

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
38th Day

Tuesday, April 1, 1952

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

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of this House an article appearing in the "Commonwealth" of March 12, in which it refers to the member for Saltcoats, who:

“. . . told the Legislature that Premier Douglas had gone into Dubuc, a town in Saltcoats constituency, and had told the people there that a sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin was the first of its kind in Saskatchewan; and he challenged the Premier to go back to Dubuc to tell them the truth — that that was not the truth.

“Premier Douglas replied that this was not what he had said at all. He had merely told the audience that the plant was the first to use the brine method, and explained what that method was.”

I subsequently got in touch with a plant in Saskatchewan that was erected long before the Chaplin plant was erected, and I had them wire and tell me when they started to use the brine method, and I will read the telegram. I quote:

“Re your phone conversation of this date. This Company has been using the brine method for crystallization of sodium sulphate since 1943. Brine method means pumping brine from lake into reservoir.”

I question the Premier in Committee of Crown Corporations, also the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) who looks after this plant, and then they squirmed out of this by saying that the Chaplin plant was the only one that used that method exclusively.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is out of order. He is referring to something that has already been disposed of.

Mr. Loptson: — No, it has not. This is an article. They told me then that what they meant was that this plant used it exclusively and . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is out of order.

April 1, 1952

Mr. Loptson: — I am correcting a statement that was alluding to me in this House, in the Press, and I have a right . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You are alluding to something that has already been discussed and disposed of in the Crown Corporations Committee.

Mr. Loptson: — This article has never been discussed, Mr. Speaker. Now, I want to refer to an article, and what they said in Crown Corporations Committee is not any truer than the statement that they had made previously.

I have a letter here from Mid-West Chemicals, and I will read it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Well, if there is no objection.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — There is no objection, providing it is understood that we are having a full-fledged debate and we will be able to take part in it.

Mr. Speaker: — That is the point of order. This is not a time, before the Orders of the Day, to introduce a debate. I think the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Loptson: — I am not introducing a debate. I am trying to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You are making statements that require answers.

Mr. Loptson: — No, I am straightening out a statement that was not correct . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, the hon. gentleman has read from a statement in the “Commonwealth” attributed to him, and he does not deny that statement; but he now wants to explain it or to argue it. I would suggest that the proper place to argue it is when some item is before the House. The hon. gentleman has not a question of privilege; he does not deny that he made the statement. He merely wants to try and substantiate the statement. If he wants to do that there is plenty of time to do it when estimates are before the House and if he wants to have a full-dress debate on it, there is no reason why he shouldn’t but certainly on Orders of the Day is not the time to do it.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I am trying to tell this House that the answer of the Premier was not true.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is out of order, and I must ask him to discontinue.

Mr. Loptson: — Will you say that I haven’t the privilege to read this letter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I say that that is not a proper method of bringing up anything debatable — before the Orders of the Day. You can make a statement, but you cannot . . .

Mr. Loptson: — But this is a statement I am going to make . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has read something out of a paper that has been accepted as . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Would you like to hear the letter?

Mr. Speaker: — No, no. This is not a question for levity. Order! The hon. member knows, or should know, that he is out of order in introducing this.

Mr. Loptson: — They do not want to hear this!

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Walker (Hanley):

“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. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure all members of this House that it is not my intention to speak at any great length on this Subject, nor is it my intention to say anything of a contentious nature, unless some members of the House may construe my remarks as such.

The completion of the South Saskatchewan River Dam is of interest to us in the northeast, because the economic feasibility of the much talked of power dam at the Fort a la Corne site is dependent upon the completion of the dam on the South Saskatchewan river. Likewise, the nature of the drainage projects that will have to be carried out in opening up in the neighbourhood of 700,000 or 800,000 acres of arable land in the Carrot River triangle will be dependent, somewhat, upon the completion of the dam on the South Saskatchewan river.

I do wish to congratulate the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) for introducing the subject in the Legislature, and for focusing so much of our attention on such a vital matter. Particularly am I grateful to the hon. member for Hanley for having provoked such a healthy debate, which resulted in a very masterful address delivered in this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker). I believe that the address delivered by the Leader of the Opposition, on that occasion was certainly the most logical and the most masterful address that I have heard in this eleventh Legislature.

It is my intention to deal, very briefly, with what the Premier has said in the debate, and likewise, very briefly, with some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Hanley. Then I will proceed to

April 1, 1952

review some of the facts that have been brought to light in this debate, and I intend, at the conclusion of my remarks, to introduce an amendment, which I think should be acceptable to all fair-minded members of this Legislature, and I believe there are a goodly number of fair-minded members on all four sides of this House.

The Premier's remarks can be divided into two main parts. One part deals with the usual type of vindictive remarks that we are accustomed to hearing from the Premier. The other part deals with the willingness of his Government to spend something like \$33 million, in spite of the rather unfavourable Cass-Beggs report.

