Well, that is the time when this project will be producing power, if it is started at once. Continuing with the report:

“The adoption of the hydro project at that time, (following a decision made now) would preclude the adoption of these alternatives for a further 10 years or more, at least as far as the area accessible to hydroelectric energy is concerned.”

In other words, Professor Cass-Beggs is saying that if we get these technological advances it is going to set back our progress perhaps by 10 years. Well, that is what he is saying here. I will read it again for the benefit of the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank).

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Do I understand from what the hon. Leader of the Opposition says that technological advances are going to set us back? Is he opposed to technological advances, even if it is nuclear energy?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, the Minister of Natural Resources has just demonstrated that he was not paying any attention to what was being said. And if he is not paying any attention he should not undertake to expose his ignorance by asking questions.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his answer.

Mr. Tucker: — You are very welcome, I am sure. I am always pleased to oblige you. I will read it again — well, I won't bother, because he is not listening again, he is just trying to interrupt that is all. I will read you the last sentence:

“(4) The adoption of a hydro project at that time, following a decision made now, would preclude the adoption of these alternatives for a further 10 years or more, at least as far as the area accessible to the hydroelectric energy is concerned.”

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that he is saying here that if we made a decision now for the Coteau Creek scheme and we got these technological advances, the fact of the adoption of this scheme now would preclude

March 18, 1952

the adoption of these alternatives which are so beneficial for a further 10 years or more.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He is not saying that.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that is what he says in so many words. I suggest that the Minister get it and spell it out for his own benefit. Now then . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I can read too”

Mr. Danielson: — He is one of the experts!

Mr. Tucker: — “In the event that major natural gas fields are developed in Saskatchewan . . .”

There is another consideration. He says to begin with it is going to have these limited advantages, but it is subject to all these other considerations. When he gets through with all these other considerations I wonder how much is left of the advantages?

“In the event that major natural gas fields are developed in Saskatchewan — (which we expect and confidently believe will take place) — the resulting reduction in fuel costs could make a considerable reduction in the costs of the all-steam case used for comparison. If natural gas were to become available, say at Saskatoon, at 10 cents per thousand cubic feet, it would halve the fuel cost by nearly 2 mills per kilowatt hour. This would be more significant than the greatest economies to be obtained from the hydro project.”

In other words, if we get that gas it wipes out the advantage of the thing from a hydro standpoint altogether. Now, there is the Cass-Beggs report.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is why he doesn't want gas.

Mr. Tucker: — This was turned over to P.F.R.A. in June, made available to the people studying the projects down at Ottawa; and nothing was said by this Government showing that they disagreed with it, until a letter was written by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), February 1, 1951. He then submits a statement of Mr. Tomlinson, suggesting that perhaps Cass-Beggs did not take full account of the flow in the streams, that perhaps the P.F.R.A. were too optimistic, and that perhaps the benefit of this lies someplace between. But that it is all subject to the idea put forward by Cass-Beggs that if gas is found, for example, the whole thing is still wiped out as an advantage, from a power project standpoint.

Well, having put this report out and having done nothing to stop it for so long, even in a limited way, by the Tomlinson report, which still this Government did not endorse, they would not even say that they would go as far as Tomlinson in disagreeing with Cass-Beggs.

Premier Douglas: — Did we endorse the Cass-Beggs report?

Mr. Tucker: — No, you did not endorse it either. You just sent it on for what good it might do, or bad.

Mr. Danielson: — For election.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes. Well, that is really something! This Government gets a man from Toronto in here to make a report like that and then just puts it out and says, “We do not endorse it because we do not have to stand behind it actually.” “But if anything happens it will be the Liberals at Ottawa that will get the blame and won’t we raise the devil about it if we ever get them in that position.” And aren’t they doing it, today, Mr. Speaker. They could hardly wait to get this on the Order Paper. One week after the Session started they were busy trying to condemn the Federal Government, because, having read the reports that they caused the engineers that they hired to give, the Federal Government said, “Well, we had better take another look at the thing because the Provincial Government itself says, through their engineers, that the P.F.R.A. are too optimistic.

Premier Douglas: — Who in the Federal Government said that?

Mr. Tucker: — The Prime Minister says, that in view of the material submitted, they decided to take another look at the project.

Premier Douglas: — Submitted by whom?

Mr. Tucker: — By the Royal Commission they set up.

Premier Douglas: — What Royal Commission did they set up?

Mr. Tucker: — Surely you know about the Royal Commission that was set up? And, incidentally, in regard to that Royal Commission, now it has been mentioned — it was announced that it was going to be set up on May 31, 1951 — just about that time, well, there is May, April, March — about four months after this Government sent in Tomlinson’s report which still persisted in the fact that P.F.R.A. were too optimistic and decision was taken to look into the matter.

Mr. Gardiner took this attitude in the House:

“I still believe in this proposition. I still expect that it can be proved to be feasible; I am still behind it.”

And he did everything that he could possibly do, but the damage was already done.

March 18, 1952

Mr. Danielson: — You did it.

Mr. Tucker: — Here is what Mr. Gardiner said on the floor of the House, on May 31, 1951:

“What does the Government permit me to say to you tonight? They permit me to say this: They know I am convinced; they know the people out west are convinced. They think likely when we are all through that they are going to be convinced also, but they want to be sure they are right when they make the decision to go full blast ahead.

“They asked me to do one more thing for them. I said, ‘what is the one thing more?’ There are one, two or three experts we would like to have look at this thing. We are not going to ask you to get any more engineering reports, because we think you have all the information. Will you submit that information to one, two or three experts that we will agree upon and let them tell us whether they are as much convinced as you are? I have agreed to do that. I think it is a reasonable suggestion and I hope we will be able to get it done before we meet again, even if we meet this fall.”

There is the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture. He is convinced. He did not hesitate to say he was behind this project.

Premier Douglas: — He says, “we are convinced.”

Mr. Tucker: — Well, he is saying “we” speaking of himself and . . .

Premier Douglas: — No, he is saying the “people out west” are convinced, including this Government.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, you did not say so in your letter submitting to the P.F.R.A. the studies. You did not say it when you submitted the Cass-Beggs report. You just sent it on its way. When Tomlinson tried to cut it down a bit you said, well probably — but you sent it on its way without any endorsement. When you were asked by this Commission to make a submission on this matter, the Premier mentioned this Commission, and according to the statement recently filed in the House of Commons about the Royal Commission, as I read that statement this Government was asked some time ago to file a submission to that Commission, and so far as I remember it (I believe that letter was dated March 3, 1952), the Royal Commission said that they still had not got a submission from this Government.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend if they have got a submission from any other governments yet?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, this Government is one that should be most ready to get the submission in because this scheme is all in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Yes, they are ready to get up on the floor of the House here and condemn the Federal Government, but why don't you do some of the things you are asked to do to back this scheme up in the only effective way it could be backed up? Here is this letter of March 3, 1952, from the Royal Commission:

“As you know a good deal of time and money has already been devoted to a study of this project. Our chairman, Dr. Hogg, some time ago invited the Governments of the three prairie provinces to file submissions in order to expedite our enquiry.”

I understand that no submission has yet been filed by this Government. Get up and deny it if you want to.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Commission asked that there would be hearings when they come here to Regina and we will certainly submit hearings when they come here. We have already met with the Commission last fall and we told the Commission that when they hold hearings here in Regina we will most certainly make submissions at that time. My hon. friend does not expect us to go . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I would like to inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Is the Minister of Agriculture in order? Is this a point of order, or is he correcting me?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You were asking . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Some Hon. Members: — Order! Quiet!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. B.T. Richardson, secretary . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I suggest to the hon. Minister that you might just as well wait. There is no use you trying . . . There evidently is going to be no decorum in the House.

Mr. Tucker: — It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that when you attempt to maintain order that the Premier and the members of his Cabinet . . .

Premier Douglas: — It was on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to say that when I tried to maintain order there was so much noise over there that no one could hear what I was saying, but evidently they are not taking any notice of anything.

March 18, 1952

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman is now reflecting on the fact that I got up. You asked me to get up. You said, "If my hon. friend denies it, get up." I got up and denied it. I got up and said, Mr. Speaker, that we had met the Commission, that we had told the Commission we would make our submission when they met in Regina to hold public hearings and we will make that submission when they come to Regina. Therefore I deny the implication that we have refused or been dilatory in making a submission.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the Premier to say if they had made a submission to this Commission. He got up and made a speech. He did not deal with the thing that I asked him. I will read it again. They wanted a submission from this Government. This is March 3, 1952, (this Commission was set up almost a year ago and they asked for a submission). I quote again:

"As you know, a great deal of time and money has already been devoted to the study of this project. Our chairman, Dr. Hogg, some time ago invited the governments of the three prairie provinces to file submissions."

You cannot file verbal submissions. They wanted written submissions in order to expedite the inquiry, and my suggestion was that this Government has not yet filed a written submission before this Royal Commission, although they were invited to do so long ago. That is how much they care about this thing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition a question?

Mr. Tucker: — Under guise of asking me a question you have persisted in making statements. That is what you have done over and over again, and His Honour the Speaker has pointed out that you have taken advantage of that ruse. He has not said it in so many words but he has implied it. I am not going to be a party to it any more.

Some Hon. Member: — How funny can you get?

Some Hon. Member: — He is getting balled up more and more. He can't take it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — I pointed out how the Cass-Beggs report threw great doubt on this, how it was turned over to the Federal Government, and nothing was done to show that in any way this Government disagreed with it; and nothing has been submitted by this Government for which they take responsibility, to this date, to show that they disagree with the Cass-Beggs report — nothing at all. Well, all right, but even when they submitted the Tomlinson report they said they did not endorse it. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — That is not true, I'll tell my hon. friend.

Mr. Tucker: — Is the Premier in order or not? I pointed out that when they submitted the Cass-Beggs report they said they did not endorse it, they just sent it forward. When they submitted the Tomlinson report they did not say that you supported the data sent with that or anything. All you said was this, that you were behind the project. But what I said was this: “Where have you ever disavowed the Cass-Beggs report?” You send in a report which makes out that this scheme is not in any way an advantage from a power standpoint. You have never disavowed that report in any way, but you say you are still in favour of it. That is the situation.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he makes provocative statements that are technically a statement of fact. You are not in a position to say that someone else did not do something and then object to them when they rise on a point of privilege and say that it is not correct. If you will confine yourself to your own opinion instead of making categorical statements I do not think we would have half the trouble that we are having at the present time.

Mr. Tucker: — I read their letters, Mr. Speaker, and I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that when the most categorical statements were made about the Liberal party and myself and I rose on a point of privilege to correct them, you told me I was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — They were being cited from the publication.