Whenever the C.C.F. Government happens to be confronted by cold facts, the Premier finds it necessary to resort to considerable vindictive language, and I have sat in this Legislature long enough to know that when the Premier resorts to such abusive tactics, to ridicule, that that is his method of evading a very major issue.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Egnatoff: — About the only type of reply that the Premier was able to give to the solid facts that were presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) was a statement along this line — that the Leader of the Opposition had made a “brazen and laboured and pathetic attempt to extricate the Liberal party from the hole into which it had got itself by political dishonesty.” That, Mr. Speaker, represents the best type of answer that the Premier of this Province can give, when he is confronted by solid facts, and facts are stubborn creatures which cannot be lightly thrust aside. Or, he accused the Opposition of resorting to “political subterfuge”, and bringing in “political tripe”, or, he said, “the Leader of the Opposition could no more take politics out of a subject than he could take the smell out of an onion.” Well, a statement such as that, coming from the Premier, simply invites some other hon. member to reply — I do not intend to make this reply — but he is simply inviting some other hon. member to reply that the Premier of this Province can no more take politics out of a subject than he can take the smell out of a skunk. As I say, it is not my intention to make that statement, but to merely draw to the attention of this House that whenever the Premier resorts to that sort of thing, he is simply inviting somebody else to reply along that line; and that does not serve any useful purpose. It does not serve, in any way, in the solution of some of our major problems.

Now the Premier did state, and as a matter of fact, he emphatically stated, that his Government was prepared to spend \$33 million, regardless of what the Cass-Beggs report had stated; but he overlooked this important fact: That the cost to the Dominion Government, under the present estimates, would be somewhere in excess of \$100 million. Now, while the provincial investment . . .

Premier Douglas: — You mean the Dominion and the Province, together.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is right. It may be over \$100 million and it may be over \$125 million — we do not know the exact cost by the time the project is completed, because materials are continuing to increase.

Premier Douglas: — But \$68 million is the Federal Government's estimate to us.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is right. That is according to the old estimate, but I think if you take into consideration present costs you will find that the Federal Government will have to spend, not \$68 million, but possibly over \$100 million.

Premier Douglas: — Well, the \$33 million will go up, too, then.

Mr. Egnatoff: — It is possible the \$33 million may go up as well. It is quite possible. But what I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is this — that while the Provincial Government's investment in this project will be one that will liquidate itself, one that will pay for itself, as the years go by, the investment of the Federal Government is not one that will be able to pay for itself, and I think that is important for us to keep in mind. Therefore, the Provincial Government may have decided to pay no attention to the pessimistic attitude of the Cass-Beggs report, but it is not at all surprising that the rest of Canada would think that if this is the view of the engineer appointed by the Provincial Government, then perhaps the whole project becomes questionable and becomes one that should be re-examined. Certainly, the rest of Canada could not be expected to take the attitude that they would be willing to spend \$100 million on a doubtful proposition as readily as the Province would commit itself to spend up to \$33 million which would be returned to the Province pretty well in its entirety and would undoubtedly pay dividends in years to come.

So much for the Premier's contribution to the debate. I think it is very regrettable that my hon. friend from Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) injected so much politics into his address. I cannot help but feel that if he had confined his remarks to the type of remarks that were delivered by the hon. member for Morse (Mr. Gibson), that the resolution possibly would have passed unanimously, without a great deal of debate.

The member for Hanley had a golden opportunity of introducing a resolution, urging the construction of the South Saskatchewan River Dam at the earliest possible date, without injecting any politics into the resolution; and had he done that, he would have rendered a real service to this Province, and would have been a real credit, not only to himself, but to his constituency and to the political party which he supports. Instead, you will recall that he proceeded to dissect the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner, Federal Minister of Agriculture. I happen to be one of those citizens of this Province who is very proud of the part that has been played by the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner in the public service of this country. Thousands and thousands of people in Saskatchewan, and all over the Dominion of Canada, have recognized that gentleman as one who has given of his talents, his energy and his time, to serve the people to the very best of his ability. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, unlike the member for Hanley, the Premier has even recognized this fact, that Jimmy Gardiner has done a great deal for the west. As a matter of fact, in one of his moments of better judgment, I am told that the Premier had suggested that the Dam might very well be named the "Gardiner Dam" after its completion, as a recognition . . .

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — The "Dam Gardiner."

April 1, 1952

Mr. Egnatoff: — . . . of the services rendered by a man; and I believe the Premier has made reference to the Federal Minister of Agriculture along these lines. He said that he knew of no one who had toiled so continuously and with such integrity, and with such sincerity, as the Minister of Agriculture (Federal). I am sorry that the hon. Premier did not see fit to make his contribution to this debate in that same fair-minded manner as he had referred to the Federal Minister of Agriculture, during one of his moments of better judgment.

Now what facts have been established in this debate, so far? I think it is well for us to just take stock very briefly. First of all, it has been established that the Provincial Government hired Professor Cass-Beggs to prepare a report regarding the feasibility and advisability of the project from the power standpoint. Of course it is a well-known fact that Professor Cass-Beggs is better known in Toronto as a C.C.F. candidate and for his socialistic activities, than he is known as an outstanding power engineer.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Egnatoff: — Secondly, it has been established, beyond any shadow of doubt, that Professor Cass-Beggs was paid for a major portion of his services by the Provincial Government, and that he submitted that report to the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Likewise, it has been established that the Government of Saskatchewan held that report for several months before transmitting it to the P.F.R.A. They held it from March until June 23rd, and when the Provincial Government did finally transmit that report to the P.F.R.A., it added no reservations and made no modifications regarding the report. If the Saskatchewan Government did not agree with the report, it could have, and should have, immediately said so to the P.F.R.A. authorities, whom they knew were sending this report on to Ottawa. It certainly could have, and should have, affirmed its faith in the reports of the P.F.R.A. engineers. Instead, the Cass-Beggs report was tabled in the House of Commons on September 8, 1950. Note, Mr. Speaker – without any comments from the Saskatchewan Government — and on February 1, 1951, when the Saskatchewan Government finally got around to modifying the Cass-Beggs report by Tomlinson's report, they still did not uphold the P.F.R.A. engineers, but stated that the truth was somewhere in between the two; and I think hon. members must keep in mind that Tomlinson's report was not sent to the P.F.R.A. authorities until February 1, 1951. The damage was done. The damage was done by the Cass-Beggs report, and on May 31, 1951, the announcement came from Ottawa of Ottawa's intention to appoint a Commission to make a further survey of this project.