Mr. Tucker: — No, no, they were opinions of the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker). He was taking the attitude that the Minister of Agriculture had taken the stand that this Cass-Beggs report was the report of the Federal Government. Actually, the Minister of Agriculture had sent a wire, which the Premier referred to on the floor of this House, that it was not the Federal Government's report. Now surely I had a right to call attention to that misstatement of fact, but Your Honour said I was out of order. And you have let the Premier, over and over again, rise up to correct me.

Mr. Speaker: — All right.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I am still interested to know if you think I was out of order this afternoon. I am still interested in that.

In respect to this suggestion that there was something pulled out of a hat about the province paying a share of this over-all scheme. There was an order-in-council passed, No. PC 2298, indicating that the Federal Government would build the main dam in these propositions, impound the water and it is for the province, if they want to have hydroelectric development, to build the plant to make use of the water to produce electricity and it is for the province to make use of the water. That was established by order-in-council which this Government knows about; yet the hon. member for Hanley does not know about it. And he tried to pretend, this afternoon when he was on the air, that something had been done suddenly here, contrary to what was understood all along. This is the basis on which the St. Mary's dam was built. And Your Honour will remember,

March 18, 1952

he was talking about Mr. Gardiner suddenly springing things and so on. Was that not a statement of fact, Mr. Speaker?

Now then, just to come to the project itself for a minute or so. I wish it to be made very plain that as far as we are concerned, we are absolutely behind the scheme. We have been behind it, and we intend to continue to work for it with all the energy and resource which we have. In fact, when I was in the Federal House with Mr. Gardiner for the period from 1945 to 1948, we were there alone as Government supporters from Saskatchewan, and we certainly worked for this scheme to support it in every way we possibly could. And I am still in that position. I still believe that this would be a wonderful proposition and I regret that the Government of Saskatchewan got a report made which cuts the ground from under the scheme. I regret that they did not even really examine it before they turned it loose, bringing about this present situation. It is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because I am quite convinced that if they had not taken these steps I think that we would be going forward with the scheme today.

In regard to the advantages of the scheme — and these are based upon the P.F.R.A. figures, if we used the figures provided by this provincial Government they would not be so favourable. In this final summary report there is a very fine balance sheet drawn up following page 35. Estimated total capital and annual costs at full development. And, before I refer to this, I would like to say that I think we owe a real debt of gratitude and we should recognize it, to the people the Federal Government have placed in charge of working up this scheme — Dr. Thomson, Dr. C.G. Spence, Mr. McKenzie, the chief engineer of the P.F.R.A., Mr. G.N. Munro, the Associate chief engineer and Mr. A.E. Palmer, the superintendent of the Dominion Experimental station. Those are as fine and able a group of men as any government could assemble and it is just too bad that this Government had to import an engineer from Toronto to upset the benefit of their work. It is just too bad. This is another example of going out and getting experts from outside of the province that they figure are friendly disposed.

Here is the balance sheet drawn up by the P.F.R.A. It shows the cost of dam and reservoir (this, of course, is on the basis of the cost in, I believe, 1948) — \$68,600,000. The annual interest on that, \$2,058,000. Annual cost of operation and maintenance — \$300,000. So the total annual cost of this proposition, the dam and the reservoir, is \$2,358,000. In regard to irrigation, the distribution system would cost \$19½ million; the land development, \$5,600,000; the interest on that \$683,000 in one case and \$224,000 in the other. The total annual cost of the operation and maintenance of the distribution system, \$870,000. The total of those items is \$1,777,000. The power would cost \$10 million, interest \$350,000, annual operating and maintenance cost, \$400,000; total annual cost, \$750,000. That is the total annual cost of this whole proposition of \$4,885,000. That is the cost of the scheme, The Saskatchewan Power Development scheme — the Coteau Creek set-up.

Some Hon. Member: — What is the total?

Mr. Tucker: — The dam and reservoir, the irrigation and distribution system, the land development and the power — the total annual cost is \$4,885,000.

Premier Douglas: — You mean the cost of operation?

Mr. Tucker: — That includes the interest and the operation and maintenance cost. The total annual cost is \$4,885,000. The total cost on the basis on which they figured it — the capital cost is \$103,700,000. Those interest rates are calculated at 3 per cent on the cost of the dam and reservoir and 3½ per cent on the cost of the distribution system and powerhouse and 4 per cent on land development. And here are the estimated annual returns at full development.

This, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think every person from Saskatchewan should be familiar with and make full use of — this balance sheet drawn up by the P.F.R.A. Estimated annual returns at full development: Direct returns — irrigation, \$1½ million. They figure that on this basis — the net available to pay operation and maintenance of irrigation and on capital cost of providing same. This is obtained by deducting from the estimated annual gross farm income all costs for farm operation, interest and maintenance of farm capital exclusive of irrigation facilities and farm family living expenses. They figured that the direct returns from irrigation would be \$1½ million. On the basis on which they figured the value of this power, they figure it would be worth \$2,088,000. That gives a total of \$3,588,000. The indirect returns to the National Treasury: Municipal water supply, — that is assisting in the getting water to Regina and Moose Jaw and so on, it would eliminate the pumping cost and give them better water, and it is figured that the value of that is \$160,000. The saving in regard to P.F.A.A. that they would not have to pay out in regard to crop failures — \$368,000. Estimated increase in national revenue from enhanced production — \$800,000, and that is calculated on the basis of 13.8 per cent of increased gross farm revenue in the project area as a result of irrigation, using long-term average prices. Now that totals nearly \$5 million (\$4,916,000). And the annual cost is \$4,885,000. Those direct advantages cover the cost of operating for a year. Then, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, there are these indirect returns, the indirect returns to the provincial treasury — the increase in Education tax, school taxes, fishing licences, etc. The indirect returns to the municipalities, the increase in land taxes, etc. They do not attempt to estimate them. And then the intangible returns, and for those, they say: “See the body of the report.”

Now then, any one of us who thinks of the advantage of this scheme to Saskatchewan, and when you can point out that your actual direct returns would exceed your actual annual expenditure, and then think of all the indirect advantages, well, of course, naturally, anybody in Saskatchewan, if this thing is feasible at all, could not help but be in favour of it.

Now it has already been indicated, in regard to this report of the P.F.R.A. — I must say that I can understand why Mr. Gardiner feels that there is bound to be a favourable report of the Royal Commission. In this summary of the report it points out, as read by the hon. member for

March 18, 1952

Hanley, this afternoon, that thorough engineering investigation shows that construction of the dam will not involve any difficulties that modern engineering skill cannot solve within reasonable cost. But, Mr. Speaker, to find that site, where that could be said, entailed months and months of search and boring and work, to find the site where they felt they could put the dam in. This was not arrived at in one month. This finding of that specific site was arrived at after a tremendous amount of splendid engineering work on the part of P.F.R.A.

The water supply — here again I am glad that they did not go to somebody in Toronto who could throw a monkey-wrench. If the Federal Government had operated like that I wonder if we would be where we are, with a splendid report like this to go to our fellow-citizens in the rest of Canada to ask them to back this scheme.

Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas: — Why don't they act on it?

Mr. Tucker: — They do not act on it because you put in a report which made them doubtful about the thing, that is why.

In regard to water supply (this is an interesting thing) there is sufficient water in the South Saskatchewan river to develop this project to the extent visualized herein after making full allowance for International Treaty obligations and the irrigation of 1,700,000 acres in Alberta. And the area already irrigated in Alberta is only 450,000 acres. In other words, there is enough water here to fulfill our Treaty obligation to the States and irrigate another 1,250,000 acres in Alberta, — 1¼ million acres in Alberta, over and above that already irrigated.

One of the disadvantages of the scheme is the fact that to irrigate a third of the 500,000 acres, the water is going to have to be raised 120 feet which, of course, is going to cost a lot in pumping. That is one of the reasons why the available power for sale is going to be cut down if this thing develops. Because, on a third of the acreage the water has to be raised 120 feet. The other one-third requires a pump life of 30 feet, then a third of it is irrigated by gravity. They say that this will irrigate about the same amount of land as already irrigated under P.F.R.A. or otherwise, in western Canada. The capital cost of this is put by P.F.R.A. at \$57 per irrigated acre, which again is based upon a tremendous amount of work in examination of the whole situation. It could not have possibly been arrived at except after a tremendous amount of work.

Then, in regard to power. As I said, they are taking their own estimates of power. They are apparently not even accepting the Tomlinson records, because apparently in their opinion it is not optimistic enough. It is a most amazing thing that this Government puts up an amendment to condemn the Federal Government because it set up a Commission and, on the basis of the report made by the P.F.R.A., they are much more optimistic than any report sent in by this Provincial Government.

Premier Douglas: — Regarding power.

Mr. Tucker: — Well that is all the Provincial Government were asked about. They said “Power is the thing that you are particularly asked about.” And the one thing that they were asked about is the thing that they certainly made a job of in throwing cold water on the scheme. It is a good thing they were not asked about anything else, that is all I can say, Mr. Speaker.

Now in regard to irrigation. As has been pointed out, the increase in productivity of the land and so on — I was rather surprised to read the reports. I thought that there would be more farms made available as a result of this project before examining it carefully, but even the 1,500 additional irrigable units, making homes for that number of extra people is certainly well worthwhile. But in addition to that there is the advantage to the surrounding districts in regard to growing feed and giving them more stability.

Now I will not deal any more with the power angle of it, except to say the report does point out this, and this is the thing again that all the reports that this Government sent in threw cold water on, and I think they are wrong about it, Mr. Speaker. In the P.F.R.A. report they say down-stream power sites will be created and existing sites improved by this project. The Fort a la Corne site, as an instance, will have its potential energy production increased by nearly 100 million kilowatt hours by the building of this site at Coteau Creek. As I read Cass-Beggs’ report, the suggestion there (and, I understand, the attitude of the Power Commission) is that this is of no great increased advantage. The Minister agrees with that.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — No, Mr. Speaker, I must have shaken my head the wrong way.

Mr. Tucker: — You did. Certainly Cass-Beggs indicates that the Fort a la Corne thing is just as good as Coteau. The Tomlinson report, which I will not take time to read again — but I certainly understood it to take the attitude, that from the standpoint of improving the situation at Fort a la Corne, there was no great advantage from the scheme.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — That is not so.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I certainly understood that from the report. However, in this report it does definitely set out that there is a real advantage — and a considerable advantage. I have already dealt with the improvement in the situation so far as Regina and Moose Jaw is concerned.

In regard to recreation, the providing of this lake, which will add a 500 mile shore line, pretty well in the settled area of this part of Saskatchewan, is bound to have a good effect upon the people settled in this area, because it will be a real recreational site. I was very particularly interested in that aspect of things at Fort Peck, and the tourist development based upon the lake that has been created at Fort Peck is growing by leaps and bounds and I think that there is a great future in that regard if this lake can be created here.

March 18, 1952

As to stream control. It again points out the enhancement of the value of other potential power sites down stream and minimizing the danger of flood in the area down stream. And also the ability to raise the lakes in the Qu'Appelle system and regulate the flow through the Qu'Appelle and the Assiniboine which, of course, again is well worthwhile.

These are only some of the many advantages of this scheme and my own feeling, Mr. Speaker, is that here we were fortunate in having in charge of P.F.R.A. as Federal Minister of Agriculture, a Cabinet Minister from Saskatchewan. I am satisfied that he has made every possible effort to show that the scheme is feasible and to persuade the rest of the country to agree to going ahead with it. It is unfortunate that this Government, as I say, saw fit to import another one of their experts, who has taken the action which has been so detrimental to this scheme being proceeded with. I am hopeful that it will be abundantly established before this Royal Commission that the P.F.R.A. in their optimistic attitude toward this scheme and toward the power advantages from it, will be proved to be right and Cass-Beggs will be proved to be wrong.

This Government, in the course of this debate, has more or less taken the attitude that this is not of great advantage as a power proposition and has indicated they still think Cass-Beggs is right. That is not the attitude of the P.F.R.A., and I think it is not the attitude on which we will get the support of the rest of the country. I think that the P.F.R.A. are right. I think we are going to get great advantages from the development of this thing as a power scheme. I think we are going to get great advantages from an irrigation scheme, from a system of flood control and making better the sites below the system, in improving the Qu'Appelle and the flow in the Assiniboine and from the standpoint of creating a tourist attraction right here in the centre of the province; from the standpoint of making more stable the agriculture in all this part of Saskatchewan. I think we can establish that this is a splendid idea. But I think that one of the ways in which we will get it established, Mr. Speaker, is by getting behind it unitedly as Saskatchewan citizens and not trying to get some political advantage by saying, "Oh, because this has been held up to look into the matter, we condemn the Federal Government."

We say that that attitude is unjustified. Is that the way to persuade the rest of the country that they should support this scheme? If the members of this House who belong to the C.C.F. Party are sincere in their desire to see the scheme brought about as soon as possible, do they really think, in their hearts, that the way to bring it about is to pretend that Mr. Gardiner, for example, the man who has been working for this scheme for years and years, and is working for it today, is deliberately trying to get out of going ahead with it, as I have heard whispered across the floor of the House over and over again?

Some Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tucker: — Somebody says “Hear hear” to that. I wonder if they think that that is the way to get this scheme, or is it that they are so desperate and anxious to try to get votes somehow or another, in order to make an attack on the Liberal Party, they take this attitude.

Mr. Speaker, if it had not been made abundantly clear that the C.C.F. Party were out to try to make political capital out of this thing I would not have been interested in bringing out these facts about Cass-Beggs. The only reason I bring it out is because we are faced with the resolution moved by the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), and in the one thing that they were asked to deal with they practically indicate that they do not have much faith in it as an advantageous scheme. And, having done that, then they ask us to attack the Federal Government because it says, “Well, in view of what you have put forward, we would like to have another look at it.” I hope and trust that this Commission will report favourably to the scheme. If there are some things in which they uphold the attitude of the Provincial Government engineers, as far as I am concerned, I will go on working for the scheme. I hope that the people of Saskatchewan will know who is to blame for the hold-up in the scheme and I hope, at the first opportunity, they will put a government in power, a Liberal Government, that will see to it, in any report submitted, that they are sure it is right, and not send it forth without saying whether they believe in it or not. We will work for this scheme because we believe in it. We will not sit on the fence the way the C.C.F. Government has done, and hide behind an engineer imported from Toronto.

The hon. member for Hanley mounted to a very lofty attitude in talking to the members on this side of the House. He said: “Let us all get behind this scheme.”

Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — I am glad that somebody says “Hear hear”. It is the Minister of Highways — one recruit! “Let us forget politics; let us endorse this scheme . . .”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — Now I have lots of recruits. I think now this motion of mine is going to carry, because here is the motion. I am eliminating the politics out of this resolution. I am saying let us endorse the scheme and let us forget the politics, and if you agree with it, I ask you to vote for this amendment of mine. Now here is the motion that takes the politics out, Mr. Speaker:

I move, seconded by Mr. Danielson:

“That the proposed motion be amended by striking out the word ‘unwarranted’ in the first line thereof; and the words ‘in the face of ample evidence of its practical feasibility’ in the second and third lines thereof.”

March 18, 1952

This would take the politics out of it, and I hope that every member in this House can hold up his hand, because it is a vote on the feasibility of this proposition with all the politics taken out of it, removing this attempt to put blame on somebody. It would read like this:

“That this Assembly regrets . . .

Premier Douglas: — (interruption)

Mr. Tucker: — The Premier laughs at that! He would much rather get the political capital out and get a resolution through that asks for the scheme to be finished, or proceeded with. This resolution will read then:

“That this Assembly regrets the delay in proceeding with the South Saskatchewan River Dam project . . .”

We do not say “due to the report of Cass-Beggs.” We leave that out. We are not trying for political advantage. We say, “we regret this delay”, without saying why we think it occurred; and then we go on and say:

“. . . and urge that, in view of its economic and social value to the country as a whole, the Government of Canada proceed with the project without further delay.”

We regret the delay, and we ask that this be proceeded with, without further delay.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, in moving that motion, I am accepting the challenge of the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker). Let us take the politics out of this thing, and let us vote for Saskatchewan, and its development in the vote on this amendment which I now move.

Premier T.C. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all extend my congratulations to the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) on the masterly manner in which he presented what I thought was a very well documented, and very well prepared speech, this afternoon. I think it is one of the best speeches I have heard delivered in this House, and it is particularly subject to congratulation, having come from a member who is still a new-comer here for his first term.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition spoke for some two and three-quarter hours. I always notice that the length of his speeches are in inverse proportion to the amount of facts that he has at his disposal. He started his speech with lamenting that the member for Hanley had injected politics into this discussion, and wound up by asking us to take politics out of the discussion. The two and three-quarter hours in

between was spent on entirely politics, and in trying to lay the blame on this Government for the failure of the Federal Government to do something which he and his party promised they would do. He says: "I am moving an amendment to take off the blame. I do not want to attribute blame." But he spent two and a half hours trying to attribute blame, Mr. Speaker, to do so in the most unfair, and I think, in some ways, the most unscrupulous manner that any speaker has ever tried to do.

I do not think that in all the years I have listened to public men that I have seen such a brazen and laboured, and pathetic attempt of any speaker to extricate himself from the hole into which his Party has got itself, by its political dishonesty over a period of years. Here is the Leader of the Opposition, starting a speech by saying to this young member: "Now, I am very sorry that you introduced politics into this question." Why, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has made it a matter of political discussion for the last 16 years! There has not been a political campaign, Federal or Provincial, in this province that they have not discussed the South Saskatchewan dam, and held it out as election bait. They have even gone further, and hinted that if the people did not vote for the Liberal Party, they certainly would not get the Saskatchewan dam.

Well, they voted for the Liberal Party and they still did not get the South Saskatchewan dam!

No, let us take a look at our hon. friend's very transparent attempt to get the Federal Government out of the hole into which he and other Liberal speakers have managed to precipitate it. The real fact is that they went out and promised something, and apparently now they cannot sell the bill of goods to their own Government in Ottawa. They are now looking around for a scapegoat, and they tried two or three. The scapegoat is going to be, apparently, Professor Cass-Beggs, who, according to these gentlemen, is an outsider; one of these experts from outside that was brought in. One fellow from Toronto. But I notice that he was quoting extensively the consulting engineers on the P.F.R.A. report. Who are they? Major General H.B. Ferguson of the Corps of Engineers of the Army of the United States of America. He would not be an outsider — No. Dr. A. Cassandi, Professor of Civil Engineering, Harvard University. He would not be an outsider, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: — Was he not a C.C.F.er?

Premier Douglas: — No, no.

Mr. Tucker: — Cass-Beggs was.

Premier Douglas: — No, these fellows are not outsiders! The third one on the committee is Dr. John A. Allan, Consulting Engineer and Geologist at Edmonton. None of these people are Saskatchewan people that were on this Committee for the P.F.R.A. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. Tucker: — They are outstanding men, though.

March 18, 1952

Premier Douglas: — I always believe that you should go out and get outstanding men, and I think these are outstanding men.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — But to turn around and sneer at Professor Cass-Beggs because he comes from Toronto, Mr. Speaker, is a pretty cheap type of politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — And to make the statement that he is better known for his C.C.F. activities than he is for his knowledge of engineering is indicative of an individual who would not know an engineer if he met him in broad daylight.

Mr. Tucker: — You wouldn't either.

Premier Douglas: — What does the Leader of the Opposition know about engineering? I will show you in a few moments what he knows about engineering.

Mr. Tucker: — Court jester!

Premier Douglas: — You can always tell when the pups begin to growl that something is perking. You can always pick the mongrels out when you are throwing stones.

Mr. Tucker: — My that is funny! Look at them laugh!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts of this thing. There is no point in getting into a long argument about how much of the report was paid for by the P.F.R.A., and whether all the payments made covered this part of the report, or other work which was done at Fort a la Corne. There has been no attempt on the part of this Government to becloud the issue with reference to Professor Cass-Beggs. Professor Cass-Beggs was hired by a Committee that was set up. Professor Cass-Beggs not only did work on this report which was submitted to the P.F.R.A., but he has done other work. In successive summers he has come out here and done work, not only on the South Saskatchewan, but on the Fort a la Corne project, and on load growths, and has done a good deal of very commendable work. He submitted a report to Mr. Tomlinson, who is Chairman of this Committee, and that accompanying letter has already been quoted, submitted in March, 1950.

Now what did the P.F.R.A. and ourselves want? What did we want from Professor Cass-Beggs? Well, I cannot speak for the P.F.R.A., but I think they wanted exactly the same thing we did. We wanted an honest opinion by a well-trained engineer in hydroelectric power, as to whether or not the province of Saskatchewan would be justified in spending a very considerable sum of money in putting in power installations in this South Saskatchewan dam. May I make clear at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that if we had not come in on power at all the South Saskatchewan dam would still be a good project. In Alberta, the P.F.R.A. went ahead and built the St.

Mary's project, and my information is that there is not any power in connection with the St. Mary's project. Is that right?