Another point that has been established in the debate is this: Although the three prairie provinces have been invited to submit briefs to the Commission, the Saskatchewan Government has not yet submitted a brief. Now, in the interests of the people of this province, the Saskatchewan Government should have submitted its brief, and I would strongly urge it to do so forthwith. I do not think it is necessary for the hon. Premier to say that he is waiting for a public sitting of that Commission here in Regina. We are the people who are interested in the building of

that dam. We are the people in this province who should, through the Government of Saskatchewan, submit that brief immediately.

Now, the hon. Premier asks: "After all, what is wrong with the Cass-Beggs report?" Well, here is what was wrong: The report placed the entire project in an unfavourable light. It placed the entire project in an unfavourable light from the standpoint of power development, and officials at Ottawa must have felt that if the P.F.R.A. engineers were wrong in the case of the Power aspects of this project, those same engineers could have been wrong with regard to the entire scheme. In other words, the Cass-Beggs report simply threw cold water on the whole scheme. The Cass-Beggs report and the Provincial Government's reluctance to take adequate measures to counteract that report constituted a major factor in the Federal Government's decision to appoint a Commission to take a further look at the project to determine whether the social and economic advantages were commensurate with the cost.

Now Mr. Speaker, these are the facts that have been well established, and I say, now that these facts have been well-established, that all hon. members take politics out of this discussion, and let us amend this resolution in such a way as to remove the petty political aspects of it. For, after all, the interests of the province are far greater than any political advantage that any members might obtain by dragging politics into this discussion. And it is time — high time — that we all joined together in proving the necessity and the feasibility of the scheme to the whole of Canada. Surely we all must have enough faith in Saskatchewan to make a firm resolve, unitedly, to urge the construction of the South Saskatchewan River dam. It should not even be necessary to talk about the significance of this project in terms of the possibility of irrigation, the possibility of bringing somewhere between 500,000 and 700,000 acres under ditch, the possibility of increasing the number of farm units from 1245 to 2700. It should not be necessary to talk about the possibility of supplying water for cities like Regina and Moose Jaw by raising the level of Buffalo Pound Lake, nor should it be necessary to talk about the advantages that might accrue as a result of the tremendous lake that would be developed, and which should serve as a great tourist resort.

Nor should it be necessary for us to review, in this House, the power development aspects, the possibility of developing 400 million kilowatt hours. That power development would not only help curb the farm de-population trend, but it should be, and would be an essential inducement to industry, because, after all, to have industry it is necessary to have cheap power and a good water supply; and obviously we need industry in this Province, if we are going to increase our population instead of de-populating the Province at the rate of 50,000 people a year.

Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the development in that part of the province that will be affected by the construction of the South Saskatchewan River dam would benefit the rest of the province, and could come simultaneously with a great development programme in the forest region of this province, and in the great Pre-Cambrian areas across the north.

April 1, 1952

I want to say that it is because I believe in Saskatchewan — in Saskatchewan as a province in which there are tremendous possibilities for development — that I want to move an amendment to the motion that is now before us, and this amendment is based on the ideas that were expressed by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson). Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not care whose ideas they were; whether they happen to be the ideas of an Independent member, or a C.C.F. member. As long as those ideas are sound, and as long as they are good, then I think we should be men enough to support them.

This amendment is non-political. It calls upon both the Provincial and Federal Governments for action, and let it not be said of any member of this Legislature that he was not big enough to vote for the South Saskatchewan River project. Let every hon. member support this, not only for the benefits that may accrue during the lifetime of some of us, but let every member vote for the South Saskatchewan River dam for the sake of posterity.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by Mr. Benson,

“That all the words after ‘That’ be struck out, and the following be added:

“That this Assembly believes that the South Saskatchewan River dam project will be of great economic and social value to Canada 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;
- (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 consider proceeding with the project without any further delay.”

In this amendment, Mr. Speaker, we are expressing our confidence in the economic and social value of this project. In this amendment we are expressing our beliefs that considerable power can be developed; that large areas of land could be irrigated, and that an adequate supply of water could be provided for the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina.