Some Hon. Member: — Yes, that is right.

Premier Douglas: — But that did not stop them. It was certainly a matter which was most important — whether or not we should say to the Federal Government: "Let us just have this as an irrigation project. Let us have this as a project to conserve water, to irrigate land, because in our opinion, power would not be economical." Or, are we in a position to say to the Federal Government: "Yes, when you are putting in this dam, we would like at the same time to put in power installations, so that this project may not only be of benefit for agriculture, but also may provide cheap hydroelectric power." That is the information we wanted, and that is the information we asked Professor Cass-Beggs to get. He proceeded to make his study. My hon. friend complained, first of all, because he does not like the findings of this man. He says we should not have liked it. What is he suggesting — that we should have suppressed the report?

Mr. Tucker: — You should have got another engineer to examine it, as you did later.

Premier Douglas: — We will come to that. Is he suggesting that we should have suppressed the report?

Mr. Tucker: — No, I did not say that.

Premier Douglas: — Is he suggesting that Professor Cass-Beggs should have been asked to change some of the figures in the report, so as to make the picture look different from what it actually was? Is that what he is suggesting?

Mr. Tucker: — You have asked me a question. I will answer it if you want me to.

Premier Douglas: — Well, my hon. friend can answer it if he wants to, but certainly I will say this, that the whole impression I got from my hon. friend was that either the Government should have told Cass-Beggs to change the tenor of his report, or that we should have suppressed the report, because there might be certain things in it which we did not agree with.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I never suggested anything of the sort. I said that the least that could have been done by this Government, when it got the report, that it would not even endorse, was to have it looked into right away by other local engineers in whom they had faith, before they turned it over, to make sure that it was correct.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we did. That report was submitted in March 1950, and I will deal with the report in a moment. My hon. friend has completely misrepresented this report. Because the report raised certain problems, we then asked our own engineers to look into some things in this report, which we thought might be debatable, and that was why Mr. Tomlinson, manager of the Power Corporation, said to the P.F.R.A. "Well, there are

some things in it on which Professor Cass-Beggs is a little pessimistic, or it may be that you are a little optimistic, with the results of our further investigations. Here are certain opinions we want to give.”

Mr. Speaker, the Government is certainly not in a position to get half a dozen engineer’s reports and ask: “Was this engineer right — and that engineer wrong?” these engineer’s reports are the opinions of individuals, given honestly. These opinions differ, and differ very widely, as my hon. friend will find when he goes over the various reports that have been submitted, even to the P.F.R.A.

But what is wrong with this Cass-Beggs report? My hon. friend could not find, in his quotations from it, a single statement that was not true. That is significant. all he could find was that some of the statements might discourage somebody from going ahead with the power part of the South Saskatchewan. But nowhere were there statements in it that are not true.

I do not know whether I should quote in length from his letter and from his report. I will do so if it is necessary, but I can summarize it, and if anybody disagrees with my summary I will go back and quote it. Let me summarize it first:

What does Cass-Beggs say in his letter of submission, and in his report? When you take all the jargon out of it, it boils down to this:

(1) If you were going to spend \$33 million just for the power the South Saskatchewan development scheme would produce, you would be better advised, probably, or you might be better advised, to put up Fort a la Corne, which at that time was estimated at \$18 million, which would give you practically the same amount of power for about half the price.

(2) You have got to realize that while this thing looks all right now, in all fairness as a professional engineer, I must point out to you that other things may develop. Other sources of power may come along in the course of the next 20 or 25 years, that will produce power just as cheap, and maybe cheaper.

He said that in all honesty. You have to take into consideration that while it will be cheaper now than anything you can produce now from coal, or from oil, steam-generating plants, that there is the possibility of natural gas. There is the possibility of the gas turbine engines which are being used very extensively in the United States, and there is always the possibility even, of nuclear energy.

“Those things, in all conscience”, he says, “since you have asked my opinion, I must tell you that those things should be taken into consideration.” “But when you have summed it all up”, he says, “if I were speaking of this project in terms of power and power only, I doubt if I would recommend \$33 million being spent on it.” (That is at that time. The sum would be increased in relation.)

Mr. Tucker: — That was not the amount involved in power — \$33 million.

Premier Douglas: — No, no, but if we were going to put in \$33 million, only thinking in terms of power, it would not pay. But in view of the fact that this is a part of a larger scheme that will have other benefits, not related to power, then he recommends that the scheme is a feasible scheme for the Provincial Government to go into with respect to the power aspect of it.

He was not asked to report on irrigation, or any of the other benefits, but he does. He says here in his letter of submission:

“My investigation indicates that while the total cost of the project is several times its value as a power site, if the dam were constructed mainly for irrigation and available power could be usefully absorbed at the time of completion, it would have considerable value.”

He says here on page 2:

“Nevertheless, in the period of 1965 to 1975 the Coteau Creek project would show economies over any available alternative. These, and long-term savings appear to justify capital expenditures in the period immediately prior to 1965 of some \$12½ million more than would otherwise have been required.”

In other words, he is saying to the Government that the Government will be committed to putting money into main ditches. The Government will be committed to putting in money for levelling, and he is saying:

“In my opinion, as a professional engineer, you will be justified in putting even another \$12½ million into power, in order to get the benefits from the power.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this report? There is not a statement in it that is untrue. It is true that he points out all the things he has taken into consideration, and that is what we wanted. We did not ask somebody to come out and play “Pollyanna” for us. We did not want somebody to come out and say: “Now, the South Saskatchewan is such a good idea that you just go ahead and spend \$12½ million putting in \$8 million for a power plant, and \$4½ million for a transmission line. You just go right ahead and do it.” The South Saskatchewan project did not depend on power being produced then. It could still have been gone ahead with, even if there was no power.

Mr. Tucker: — Without power, you could only irrigate about a little over 150,000 acres. That means two-thirds of it would have to be irrigated by power.

March 18, 1952

Mr. Speaker: — May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he is doing exactly what . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Well you let him do it. Then I should have a right to do it too.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, I have interrupted my hon. friend a couple of times. Mr. Speaker, that is not so. The power we are talking about is power for transmission to other parts of Saskatchewan. There would always have to be a certain amount of power generated by whoever was running the dam, for the purpose of pumping water up on to the high land.

But the power installations we are talking about is power that would be put in by the Power Corporation, and whether that was put in or not does not determine whether or not the dam and the irrigation project is a feasible one or not. Therefore, Cass-Beggs did the thing we asked him to do. He pointed out that if you were going to build this just to get power you might be better to go to Fort a la Corne. You might be better to think in terms of gas. “But in view of the fact that you are really getting the dam for nothing — that it will be part of a bigger scheme — you are justified, in my opinion, in spending \$12½ million in going ahead with it.”

What better report could you get than that? The Leader of the Opposition says that “no place have we taken a stand definitely on this matter of where we stood on the Cass-Beggs report. That we did not endorse the Cass-Beggs report, and we did not endorse the Tomlinson report.” Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to have the fortunate position of my hon. friend, that I know more than the engineers. I am not prepared to say whether or not Mr. Cass-Beggs is right, in all the data he has submitted, and all the statistics that he produces. Nor is Mr. Tomlinson, nor is any other engineer. What the Government did do was after it had looked at the Cass-Beggs report, after it saw what Mr. Tomlinson had to say, who had done some study following Professor Cass-Beggs, the Saskatchewan Government showed where it stood by saying to the Federal Government on the 10th day of February, 1951: “We are prepared to put \$33 million on the line to show our good faith.”

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words, and louder than reports!

When we met Mr. Gardiner here on the 2nd of February, (and I do not usually go into what happens in private conferences — I usually try to avoid that, but my hon. friend has left me no alternative) we asked him what he thought would be a fair allocation of costs. Mr. Gardiner enumerated:

\$19 million for the main ditches and channels;	
6 “ “ levelling the ground;	
8 “ “ the power installation, (that does not take into consideration the transmission line)	

Total	\$33 million
-------	--------------

I ask the members of this House to accept my statement when I say that we did not quibble with Mr. Gardiner. We did not, as was suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition argue that, on the basis of the Cass-Beggs report, this might be a losing proposition; that this might not be good business; that \$8 million was too much; that \$19 million was too much for the drainage ditches. We did not argue at all. We said: "If you think those figures that your engineers have drafted are a fair allocation, we will discuss it with our engineers as to whether they think it is a fair allocation, and we will let you know."

At that time I said to Mr. Gardiner, in the presence of my colleagues: "We do not want to be discussing a hypothetical case. Are we really going to have this dam, or are we just talking about something that is only in the future?" Mr. Gardiner said: "Well, as a matter of fact, I saw the Prime Minister before I left Ottawa, and I had hoped, and I had reason to believe that an announcement that the dam would be built would be in the Speech from the Throne."

Mr. Tucker: — What year?

Premier Douglas: — Last year — 1951.

You will remember Mr. Gardiner was out here for the hanging of his picture, and we met him immediately after the picture was hung. We met him on February 2nd, following the hanging of the picture. Of course, the House had just opened the day before — I think this was a Friday and the House had opened on the Thursday. Mr. Gardiner said: "I had hoped, and I had reason to believe, that it would be referred to in the Speech from the Throne." "But", he said, "I noticed by this morning's paper that it is not in the Speech from the Throne." "But", he said, "I am confident that we have a pretty good chance of getting it in the estimates."

(Again may I say I do not like quoting conversations, but my friend has left me no choice.) I said to Mr. Gardiner (and my colleagues will vouch for it): "Do you want to write me and suggest this allocation — this division of cost?" Mr. Gardiner said very frankly that he preferred not to write. He preferred that we would write an offering so that it would strengthen his hand when he took the matter to the Government. In consequence, I wrote as an offer from the Saskatchewan Government, outlined as follows, dated February 10th:

"This will confirm the conversation which took place between you and the members of the Saskatchewan Government on Friday afternoon, February 2nd.

"Our understanding is that the Federal Government is prepared to accept full responsibility for the construction of the dam — the estimated cost of which is to be in the neighbourhood of \$68 million.

"It was further suggested that a distribution system at an estimated cost of \$19 million, and the cost of levelling the land for irrigation, which is estimated

March 18, 1952

at \$6 million, were to be the responsibility of the Provincial Government, and the water users who will benefit by this project.

“It was also suggested that the installations for the generation of hydroelectric power, at an estimated cost of \$8 million, were to be the exclusive responsibility of the Provincial Government.

“My colleagues and I are most anxious that the South Saskatchewan River Development Project shall be proceeded with at the earliest possible date. As soon as the Federal Government has announced its intention to proceed with this undertaking, we are prepared to negotiate and sign an agreement on the basis of the allocation of costs outlined above.”

How could anything be more specific? No question here of Cass-Beggs.

Mr. Tucker: — No, it was lurking behind the scenes.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, surely the Leader of the Opposition does not think that the people of this province are morons. The P.F.R.A. headed by Dr. Thomson and some other very capable people, supported by a committee of General Ferguson of the United States, Professor Cassandri of Harvard University and Professor Allan of Edmonton — three outstanding authorities, have tabled the reports. All the engineers they can get report, Mr. Speaker, not on the power aspect but on the economic practicability and the engineering feasibility of putting in a dam, drainage ditches, and the irrigation of 500,000 acres.

The Leader of the Opposition wants us to believe that with all that mass of evidence, the Federal Government threw it all out the window, because a power engineer, who reports, not on irrigation at all says: “I think it is a good idea, but if it were by itself — not part of an irrigation — I do not think it would be economically advantageous to put the site there.”

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition does not expect anybody to believe that. He may be able to get some of the supporters who sit with him over there to clutch at that as a straw, to save their political hides, but he is not going to get any intelligent person to believe that sort of story.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, here is the interesting thing. This Cass-Beggs report was sent to the Federal Government in June, 1950. It was six or seven months later that Mr. Gardiner came to meet us and said he wanted us to send this letter in; he wanted us to agree to put up our share. There was no question then of him saying: “Well, of course, in view of the Cass-Beggs report, we are not going ahead.” He had the report then for six or seven months. It had been tabled in

the House of Commons. Did Mr. Gardiner come to us and say: "Well, in view of the Cass-Beggs report, I think the deal is all off?" No, he said, on February 2nd, 1951, "I expected it yesterday in the Speech from the Throne, but I am sure it will be in the estimates when they come down in the course of the next few weeks."

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that they have not got a case. I will say this to the credit of Mr. Gardiner, that he has never tried to resort to the kind of subterfuge that the Leader of the Opposition has been resorting to all this afternoon and this evening.

Of course, Mr. Gardiner wrote to me in reply to my letter. I first of all received an acknowledgement from his secretary on February 19th, and then I received a letter from Mr. Gardiner himself dated June 26, 1951, and he said:

"Dear Mr. Douglas:

I am sorry when going over our files to find that I did not answer your letter of February 10, 1951.

"I note that you indicate in your letter that your Government is prepared to consider an expenditure of \$25 million on the irrigation system, and \$8 million for the generation of hydroelectric power, if the Federal Government would undertake to build a dam across the South Saskatchewan river near Outlook, at an estimated cost of \$68 million.

"I note that as soon as the Federal Government has announced its intention to proceed with this undertaking your Government is prepared to negotiate and sign an agreement on the basis of the above allocation of costs.

"There has been considerable discussion on the question since, some of which has found its way into Hansard, and some of which has taken place through the press. It has been recently announced that all of the information available with regard to the proposed South Saskatchewan development will be placed before a Committee of experts, and their opinion obtained before final consideration is given to the proposed development.

"The Prime Minister, Mr. St. Laurent, stated to the House, today, that he hopes to be able to announce the personnel of the Committee of experts at an early date.

"I hope favourable consideration will be made to the findings of the Water Board, etc."

March 18, 1952

There is no suggestion here, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Gardiner that the Cass-Beggs report, or any other report, had anything to do with the fact that the Federal Government had failed to announce the South Saskatchewan project as he had expected, when he met us on the 2nd of February.

If you will look at that statement which Mr. Gardiner made, and which the Leader of the Opposition quoted, I think it is a very significant statement. As a matter of fact, I think it is a very sad statement. I think it is a statement of a very disappointed man. Mr. Gardiner, speaking in the House of Commons, on May 31, 1951 — (Remember, Mr. Gardiner has confidently expected that as soon as this letter came from the Saskatchewan Government, that the Federal Government would agree to proceeding with the South Saskatchewan project), and Mr. Gardiner said to the House:

“What does the Government permit me to say to you tonight?”

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on the question of Mr. Gardiner never mentioning this Cass-Beggs report, or that he never brought it up, I just wish to refer the hon. Premier to what he did say on November 12, 1951, about the matter.

Premier Douglas: — I have it here.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, well do not say then, that he did not make a statement.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, Mr. Speaker, now that is trying to draw a red-herring across the tread. Well, I do not need any sneers from the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). Those bother me not at all. He has spent most of his life sneering at people, and the strange thing is that the world has gone on progressing, while he has continued to retrograde.

Surely Mr. Gardiner refers to the Cass-Beggs report. He referred to the fact that it had been tabled in the House, along with the other reports of the Commission, and I invite the Leader of the Opposition to produce any statement by Mr. Gardiner to the effect that the Cass-Beggs report has prevented the proceedings on the South Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — Thank you for the invitation. I accept it. On November 12, here is what Mr. Gardiner says — Page 937:

“This was the general power report made by Mr. Cass-Beggs:

“The paragraph I should like to read appears on the second page of this report, and is a letter from Mr. David Cass-Beggs, the engineer, to Mr. J.W. Tomlinson, General Manager, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Regina, presenting his report. He said:

“I am not able to recommend that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation make any contribution in

respect of hydroelectric sites near Coteau Creek which might be economically developed as a result of the regulated flow from the main dam.

“The criterion that must be applied, if development was considered at an early date is the same as that now used to estimate the investment justified at Coteau Creek, namely, they must compete with cheap fuel stations on fuel and operating costs alone. None of the sites required in the construction of the dam, as well as the power plant, could be built at the figures suited to the plant at Coteau Creek.”

Mr. Gardiner goes on to say this: (I read only that one paragraph, but there are other paragraphs along that same line. I shall not take the time to read them all, but they could be read. I read that paragraph in order to suggest that the results from the building of the dam were questioned.)

“There was the suggestion made that there was possibility of developing power from coal at a cost which might be less, but I understand that that question is now entirely removed, after examining into all the facts in relation to Mr. Tomlinson, of the Power Board of Saskatchewan, and the Government of Saskatchewan was satisfied that that would probably not be the result — that the cost would not be higher.

“But I do suggest that there is some reason given in that for the suggestion being in the minds of some people, that probably we ought to have further information on the whole matter, and at least a further examination made of the report, by eminent engineers, both those experienced in irrigation and those experienced in the development of power, before proceeding to spend over \$88 million to put in a dam, and then depend upon the province and the farmers to spend another \$33 million in order to carry out the power and irrigation development.”

Some Hon. Member (Govt.): — Read it all.

Premier Douglas: — You bet!

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Gardiner is saying there, in effect, that this is what made other people think there should be another report.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, how absurd can a man get when he is trying to get himself out of a hole? Mr. Gardiner himself says: “I understand that that question is now entirely removed.” Entirely removed! Well, he skipped over that very quickly, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend should read the whole thing.

March 18, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — I did it to be honest about the thing.

Some Hon. Member: — Read the whole thing.

Premier Douglas: — It has already been read once.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, here is a government that is talking about putting up a dam, but whether or not the power project is economically feasible does not affect them one iota. If the provincial Government wants to go ahead, and we have agreed to go ahead, in my letter of February 10th, to put \$12½ million into a hydroelectric installation in the South Saskatchewan — and if it was a losing proposition, why would that affect the Federal Government? What has the Federal Government got to lose?

Mr. Tucker: — They have to put in a plant to pump the water, to irrigate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, we have indicated our willingness to go ahead and put in the installation, and to sell them the power to pump the water. Now what could they lose? If anyone is going to lose — if Cass-Beggs were right in any of the doubts he raised, and later on gas or nuclear energy made possible cheaper power, this then becoming a liability — it is a liability for the Power Corporation, not for the Federal Government.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. gentlemen just sit down?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, you corrected me and I am going to correct you.

Premier Douglas: — The revenue from this power was to carry a good deal of the cost of this dam.

Mr. Tucker: — You misrepresent the thing entirely.

Premier Douglas: — Will this gentleman just sit still? He has been crying all day about being interrupted; being a cry-baby does not impress us, Mr. Speaker. Sit down! Sit down!

Mr. Tucker: — I do not have to sit down any more than you do.

Premier Douglas: — I have the floor.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, I had the floor too, and you got up and interrupted me. I have not interrupted the Premier one-quarter of what he interrupted me.

Premier Douglas: — After a member talks for two and three-quarter hours, and then tries to keep everybody else from talking, I think most people will be able to realize that it is simply because he cannot stand to have his case examined. He cannot stand to have his case examined!

Some Hon. Member: — He hasn't got a case.

Premier Douglas: — Here he is, saying a report submitted to us and passed on to the P.F.R.A. that because it raised certain questions about the economic feasibility of power which ought to be investigated, and finally wound up by saying that that stops the Federal Government from proceeding when the Federal Government were not interested in power in any shape or form, and if there was any loss it would be to the Provincial Government. How completely obtuse can one become in discussing public questions?

Mr. Tucker: — That's what I would like to know, as I listen to you.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition brings in this hypocritical tripe about taking politics . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That is in order, Mr. Speaker, I suppose?

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is some other parliamentary term I can use, I will say that when he brings in this line of his, about taking politics out of this question, when the Liberal Party have never allowed politics to get out of it for five minutes, and have used it for political advantage every time they could; when he comes in here and says he wants to move an amendment so that it will not allocate any blame, his whole attempt, not only while he was speaking, but all the time I have been speaking was to put blame on a gentleman who never did anything else except come and express his honest opinion, as to whether or not putting power installations in the South Saskatchewan would be economically advantageous for the Power Corporation, or not.

Mr. Speaker, the real fact is that Mr. Gardiner, (and I suppose my hon. friends opposite have belief in the South Saskatchewan River project. I think they have. I think they sincerely have) recognized as we do, that that project could be of tremendous value to this province, and to the people of this province. That is what Mr. Cass-Beggs recognized. In addition to the power — because you cannot look at it in terms of power alone (the power is a by-product) you have to look at it in terms of irrigation. While irrigation will only cover from 500 to 700,000 acres, there is something more important than the 1,500 families or so who will be moving into that area. That area would become a veritable feed, fodder and seed bank for all of Saskatchewan — all of southwest Saskatchewan. It would become the place to which we could go if we ever have drought again on a large scale, to be sure of getting feed and fodder to take care of the other parts of Saskatchewan.

By virtue of a large concentration of water (it seems to be generally agreed that moisture attracts moisture) we will get precipitation. It is the kind of thing that is being done at Fort Peck, done by the Americans during the depression — a much bigger proposition than the South Saskatchewan — for or five times as big. It was done there in the 'thirties, when we should have been doing it here. I think that the Leader of the Opposition believes that that would be a great advantage to the people of Saskatchewan. He and Mr. Gardiner have both advocated it.