As I say, this amendment takes politics out of the South Saskatchewan River dam, and I want to appeal to my hon. friend, the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) to support this amendment, if he believes in the feasibility and value of the South Saskatchewan River dam, as I think he does. If he does that, and other members on the Government side

do likewise, I think they will be rendering a real service to the people of this province, and as I say, not only to the present generation, but to posterity as well.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) professes to take politics out of any utterances of his, it reminds me of Lucifer professing to take sulphur out of Hades.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon is the only city in the Province of Saskatchewan that is located on the South Saskatchewan river. Our people have a special interest in it. The pioneers of Saskatoon, with an eye to beauty, located the city on its present site. We have an aesthetic interest, the city has now become known as the city of bridges. We also have, Mr. Speaker, a nostalgic interest in the river, it is just as precious to us as the river Avon is to the lowland Scot. But we also have an economic interest, Mr. Speaker, and our people in Saskatoon resent that, after each election, Mr. Gardiner goes to sleep by the fast-flowing stream, and I trust he will pardon us if we disturb his dream, because we certainly intend to do so. Maybe ten or fifteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, this South Saskatchewan River project may have been known by Saskatonians as the “Gardiner dam”, but let me assure you they now express it in reverse.

The interests of the people of Saskatoon in the South Saskatchewan River development is, first of all, a general one. It is common to all people in the province of Saskatchewan. We think that nothing would be better designed to give stability, or a degree of stability to the agricultural industry in this province. We have not forgotten, nor indeed, have the people of this province forgotten, the grim days of the ‘thirties, when, under combined depression and drouth, we expended tens of millions of dollars, and when the people of this province were subjected to a great deal of suffering during those drought years. We think it would stabilize the feed situation in the province, and the food situation in the province, to the point where we would never again need to fear a repetition of those dread years.

Our Saskatoon workers are interested because of the establishment of industries associated with the diversified agriculture accompanying irrigation farming. We have, as a guiding experience, the city of Lethbridge, which has become a thriving city — an example of the industries which are associated with irrigation farming.

Saskatoon is the headquarters of the co-operatives of the province, the co-operative organization that did \$20 million worth of business in this province last year. Saskatoon has several large Wheat Pool industries, a modern flour mill; and, I am told, one of the most up-to-date in the North American continent. We have an Oil Seeds plant, and also the Flax Crusher, and we have the manufacture of oleomargarine as a co-operative endeavour, jointly, by the Dairy Pool and the Federated Co-op.

April 1, 1952

The irrigation development scheme, Mr. Speaker, presents vast opportunities for co-operative development, not only industrially, but in various kinds of producer and consumer co-ops. This province has taken the lead in North America in Co-operative development, and Saskatoon is organized in such a way as to take immediate advantage of a large-scale irrigation development project.

Naturally, our Saskatoon business men are interested in the development of this project, and in the growth of population which would accompany it. I do not think that they are unduly impressed with Mr. Gardiner's pre-election comparison to Pittsburgh, or Essen, or the Ruhr Valley; nevertheless, stripped of its political camouflage and exaggeration, this is a good sound economic scheme, and one that we should get on with.

Now another reason is this, Mr. Speaker. The flood control value of the huge storage basin which I am told would be 140 miles long, would remove the frequently recurring flood damage to the low-lying farming areas adjacent to Saskatoon — that area around Moon lake. I agree with the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) that the flood control feature would be the first step in the development of several hundred thousand acres of good agricultural land in the Sipanck area or the Carrot River triangle.

Saskatoon people, Mr. Speaker, are anxious for Ottawa to get on with the job. This attitude, which reflects the attitude of all Saskatchewan people, is best set forth in the "Saskatoon Star-Phoenix" of March 5, in the editorial column. There are occasions when I can agree with the "Star-Phoenix" editorial page, and this is certainly one of them. The "Star-Phoenix" editors were taking exception to the unwarranted and unconscionable delay in proceeding with this project, and this is what the editor has to say:

"All of this adds up to a long delay in getting a decision on the South Saskatchewan River development. Such delays fit badly with western impatience to get on with the job. The Federal Government has been talking about the dam for some six years; it should not be surprised if Saskatchewan's opinion is becoming brittle.

"Nevertheless, having followed the line it has taken up to this point, the Federal Government must be prepared to sweat out another waiting period, so that when the project is undertaken, there will be no unanswered question about it. Having fiddled away so many summers, when construction might have been undertaken, the Government, we think, must stoically accept whatever criticism its policy has now occasioned."

This is the opinion of a paper which is a supporter of the political party of the gentlemen opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) for the clear, concise and dignified manner in which he presented the original resolution to this House. I have heard many favourable comments from Saskatoon particularly, and may I state this (and I am sorry to state it), it was in striking contrast to the uncontrolled, hysterical desperate rantings of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker), who, for a period of two and one half hours, said . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Nothing!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I agree with you — he said exactly nothing. He dealt with a matter that had little or no bearing on the irrigation scheme. I refer to the Cass-Beggs report, and possibly I can best substantiate my argument with respect to the fact that this was merely political subterfuge — a political red herring — by referring to the “Star-Phoenix” of March 8th, again on the editorial page. This is what they have to say, in dealing with the Cass-Beggs report:

“Now that we have had a chance to read a summary of the Cass-Beggs report on the power aspects of the proposed dam at Outlook, we find it a very small squeak in a large orchestra of discontent.”

The “orchestra of discontent” to which the Star-Phoenix was referring, was undoubtedly that speech rendered by the hon. Leader of the Opposition a week ago Tuesday.

To continue with the editorial:

“But what the report says, in effect, is that no power man in his right senses would build a huge earth-filled dam such as is contemplated at Outlook, and expect to pay for it out of power alone. Of course, no one has ever argued, as far as we are aware, that the return from power was anything but supplementary to the main purpose of providing a storage basin, and the necessary water levels for irrigation projects.”

There is the proposition in a nut-shell, and yet my friend laboured for two and a half hours to draw this very obvious red herring across his own notorious political path. Again, to go on with this editorial:

“The report suggests that the Provincial Power Corporation would be justified in spending up to \$8 million on a power installation, and another \$4,500,000 on distribution lines, to put the power where it is wanted.

“Curiously enough, between correspondence with Mr. Gardiner and the province of Saskatchewan, the Federal Minister suggested that one of the costs which the province ought to bear was

April 1, 1952

an item of \$8 million for power installation, so that Mr. Cass-Beggs and Mr. Gardiner are in agreement, and so is the province.

“Mr. Gardiner also suggested further provincial expenditures of \$19 million on the ditching, to distribute the water for irrigation, and \$6 million for land-levelling. The province agreed tentatively to all these figures, a year ago. Both Mr. Gardiner and the provincial Government had seen the Cass-Beggs report when the \$8 million power figure was suggested and accepted.”

May I add, in spite of the deprecating remarks that have been made, that there were made on the occasion of that two and one half hour tirade, this is what the “Star-Phoenix” has to say about Cass-Beggs:

“Cass-Beggs is a member of the Engineering school of Toronto University, and is a highly competent man in the field of power engineering.”

I am not going to read the whole editorial, although I would commend it to the hon. members opposite, and would suggest that they read it and digest it inwardly, but I will finish with this statement from the same editorial:

Mr. Tucker: — Read it all.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — All right.

“We do not think that it (the Cass-Beggs report) amounts to very much one way or the other, for it says little that has not been known before 1950. It translates a general situation into actual financial terms in the cost of power, and the figure which the report sets has apparently been accepted by both Federal and Provincial Governments as reasonable.”

Well, that disposes of the spurious arguments of my hon. friends from the other side — the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff), and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again contend that the Leader of the Opposition, in trying to draw this particular red herring across his own and Mr. Gardiner’s political trail, has made a fool of himself in the eyes of the people of this province, and that is not unusual.

Mr. Tucker: — Oh, no, I do that every day.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — During that two and one half hours he gave an exhibition, too, of temper tantrums that I have never seen exhibited

in any school child during my thirty years' teaching in this province. Mr. Speaker, he has embarrassed the P.F.R.A., particularly the Director, Mr. Thompson. He has focused public attention on the evasions and political manoeuvrings of his political godfather, Mr. Gardiner, and he has rendered a further disservice to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Member: — Is the little black book in there?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Words, Mr. Speaker, as monotonous, as numerous and as unprofitable as the sands of the Sahara desert. I am not going to, as I have said, read from them, but they take this general pattern. Before the election of 1945 (these particular clippings do not go back beyond 1945), and 1949, Mr. Gardiner had everything ready. All the surveys had been conducted, and the engineering work was done. One hundred million dollars had been set aside, in 1945, for the employing of returned men, and for the agricultural rehabilitation of Western Canada. Everything was ready to go, if the people would merely elect this human dynamo! Well, we did, with the result that we still have nothing to show for these promises. Yes, after the elections, Mr. Gardiner is singularly distinguished by his refusal or failure to do anything about these things, or to say anything further about them, except on one occasion in Saskatoon, he scared the daylight out of some of our elderly ladies there, by warning them that if the South Saskatchewan River dam is not proceeded with, with every care, that dam may go out and flood the whole city of Saskatoon. That was said after the election.

Then, another pattern these words take is this: That before the elections of 1945 and 1949, the Federal Government was going ahead with the project without calling on the Provincial Government for any assistance whatsoever, and it was not until the fall of 1949 that the . . .

Mr. Egnatoff (Melfort): — That is bunk! You do not know what you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Well, all right, I will read Mr. Gardiner's statement.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Go ahead, read the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — For example, on April 27, 1946, this is what Mr. Gardiner said:

“Mr. Gardiner emphasized that the Federal Government did not need to wait for suggestions from municipal and provincial governments or societies, or any other group, before proceeding with this water conservation plan.

April 1, 1952

“The Dominion Government did not need the endorsement of the South Saskatchewan River development Association to begin work on the South Saskatchewan River.”

Mr. Egnatoff: — Are you reading excerpts from the Premier’s speech?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He had already decided to go through with it — God bless him, he was going right ahead.

“In the estimates was the sum of \$10 million, said Mr. Gardiner, which was earmarked for the carrying out of the survey and engineering projects in the immediate future. It was the Government’s intention to draw from this sum to complete the engineering and survey work.”

I am not going to read it all, but here is another quotation:

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Keep on, read some more!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: —

“As soon as it was finally decided upon, for the site, contracts would be let, and work would commence immediately.”

Here is another example of the type of political propaganda that has continued to amuse us down through the years in this province. It is a speech reported in the “Leader-Post” on May 2, 1945, just before the 1945 election:

“Hon. James G. Gardiner, Federal Minister of Agriculture, stood under a hissing gas lamp in the Fransfield schoolhouse near here Wednesday night . . .”

Well now, I do not think that all the gas was emanating from that lamp . . .

Mr. Tucker: — It certainly isn’t now, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — . . . but I have not finished this article. This is what Mr. Gardiner is purported to have said:

“He spoke of the future. He told how the Canadian Government had planned to rehabilitate western farming country — not through the erection of plants to make brick, or a plant to can unwanted horses — but by assurances of spending millions of dollars for a water system.”