March 18, 1952

When Mr. Gardiner met us here on the 2nd of February, he felt quite sure that he would have no difficulty selling it to the Government, particularly after getting a letter from the Government of Saskatchewan, offering to pay one-third of the total cost. He is disappointed, and this is what he said, when he spoke to the House on May 31, 1951:

“What does the Government permit me to say to you tonight? They permit me to say this: They know that I am convinced; they know the people out west are convinced (and that includes the Saskatchewan Government as per our letter of February 10th, offering to put up one-third of the cost). They think likely that when we are all through that they are going to be convinced also, but they want to be sure that they are right when they make the decision to go full-blast ahead.

“They asked me to do one thing more for them. I said: ‘What is the one thing more?’ There are one, two or three experts that we would like to have look at this thing. We are not going to ask you to get any more engineering reports, because we think you have all the information, all the engineering reports. Will you submit that information to one, two or three experts that we will agree upon, and let them tell us whether they are as much convinced as you are?

“I have agreed to do that. I think it is a reasonable suggestion, and I hope that we will be able to get it done before we meet again, even if we meet this fall.”

Mr. Speaker, there is no suggestion there that a power report regarding the question of generating power has anything to do with it. Mr. Gardiner is telling us frankly that he ran into trouble with the Cabinet, and that the Cabinet said to him: “We want two or three experts to have another look at this.”

Mr. Tucker: — Why did he run into trouble?

Premier Douglas: — Why did he run into trouble? Why? Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Because of the Cass-Beggs report.

Premier Douglas: — That is so silly!

Mr. Tucker: — No, it is not silly. It is a fact.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, how could the Cass-Beggs report on power have anything to do with the feasibility of an irrigation programme? If the Cass-Beggs report had suggested to the Government that we have no part of the power installation, and if my letter of February 10th had said to the Federal Government: “Mr. Gardiner, we will put up \$19 million for irrigation ditches; we will put up \$6 million for levelling; but power — no, we do not think it is worth generating power”, that should not

have stopped the South Saskatchewan, for the South Saskatchewan could have been proceeded with purely as an irrigation project, just as the St. Mary's was. It is true the Government would have had to generate some power to do its own pumping, but we would not have been in commercial power, and there would have been no need for an \$8 million installation, nor for a \$4½ million of transmission lines.

But we did not say that, Mr. Speaker. We said: "Irrespective of any doubts that may have been raised by engineers, we are so anxious to get this project that we will not rock the boat in any particulars, and we will therefore go the whole hog and put up \$33 million."

The Leader of the Opposition cannot get around that. He can wiggle and he can twist to pull the old dead horse out of the ditch into which it has fallen, but he cannot get around that. The Saskatchewan Government, on behalf of the Saskatchewan people, on February 10, 1951, showed its support for this project by pledging itself to put up \$33 million, irrespective of any report. The bald fact is that Mr. Gardiner, in spite of our letter indicating our willingness to pay one-third of the cost, went to the Federal Government but he could not win his colleagues over. He has lost some of his influence. Of course, down east they were pressing for the St. Lawrence Seaway. Somebody else was pressing for the Canso Causeway. Mr. Gardiner just got left out in the squeeze. I am sorry he got left out in the squeeze. I am sorry for the people of Saskatchewan's sake, but I object to this subterfuge of coming into the House and trying to blame it on to the Provincial Government, and at the same time saying: "Let us not allocate blame on anybody", at the same time that we are blaming an innocent power engineer, who had nothing to do with whether they went ahead with an irrigation project or not.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested an amendment. An amendment in which he wants to strike out "the unwarranted delay." Does he think the delay is warranted? Does he think that in the face of all the evidence that has been presented, that any delay is warranted? Engineering reports have been handed in for years, and other work has been done — not only P.F.R.A. engineers, but by General Ferguson, one of the greatest authorities on the North American continent, along with Cassandri and Allan. In spite of all that evidence, in spite of the assurance of the Minister of Agriculture to the Saskatchewan Government, who were ready to go ahead last year, they do not go ahead. The Leader of the Opposition wants us to strike out the word "unwarranted." Does that mean he thinks it is a warranted delay? Does he think we are justified in having a delay for another year or two, so this can be used for election bait for two or three more elections? We in this group say the delay is unwarranted. There is no excuse for delaying it. The preliminary work could have been started last summer. We could have been well on our way this year in the construction of that dam.

The next phrase he wants to strike out, is: "This Assembly regrets the unwarranted delay in proceeding with the South Saskatchewan Dam Project (and he wants to strike out the following words) "in the face of ample evidence of its practical feasibility."

Does my hon. friend not agree that there is ample evidence of its practical feasibility?

March 18, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — Read Cass-Beggs. It is not feasible.

Premier Douglas: — Here is a person who has been all afternoon saying what a good project it is, but this fellow Cass-Beggs spoiled it! Now he says there is not ample proof of its feasibility!

Mr. Tucker: — I do not say that at all.

Premier Douglas: — He wants to strike out the phrase that says “there is ample evidence.” Now what else can he mean, but that there is not ample proof?

Mr. Tucker: — Just to take the politics out of it, that’s all.

Premier Douglas: — Take the politics out!

Mr. Tucker: — Of course you wouldn’t agree to that, I know.

Premier Douglas: — My friend could no more take the politics out of anything he has to do with, than to take the smell out of an onion. It is part of the very make-up of the Liberal Party to inject politics into everything they have ever touched.

Mr. Tucker: — He is so much superior to everybody else!

Premier Douglas: — No, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the members of this Legislature have a duty to perform for the people of Saskatchewan, and that duty is to say to the Federal Government and the people of Canada, whose money will be involved:

(1) We think this present delay is unwarranted. In other words, we regret that another Commission and another long round of making trips around the country, and listening to evidence, and having briefs submitted, that that should all be gone through again — we think there is no need for it, and I think we ought to say so.

(2) I think we ought to say, secondly, what this resolution says: “That there is ample evidence”, that that evidence all points to the economic feasibility of the irrigation (and in the case of Mr. Cass-Beggs and Mr. Tomlinson, even of the power project).

(3) We ought to say that insofar as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, they have said, through their Government: “We are so convinced that we do not need any more evidence, that a year ago we offered to put \$33 million on the barrel-head. That is the best proof that we think there is ample evidence.”

Mr. Speaker, this Government will be put in an impossible position if, after having said that we are willing to put up \$33 million if we did not think there was ample evidence. We thought, a year ago, that all the evidence which was in our possession, weighing the good with the bad, weighing the different problems that were involved, trying to foresee the future and what new developments would take place — looking over the whole thing, it was still worth an expenditure of \$33 million.

Having said that more than a year ago, we cannot turn around now and say that we think there should be more investigation, and that we are not just sure that we have sufficient evidence to warrant going ahead with it.

We think there is adequate evidence. We think there never was any reason for not proceeding with it last year; and I think that this Legislature should go on record as saying so.

The question being put on the amendment of Mr. Tucker, it was negatived 29 to 18.

The debate continued on the motion of Mr. Walker (Hanley).

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. remarks will be very short, Mr. Speaker, on this topic, because there has been a considerable amount of discussion on this topic already. However, as I am living in the particular part of Saskatchewan where this dam is going to be built, I am very much interested, and so are the people whom I represent.

I was very much interested, this afternoon, when the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) introduced his resolution. He, of course, made some very sweeping statements to the effect that this Government had never known, nor anybody in this province had known anything about the fact that the province was supposed to put up the money for this power development. That, Mr. Speaker, is not a new thing in this province. I remember, between 1938 and 1944, when the member from Moose Jaw, the late Judge Ross, made several addresses on this topic and, if I remember correctly, he was president of the South Saskatchewan Development Association. And Mr. Spence was in the House part of that time and, as we know, he was very much interested in this development, and he explained it very fully for us. So there is no use for any C.C.F.er, or any member of this House, pretending ignorance of this fact. They know, and the people of the province know, that the cost of the power development in connection with the dam was the responsibility of the province of Saskatchewan and any statement to the contrary is ignorance on the part of the person who makes it, or else it is deliberately saying something when he knows otherwise.

In spite of what the Premier has said, the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the Government at Ottawa, when they got this report which has been so much discussed here this afternoon and this evening, hesitated to go ahead with this dam, and the Premier cannot talk that fact off. It is here. It has been proven time and time again. This report was here, it was sent in by this Government and it was paid for by this Government. Then what the Government at Ottawa did was just simply what any good solid group of business people would do. They said: "In view of this contradictory report", or should we say "pessimistic report as compared with the P.F.R.A. report on this proposition, we think it would be wise, before we commit the people of Canada to an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, to take a second look at it. It may take a year or so, but it will be well worthwhile to be sure that we know what we are doing before we go ahead." That was one thing that was done by this Government, and no amount of talking or squirming or calling names to the members on this side of the House is going to get the Premier away from the fact. It is on the record. It is on Hansard, and it is in these reports that have been read

here today. It is in here — not one, but two of them, as even Tomlinson's report, while it is much milder and much closer to the report of the P.F.R.A., nevertheless, it is very pessimistic and should give any group of good business men doubt about what might really be the situation.

If there is any delay, the delay is due to the reports of this Government, and if they can use this to squeeze through the next election, they are going to do it. That is why it is there, and for nothing else. It is there for one purpose. Why have these gentlemen over here kept this so quiet all this time? Why didn't they know something about it last winter? We had to get that report in a round-about way and then when we got it they said there were two reports. Evidently there is only one report. What is the idea? Why didn't they table this report in the House last Session? Why didn't they table it at the beginning of this Session and let the people of this province and the members on this side of the House know more about what was in it? We had to get it piecemeal. We have been getting some of it here and there. Some in the Crown Corporations Committee and some someplace else, that is what we had to do. And they can squirm and squeal and jump around all they like, they can call names to this side of the House, but the fact is there that they got this C.C.F. candidate from the city of Toronto or someplace down there to come here and make the report that they wanted and they have used it for what they wanted. That is the fact and they cannot talk it off because it is right here on the paper. And all this squirming and all this flip of the tongue will never get away from that fact.

The member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) stood here, this afternoon, and made a statement which is absolutely contrary to the facts. He is either ignorant of what he was talking about or else he deliberately made a statement that he knew was not true. I do not know which is the fact. But it was no secret to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the province of Saskatchewan was expected to provide the power facilities if this work was undertaken. So far as I am concerned, and it is in my constituency, the dam is absolutely in the middle of my constituency on the west border, across the Saskatchewan river, and I am very much interested in it and the people in my district are interested. It is far bigger than any C.C.F. or any Liberal or anybody else in this province. It is not what it is a part of or whether it is political in one sense or the other. This is the practical thing that should be done. It is an economic necessity to this part of the province of Saskatchewan and we pray that it will be done, regardless of any opposition or any quibbling or anything that can be put in the way by either the C.C.F. or any other political party. We may have to wait, but we will still fight and work for it. I am a member of that organization and I have been interested in it for many years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to go against our principles by voting against the resolution because there is something in there that is political quibbling — a little bit of a dart and stab from somebody else — trying to get a vote or two when the election comes around. We are going to vote for the principle of the thing, and that is that we want this dam. We want the dam put in there. We want the power development that will go with it, and all the other things that will be of benefit to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, particularly in the south and

southwestern parts.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will, and I am sure that every member on this side of the House will support this resolution, because the main item, the main principle of this resolution is that we want the thing done. For that reason I am going to vote for it.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — I am rising to take part in this debate as I feel there is a very great need, Mr. Speaker, to see that some provision is made to take care of the run-off from the watershed on the eastern side of our Rockies, and in doing so, provide for an irrigation scheme which is very badly needed in this province; and also to provide some protection and flood control measures for areas in my own constituency such as the Pike Lake and the Valley Park areas, which have been repeatedly flooded during the last ten years.

I have been a bit disappointed, this afternoon, that most of the discussion has been around the power possibility of this project, rather than the irrigation side of the scheme. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, there has been proven a need for a scheme of this kind that would provide security of income for the farmers in certain parts of this province. I also feel quite sure that if this scheme was properly organized and communities properly set up, that we could provide much better facilities in the way of educational and health services, as well as power and transportation services, which we have heard a lot about in this Chamber. I am not going to dwell on that, because the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) made a very good job in dealing with the need of this dam in relation to irrigation.

I do, however, want to mention the political abuse that has been made of this scheme by the Liberal Party, not only in Saskatchewan, but in the Federal field as well. The Opposition are laughing, but I want to tell them that the people of this province are not only disgusted but they are becoming quite tired of being promised, one election after the other, that this dam will be proceeded with, and then when the election is over, nothing is ever done. Now we have been told — I heard it a few moments ago — that this province was always expected to share a part of the construction of this project. Mr. Speaker, I sat in the ballroom of the Saskatchewan hotel in this city in the spring of 1946 and I listened to the Federal Minister of Agriculture state very definitely that he did not have to have the consent of this Government, nor of the Organization which the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) represents, nor of the municipalities. He was prepared, and the Dominion Government was prepared to proceed with this scheme at a cost of \$110 million. I have his words right here. And then, in Ottawa, on May 21st, he goes on to say: “We are prepared to dig the ditches to make the water available as soon as there is an organization at the end of the ditch to use the water.” And then in Lethbridge . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! Where is the Organization to use the water?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Just a minute, I'll give you all you want before

March 18, 1952

I am through here.

And then, in Lethbridge, on July 12, 1947, he outlined the conditions under which the Dominion Government was prepared to go ahead with these large projects, described as:

“1. On the part of the province concerned, transferral of water rights of the project to the Dominion.”

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. Minister reading from?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — The report in the “Leader-Post” July 12th, of a speech made in Lethbridge by Mr. Gardiner.

Some Hon. Member: — What year?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — In 1947. He continues:

“2. The province will make available to the Dominion such Crown lands as will be used in the project in any way.”

And then he goes on to say:

“Our intention is to construct dams and storage reservoirs and connecting canals. When these are completed we will deliver the water in accordance with agreement previously reached.”

There is not a word — not a single word — about the provincial Government paying one red cent in connection with this project!

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, was that not in reference to the St. Mary’s dam?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I am not talking about the St. Mary’s dam. I am talking about the South Saskatchewan dam.

And, on June 14, 1948, at Eyebrow, Mr. Gardiner was speaking at a picnic:

“It was stressed by him that the undertakings as planned by the Dominion Government to the P.F.R.A. could never be carried out as a provincial project alone. The people in Saskatchewan could not raise the money required because of the sparse population, he said.”

Now that is what he was telling us in the west. At that particular time I was in correspondence with the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe in connection with a dam at South Saskatchewan Landing — a bridge, rather, I wrote Mr. Howe wanting to know what was going to happen in connection with this proposed dam at Coteau Creek. And here is what he said, on May 7, 1947:

I am under the impression that final selection of the proposed dam site for control of the Saskatchewan river has not yet been made, although choice has been narrowed to a portion of that strip of river between Elbow and Outlook.”

“You will understand that specific location and the height of the proposed dam must be known before a prediction can be made with respect to the high water level which will occur at Saskatchewan Landing if the dam is in operation.”

These letters have been tabled in the House of Commons or I would not be reading them.

Mr. Tucker: — I think Mr. Speaker, they should be tabled here now.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I am prepared to table them. They have been tabled in the House of Commons and I am prepared to table them here.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to rule that the letter written by the Minister to Mr. Howe and the answer that he has read may be tabled.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I shall be glad to do so. Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition may recall that after I went to Swift Current and discussed with the good people there the possibility of building this bridge, he made a speech there a few weeks later, and he told them at that time that their first responsibility was to build this dam and then the bridge.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I have the report here.

Mr. Tucker: — Produce the report. I never made any such statement.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I will let you see it. I have it in the “Leader-Post.”

Mr. Tucker: — I did not make any such statement. Now you ruled over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that when a statement is made like that it should be accepted or else proof brought forward. Let the Minister bring the proof.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member cannot produce proof he must withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I’ll withdraw it, but I’ll get the proof.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough for a member to say, “I’ll produce it sometime.”

March 18, 1952

****Note:** Pages in the bound volume were misnumbered. This page is intentionally blank to maintain coordination with the pages in the bound volume.

Mr. Speaker: — He said that he will withdraw it until he can produce the evidence.

Premier Douglas: — Use your ears my boy.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — After the hon. member had made some of these statements I wrote to Mr. Howe, as follows:

“I note from the daily press in Saskatchewan that Mr. Tucker has made the statement that you have assured the Government of Saskatchewan that consideration will be given to sharing the cost of the Saskatchewan Landing Bridge.”

And I get this answer back from Mr. Howe:

Mr. Tucker: — Where does the Minister get the statement he conveys to Mr. Howe?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Just a minute, hold your temper. I did not bother you.

Mr. Tucker: — But you are reading something that I said that I never actually said. Mr. Speaker, let him prove that too.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I am reading this letter.

Mr. Tucker: — You putting it in the letter does not make it so!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — That is all right. This is the answer I got. He said:

“I am not aware of any change in the situation affecting Saskatchewan Landing Bridge since we discussed the subject in my office, and the site of the proposed dam has not been chosen.”

That was on January 31, 1948. So, while Mr. Gardiner and the Leader of the Opposition were going around this province telling the people how soon they were going to start to build this dam, here we have his colleague in the Cabinet at Ottawa stating that there has been no decision made in regard to this dam.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, we never said there was a decision made. We said if the dam were built according to the proposition, that that bridge would be under water.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Here is some of the stuff that they were peddling around the constituency of Rosthern during the by-election.

Some Hon. Member: — They were not putting politics in it!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Oh no, they weren't putting politics in it! And at that time this area up around the location of the dam was going to become the Essen of Saskatchewan. They had smelter

March 18, 1952

works in operation there. They were bringing the minerals in from Trail. I did not know they mined at Trail, I thought they had a smelter there.

Mr. Tucker: — Who was going to do that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well, according to the “Star-Phoenix” — possibly it is wrong. I have it here if you want to see it.

Some Hon. Member: — Any plastic factories?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And they were going to irrigate 692,000 acres of land; 199,000 at Outlook and Hanley; 170,000 at Elbow; 175,000 at . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister has said that we were going to have minerals brought in from Trail. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is incorrect so far as I am concerned, and I would like him to say who said that.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — This is reporting Mr. Gardiner during the by-election in Rosthern.

Mr. Tucker: — Where? When?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Here it is right here — October 16, 1948.

Mr. Tucker: — What did he say?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I just read it to you. I am not going to take the time that you took going over all the details. The trouble is it is hurting a bit.

Then, in 1950, Mr. Gardiner, at his nominating convention in Melville, gets up and makes the statement that the Dominion Government will be in a position next year to start construction of the dam on the South Saskatchewan River.

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — That was 1949.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And then he goes on to tell about the report he has had from General Ferguson, the noted U.S. authority on irrigation and power projects.

Some Hon. Member: — He did not know you had submitted Cass-Beggs!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And then again, in 1950 also, we have a group of agriculturalists who had been taken down to this scheme and shown over the works at Coteau and these people agreed that there is a great need for this dam and they agreed that the scheme is feasible.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! We all do.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And then again in 1950, Gardiner tells the House of Commons that the start of the dam is seen for 1951. And here is something else he says — doubts are all cleared.

This statement was a clear indication to the House that the last engineering doubts had at last been cleared away. "The South Saskatchewan dam at the Coteau site", he was saying in effect, "was feasible." "Now it remains to tackle the financial side." That was in 1950 on June 14th and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Cass-Beggs report was tabled at the time.

Some Hon. Members: — No, no. That was the thing that torpedoed it.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And so I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but then, again, there was a certain gentleman from Regina here, down in Ottawa. On November 1, 1951, I believe it was, and this is from an editorial in the "Leader-Post":

"A certain gentleman from Regina, who thought everybody had heard about the South Saskatchewan River irrigation and hydro scheme, had a rude jolt at a recent national convention. A group of eager-beaver Easterners approached him to second a motion for an immediate start on the St. Lawrence Seaway. He readily agreed to do so but suggested that, in return, a similar resolution covering the South Saskatchewan development scheme should be proceeded with."

Mr. Tucker: — Is there anything wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Nothing. But wait and hear the rest:

"What's that? Never heard of it, was the disconcerting reply received from the Eastern spokesman."

I found the same thing, Mr. Speaker, when I was in eastern Canada, in discussing this matter of the South Saskatchewan river with a new member of the Cabinet. He did not know what I was talking about when I mentioned the South Saskatchewan scheme.

Mr. Tucker: — He couldn't understand you, probably!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And then these gentlemen over here try to blame this delay on the report of Cass-Beggs.

I hold in my hand here a copy of the order-in-council setting up this Committee that was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. And I want to read this order-in-council:

"Under and in pursuant of part 1 of the Inquiries Act, a Commission to Issue appointed commissioners to conduct an inquiry into the following matters, namely,

"Whether the economic and social returns to Canadian people on the investment in the proposed South Saskatchewan River project would be commensurate with the cost thereof."