He then goes on to explain that most of the engineering works had been done, and that \$100 million would be expended, and just as soon as the men were back from overseas and in a position to start with this project, work would be commenced. That was May 2, 1945, and he made fun of the horse plant that was erected at Swift Current and partially financed by this Government. Well, the amazing thing about it is, Mr. Speaker, that the plant transacted \$17 million worth of business.

Mr. Trippe (Turtleford): — And a good pay-roll too!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Seventeen million dollars worth of business for the farmers and ranchers of southwestern Saskatchewan. All the returns that we have had from the multitude of promises of Mr. Gardiner has been seventeen million words — and that is all. Mr. Gardiner referred to the brick plant. The brick plant employs people, and produces a good product. These industries have been brought to fruition — both the brick plant and the horse processing plant — but all we have from Mr. Gardiner's promises are words.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Are you proposing now to use the horse meat to build the dam, or what is the connection?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I am just quoting from the speech of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner.

Mr. Egnatoff: — What are you trying to prove?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to say anything further on this subject . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You haven't said anything yet.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — . . . except this, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatoon, in common with the people of the province, are sick, sore and tired of the unfulfilled political promises of Ottawa.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! And promises of the other side.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — We will continue, with dignity, to fight for the completion of the South Saskatchewan River dam. It is necessary for the economic welfare of Saskatchewan, and in spite of the levity of the gentlemen opposite, we shall go ahead and see that it is done.

Let me tell you this, gentlemen, that if it is not done, and done quickly by the Liberal Government at Ottawa, we will replace it by a government that will get action for the people of western Canada.

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that I am going to be very short. I believe that I have a real and complete solution for the building of that dam. I noticed here, two or three weeks ago, on a question in the House of Commons by Hazen Argue, that we have some 1,300 or 1,400 inspectors for P.F.R.A. in the province at the present time — preparing for the provincial election, maybe. My solution is going to be this: Let this Government buy 1,400 shovels, supply them to Jimmy Gardiner, let him put the boys to useful work, and they will build the dam in short order!

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder how much nearer we are to getting this dam built? I think that the amendment that has been submitted is a very reasonable

April 1, 1952

proposition. It is reasonable because it has taken the vinegar out of the motion, and it has put a little syrup in it. After all, I want to tell my hon. friend that he will catch more flies with a little syrup than he will with vinegar.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Ah, phooey with flies!

Mr. Benson: — I do not think the people of this province . . .

Some Hon. Member: — What kind of flies?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. gentleman is speaking.

Mr. Benson: — . . . The people of Saskatchewan are not interested in damning. Neither the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) or the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) are interested in damning the provincial Government or the federal Government — but they are interested in “dam-ing” the Saskatchewan river, and I would suggest that the members in this House should support the amendment to this resolution; and I believe that if we do that, we are asking the provincial Government, which admits that it has a share in the building of this project, to co-operate with the federal Government, and they can get along with the job. I do not think anyone can say whether there has been unwarranted delay or not, and I do not think anyone can, for sure, say that there has been ample evidence provided to show that the project is feasible. We have to take the opinions of experts in regard to that particular phase of the project, and I would suggest that if we are interested in getting this job done, then this Legislature will ask the Provincial Government and the Federal Government to get together and try to do something about it.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — I have sat here during the course of the debate on this project and I have listened to the various arguments, one way and another, as to its feasibility, and being one who is not very well acquainted with the dam or its potentialities, and representing a part of the country which does not know very much about this dam, I have been particularly interested in hearing the arguments for and against it.

I am considerably impressed by the magnitude of this undertaking, because it is going to be really something big, and from what I read, I understand that it is going to, when it is built, impound waters which will create the largest lake in the southern portion of the province of Saskatchewan, and that it will be the largest construction project ever undertaken, north of the American border. It is truly something very magnificent, something really big, if we can get it. We have a good Association in this province that is doing everything possible to get this thing started and completed. The Saskatchewan River Development Association is what I am referring to. I never had very much interest in the thing until I met some of these gentlemen a while ago and they said, “Really, everyone in Saskatchewan should get behind this dam and promote it to the very best of their ability, because it is really a big thing.”

Also, do not lose sight of the fact that we are asking the Federal Government for something between \$75 and \$100 million as a straight

handout, which they will never be able to recover any part of — quite different from what the Saskatchewan Government is proposing to put in, which will be almost all recoverable, in power and charges for irrigation, and they said, “let us approach this thing very easily and in a gentlemanly way.” We are not going to bludgeon this amount of money out of the Federal Government, and the more anyone tries to do it, the further we are going to get away from our ultimate objective. We are not going to go down there and just really kick a hundred million dollars out of these people, and, personally, I wonder if Louis St. Laurent ever got hold of the debate that has been conducted in this House just lately in regard to it, if he would not throw the whole thing in the waste paper basket and say, “just forget about it”, but I hope he does not get hold of that.

Well, I have a quote here from a little literature sent to us by the Saskatchewan River Development Association, which impressed me very much and I trust you will let me just make a few short quotes from it, Mr. Speaker. It tells about the population decrease in the prairie provinces during the last ten years, and it says that the farming business is getting more consolidated all the time and people are moving, not only into cities, but out of the prairie provinces altogether, and this is what it says:

“It is clear from this that, between 1941 and 1951, they lost (that is, the prairie provinces) 280,750 people — a disaster as great from the population viewpoint, as if Winnipeg and its suburbs had been wiped off the map. The greatest loss was in Saskatchewan. Between 1941 and 1951, that province’s population shrank 66,817, but its natural increase, during that time, was 137,308. Thus the true loss to Saskatchewan was not 66,817 persons, but 204,125 — enough to wipe out the present population of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, North Battleford, Weyburn, Yorkton, Melville and Estevan.”

That is a most astounding thing, Mr. Speaker. And then they seek to say to us that, by building this dam and irrigation projects that would go along with it, we would encourage settlement in that country and would have a chance to regain, or to hold our population, at least. Now, I think that is a very good thing, but I do not think we are going to come close to it by the nature of this resolution that was introduced in the House, the other day, by the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), because it was bitter politically, and it was biased, and it sought to depreciate the good name of people who had tried to do something to get this dam built.

In connection with that, and due to the fact that the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) has quoted considerable from the Saskatoon paper, which he has so much confidence in, and which treats him so nicely, I also have a comment or two from the Saskatoon paper, in this connection. One, on the 20th of March — an editorial — in which

April 1, 1952

they say:

“Mr. Robert Walker of Hanley talked a lot of nonsense, the other day, in his speech on his motion, censuring the Federal Government for the delay in getting along with the South Saskatchewan Dam. During his speech, Mr. Walker is reported to have uttered ‘this gem of pure thought’. To make a final decision dependent upon the Commission’s report would amount to a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan.”

But suppose the Commission recommends an immediate start on the project? Is that going to be a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, I am one who wishes to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) for his very long and untiring efforts to dig out the truth about a few matters in connection with this dam. When he brings it out that the Cass-Beggs report is not at all favourable to this in some ways, that causes the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix to write another editorial, from which the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) has quoted some very small parts which might be of benefit to him. I am going to read some other parts of that same editorial, and, incidentally, this was written on March 18, so they had just got the hon. member for Hanley’s speech at that time. And they say this:

“Mr. Walker’s current resolution before the House regretting the delay in the construction of the dam is part of the C.C.F. campaign to embarrass the Federal Liberals, and with that, Mr. Tucker, on the eve of the forthcoming election.

“The C.C.F. Party clearly hopes to emerge from this political football match as the true champion of the dam, because the Cass-Beggs report is lukewarm about the whole thing, as a power project, and because it was, in the first instance, a C.C.F. Government document. The Party should not be surprised that it has been introduced into the game.”

They go on to say:

“As a matter of fact, we think that the Federal Government has been reasonably prudent in asking for a further survey of the dam. For one thing, the province has been very slow to determine its policy with respect to its share of the cost which will be charged against the dam.”

That is the same editorial, Mr. Speaker, that was read by the Minister of Social Welfare, only he did not read that part.

Now, what about Mr. Gardiner's activities in connection with this dam? If we are to take an unbiased look, I believe that we will all agree that he is the man that has done more to originate this project and continuously and consistently support it than any other man in this Dominion. He started this thing way back in 1938, and there are enough people over there who are members of the Cabinet that know what the responsibilities of a Cabinet Minister are. You do not bludgeon something out of a Cabinet. You go in there and present your views and see if you can get them accepted. And if you do not get them accepted, you still stand up for the Cabinet's views, or you simply leave it, that is all.

Mr. Gardiner has done the very best he could, over a great many years, to get these views accepted and when he comes out to Saskatchewan and says to the people, "If I can get good backing, I will run a better chance", I think that is only a logical statement. Quite naturally, if he can get backing from more people in Saskatchewan he will have a better chance of doing that; and I submit that is all he has ever said out here. He did not say, "If you do not elect me, you will get nothing and so on." And, as a matter of fact, when the campaign was over, in 1949, there was not anybody — that is, all the C.C.F.'s that were elected would have some benefit out of that dam, with the exception of Percy Wright, perhaps. So I do not think that had anything to do with politics. And I think that we should go along with him and strengthen his hand and support a man of good will who is trying to really do something about this — instead of sniping at him for a political purpose, continuously.

Now, as far as the money that this province has said they would put up, no one knows whether that will be enough. At the present time we are able to talk about it very nicely because we haven't raised a cent of it and we probably will not be called on to raise any of it for a very long time, and certainly not during the life of this Government, because they will not be here to have anything to do with it. It is easy to talk about \$33 million when we haven't a cent of it to show anybody, and according to the summary given to us by the Minister of the Power Corporation, he told us that the cost of this Fort a la Corne project had gone up and up every time it was re-estimated, until it had got to be such a staggering figure that they could not really have anything to do with it at all. That might also be true with regard to the South Saskatchewan project, if we took a re-estimate of the dam — so it might cost the Federal Government and us, too, a real lot of money. And I wonder if this Government is doing the very best they can to try and get this dam built and to co-operate with people who are working on it, and in that connection I was somewhat surprised to see in the paper, today, (a Saskatoon paper) that Mr. F.H. Larsen, Liberal M.P. for Kindersley, had asked a question in the House regarding a submission that was supposed to have been made by the Saskatchewan Government to this Commission that is working on this project. And the reply said:

"Following discussions between the Saskatchewan Government and members of the Commission, on September 21 and November 23, 1951, concerning the presentation of material by the province, the Commission Chairman wrote Premier Douglas, on December 19, 1951, inviting the province to make a submission in relation to the Commission's terms of reference."