March 18, 1952

Did they set up such a commission, Mr. Speaker, to investigate the possibilities of the St. Lawrence Seaway? Did they set up such a commission to investigate the feasibility of the Canso causeway?

Some Hon. Members: — Yes, yes, years ago.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — They certainly did not!

To go on:

“Whether the said project represents the most profitable and desirable use which can be made of the physical resources involved.”

And here is another important thing:

“That the following persons be appointed commissioners pursuant to part 1 of the Inquiries Act to conduct the said inquiry:

“Mr. T.H. Hogg, Toronto, Ontario (a very eminent engineer, but a hard-rock engineer).

Mr. G.A. Doraty, Calgary, Alberta (another very eminent engineer, but a hard-rock engineer).

Mr. John A. Woodstowe, Salt Lake City (he is an irrigation expert).”

Not a single soils man in that entire Committee! And this is to be a soil project! If I were a person who wanted to damage this project, that is the type of Committee that I would set up — a group of men whose whole training has been in the building of projects on hard rock. And we know today — in fact I heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition state in one of the committees this year — the very fine work that has been done by the P.F.R.A. in soils mechanics, and I want to agree with him. The P.F.R.A. have done good work there. But here we have the Federal Government setting up a committee (and I presume that the Minister of Agriculture, under whom P.F.R.A. works, should have a lot to do with this Committee) and there is not a single soils man on that Committee. Now soils men are to be had, and westerners at that. At the University of Alberta you have Professor H.R. Hardy, who is one of the best soils men on the continent and would have been a man eminently suited to have placed on such a Committee. But we haven't got him there. If these people really wanted to have an excuse for not proceeding with this dam, they have it in this report of the P.F.R.A. But I am glad that they have gone as far as they have.

The thing that intrigues me is that the Leader of the Opposition would, today, try to seize upon the Cass-Beggs report as a reason in 1947, (I'll admit this is old and the project had not been thoroughly gone into) but, with this report before them, both he and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Gardiner, were going around this province telling the people that they were going to proceed with this dam. And this is what they say in this report . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely incorrect. I said we were favourable to that dam being proceeded with, but on no occasion did I make any promise that it would be proceeded with. That statement is absolutely untrue.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well, I'll accept the hon. gentleman's word, but the Hon. Mr. Gardiner certainly did, on more than one occasion, make that statement in this province.

Mr. Tucker: — I would like you to just prove that.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Here is what the report by the P.F.R.A. engineers said, in 1947, and, as I say, I will admit it is old, but we have these promises being made in face of this information:

“The general location of this site (that would be the one at Coteau) shows the location of the test holes and position of two river profiles. The test drilling at this point reveals the existence of an old river channel that has been filled with fine to medium sand, with deposits, obtaining a maximum depth of approximately 110 feet.”

That, Mr. Speaker, presents a pretty difficult problem in engineering. Then they go on to point out further that at the bottom of this 110 feet they strike a very soft shale, which is known as the “bear paw shale”, I am not going to read it all.

Then I heard something over here about the P.F.R.A. making no report on power. Well, again I am not going to weary this House tonight at this hour with this report, but, in 1947, the P.F.R.A. engineers pointed out that there was a considerable amount of power to be developed at this dam and the amount of power available for sale varied with the acreage that would be irrigated. With 100,000 acres irrigated there would be available 63,600 horsepower, and with 500,000 acres irrigated there would be only 32,200 horsepower available for sale. But there is no question that the P.F.R.A. engineer did state that power was available.

Then there was one other condition that they pointed out at this time, and I believe it has since been investigated and proven to be not too difficult. They state, in the sedimentary survey:

“The South Saskatchewan river carries a considerable silt, and it is well known that reservoir silting is a serious problem in power and irrigation developments. It is therefore considered advisable to thoroughly study silting of this river and determine, if possible, its bearing in the light of the project. This will require silt surveys and silt samplings.”

Mr. Speaker, in view of that you have the Liberal Party

March 18, 1952

in this province going around Saskatchewan, holding up this project as feasible; and advising, year after year, that this project was to be proceeded with. And now we find, in the year 1952, the best that we have got is another Commission set up that will further delay the procedure with this project, and a Commission which, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is not familiar with the type of engineering which will be required in the construction of this dam.

The hour is getting very late and I am going to say no more on this except that I am hoping all hon. gentlemen will support this motion, as I certainly intend to do, this evening.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — There is not very much time left but I would like to say a few things about this whole argument. I believe that the South Saskatchewan River dam will be constructed, in spite of the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan.

Why did the Dominion Government construct the St. Mary's River dam? There is a proof of their good faith. They built that dam. And I believe that the dam would have been proceeded with if these fellows across hadn't thrown mud on the whole thing. There is no question about that. The C.C.F. in Saskatchewan is so desperate that they are seizing upon any possible issue to save themselves. Their stocks in the public opinion have fallen down so low during the debate in this Legislature, up to now, that they see that they are finished. There is nothing very funny in that — that is actually how some of the people look at this. Their dealings — the way they have handled the natural resources in this province; the way they have handled the Crown Corporations; the way they made promises of plastic houses and all these cement plants.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — You don't like it eh?

Mr. Korchinski: — Yesterday, we saw a spectacle where they seize upon disease to save their skins. The C.C.F. Party, like any other socialist party, thrives upon distress, confusion, disease, dust, all those things.

Mr. Speaker: — What has that got to do with the dam?

Mr. Korchinski: — What that has got to do with the dam is this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Are you going to tie it up with this motion?

Mr. Korchinski: — Absolutely. I am just coming to the point to show that the purpose of all these things is to confuse the public opinion.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — The Premier got up and in no place in his speech — outside of ridicule — did he dispute the facts put forth by the Leader of the Opposition. The only answer we get to the facts advanced is a lot of laughing! But this laughing will not go on and convince the people

of Saskatchewan. I say again that the only way this Party can succeed is if it can create enough confusion in the province. That is the way they hope to save themselves. But the people are used to this stuff. They have been watching them for eight years, so it is no use to try to confuse this issue!

You are attacking a man who is in Ottawa. I would suggest that you bring him here to speak for himself. That is very fine, that is their tactics — they attack a capitalist in New York, or on St. James Street, somebody far enough away that he cannot speak for himself. They attack the press up there in the gallery who cannot answer. Bring the man here and let him present his side of the story.

I think, Mr. Speaker, their stocks are very low as far as public support is concerned, and today's show is practical proof of that idea. They are finished.

I am absolutely in favour of that motion and I say that I think the South Saskatchewan River dam will be built, in spite of them, because they won't be here!

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in regard to this motion. This matter, I believe, is of such tremendous importance to this province that I regret that we have had the tone of debate in regard to it that we have heard, today.

This project, in my opinion, is feasible, from the reports that we have received, and I understand that the Provincial Government is willing to join with the Federal Government in building this project; and if this project is built and completed the constituency of Last Mountain will also benefit from the raising of the level of the water in Last Mountain Lake, from which large areas along the side of the lake could be irrigated, especially by using a sprinkler system. Because of the arguments that have been used, back and forth, I do not think it is necessary for me to take much time, but I would like to suggest a resolution that I think this Legislature should pass, in regard to this problem, and that is:

“That this Assembly believes that the South Saskatchewan River Dam project will be of great economic and social value to the country as a whole, by providing a large reservoir of water in the centre of the province from which:

- (1) Considerable power could be developed;
- (2) Large areas of land could be irrigated, and
- (3) An adequate supply of much needed water could be provided for the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina.

“Therefore this Assembly requests that the Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada proceed with the project without any further delay.”

March 18, 1952

Now if anyone would second that amendment, I would introduce it, and I would suggest that that is the type of resolution that we should have. We want the Dominion Government, which will necessarily have to bear the largest share of the cost, and the Provincial Government has already stated that it will share a part of the cost, to proceed with this project. Therefore, we should address this resolution to both Governments.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Benson: — I believe if we would do that — if we would adopt the proposal that I have suggested, then we will leave Party politics completely out of the discussion.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Benson: — And we are asking the two Government to join together and go ahead and build the project.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Egnatoff (Melfort): — I will second that motion.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — I come from a constituency, Mr. Speaker, where every . . . Am I permitted to proceed?

Mr. Speaker: — I have had no amendment submitted to me.

Mr. Benson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I am just re-writing it. I just have another sentence to write and then I will submit it.

Mr. Speaker: — I thought you were just proposing this, but were not going to move it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I come from a constituency, Mr. Speaker, where every man and woman is deeply interested in the completion of the South Saskatchewan River Development scheme, and the people of Saskatoon are sick and tired of the delay and the evasion of the Government at Ottawa in the fulfillment of this scheme that they have talked about for the last 15 years. They are sick, also, of it being used as an election bait, to win elections every five years.

Now at Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, we will, of course, benefit very greatly by a project of this kind. The diversification of industry that this project will give rise to will undoubtedly benefit Saskatoon, and I might say that Saskatoon, too, is the very centre of the co-operative movements of this province, and already a great deal has been done in co-operative development there which will be further expanded . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would like to point out to the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) that this is not an amendment to the Motion which is before the House. It is a substitute motion, and I cannot accept that as an amendment. It is not in order.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I think the House is entitled to know what the proposed amendment was so that we will have some knowledge of the reason for your ruling. I think we are entitled to that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the mover.

Some Hon. Member: — Just read it.

Mr. Speaker: — This is the proposed amendment:

“That this Assembly believes that the South Saskatchewan River Dam project will be of great economic and social value to the country as a whole, by providing a large reservoir of water in the centre of the province from which:

- (1) Considerable power could be developed;
- (2) Large areas of land could be irrigated, and
- (3) An adequate supply of much needed water could be provided for the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina,

therefore this Assembly requests that the Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada proceed with the project without any further delay.”

This, of course, is a substitute motion, and is not an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, I realize it is the wish of the House to have this resolution voted on before 11 o'clock. It is one minute to 11 now, and I will defer my words of wisdom until some future occasion, and I would suggest that we have a vote on this resolution which I intend to support.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — I beg leave to adjourn this debate — it is 11 o'clock.

Some Hon. Members: — No, no.

Mr. Speaker: — Do you give the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to move an amendment to this resolution, which will embody the idea that has been

March 18, 1952

advanced by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson). It is, after all, just a matter of wording, and at the conclusion of my remarks it is my intention to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Being 11 o'clock the House will adjourn.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am prepared to talk till 12 or one or two o'clock . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Is the hon. member prepared to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Egnatoff: — I said I was prepared . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I will call it 11 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: — I called it 11 o'clock so the debate is automatically adjourned, since there has been no vote taken.

The Assembly adjourned at 11.00 o'clock p.m.