April 1, 1952

That was last December, Mr. Speaker, and they have not got any submission yet. So I wonder whether the Government of this province is more interested in making political capital out of that dam than they are in getting it built.

I had an opportunity, a few days ago, to speak to some people who are in business, from the province of Ontario, and we spoke about this dam. These fellows were not very enthusiastic about the proposition at all. I said, "why don't you go along with us and help us to get this dam? It is a great project for the West and it won't cost you fellows very much money, the way you are spending money these days." "Well", they said, "we'll tell you why we don't like you fellows out there in Saskatchewan — because you are never the least particle grateful for anything that we do for you, from the east. Whatever happens, we never do enough, and you want twice as much and you are never a bit grateful. So, if we take \$75 to \$100 million and throw it into your project all you will worry about is that we did not make it twice as much, or pay for the whole thing." And they said, "as far as a lot of us are concerned, we do not care whether you get your dam or not."

So, I think we had better go along with people who are willing to go forward on this project and I, as one that represents a part of the country that does not stand to benefit very much, except for the over-all prosperity of the country, am willing to co-operate with the Government or anybody else who wants to really go ahead with this project and in that connection I am particularly impressed by the amendment to this motion, introduced by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) and seconded by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson). As said by the hon. member for Melfort, this is really the thought of the hon. member for Last Mountain, that it was introduced in some other form and might have been as well if he had introduced it again. I believe that he is a gentleman of good judgment and seeks the best solution he can to get this presented in an unbiased manner by this House to the Federal Government, and I am one, also, Mr. Speaker, who would say that if anyone in this House wishes to proceed with this thing, they will certainly support the amendment to this motion.

Of course if we do not succeed with the amendment, I will support the original motion, for the over-all benefit of the province, in spite of its biting, sarcastic, miserable remarks about people who are trying to do something for this dam.

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I am just going to speak for a few minutes on this topic, but after I have listened, this afternoon, to the Opposition speakers, about political things coming into this discussion, I think they should be ashamed of themselves. After all, Mr. Speaker, you know it makes me smile when they start talking about political advantage in this, that and the other. As far as I can see, and all through this debate, this Government of ours is quite willing and has been asking for this project for years and years. Why has it been stymied? We have heard speakers, this afternoon — and we have heard hon. members speak about seven or eight years ago — about this project. Well, why is it being stymied? As far as I can see, the C.C.F. Government is quite prepared, and willing, to give the green light

to this project, and always has been, but it seems to me that every time there is something of this nature comes up and you talk about a political football, the Opposition starts to stymie it.

I think I will refer to you, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction, that throughout this Session — and I think the records will prove it — the Opposition has brought in more amendments to resolutions than they have done in the entire three or four Sessions that have gone before. Now, it is being done for a purpose, Mr. Speaker. In my estimation it is being done for a purpose — they are shadow-boxing, and probably they may get over-trained in all this stuff before they get through. But they are just shadow-boxing and it is just political jockeying as far as I am concerned.

They talk about this dam! All right, I want to bring to your mind, Mr. Speaker, that our Liberal friends, years ago, talked about the South Saskatchewan bridge going over the South Saskatchewan river, and that was jockeyed about by our friends in the Opposition Party for over 35 years. When the C.C.F. Party came into power, in 1944, it was also talked about. Oh, they were going to put a bridge across the South Saskatchewan river.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Is that in order!

Mr. Gibbs: — No, it is not a matter of order, but I am just bringing this to light — how you fellows are political jockeying now. Because, Mr. Speaker, I confidently think that if any other Government had been in office in the province of Saskatchewan than the C.C.F., the Liberals would have gone ahead without delay on this dam. That is the simple reason. They are waiting once again for election promises.

Mr. Tucker: — It won't be long now.

Mr. Gibbs: — They are waiting for the eve of election, then they will go to the people again and offer this dam, just like they promised the South Saskatchewan bridge at Swift Current for 35 years and never built it. And, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my Liberal friends over there that just because that bridge was built while this Government was in power, the Federal Liberal Government never gave us one cent for that bridge and I believe it is the only, and the first, bridge in Saskatchewan built under a C.C.F. Government that the Federal Government never assisted with. Why did they assist the Liberal Government before? Why don't they come and get behind us and get this project going? We have told them we would give them the green light. We are prepared to do our share — but no — they want to wait, they want to put it off. And I say that is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Then they bring in a lot of resolutions, and I am surprised that my Independent friend from Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) played for that. I am surprised, because he knows what our Liberal friends have done back in years gone by and they bring out an amendment, which he supports, to this resolution. I see nothing wrong with this resolution at all. It is just worded briefly and it is quite simple to understand. Then they say just because the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) brought in the Government of Canada, it is a political football. I believe they mentioned the

April 1, 1952

Federal Government in the amendment to this resolution. Is that — can we term that also a political football? No, Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of just bringing in amendments, to my estimation, in order to get publicity, because there is nothing wrong with the original motion as far as I can see. I do not know why we are wasting time with all this talking about this, that and the other, because we are prepared to go ahead and urge the Federal Government to get on with this project and get it built and I think that is what the people of Saskatchewan want.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Is there anything in this amendment to which we object? Is there anything in this amendment — (if you did not get a copy, we will send one over to you). I just wondered . . .

Mr. Gibbs: — No, it is all right. There is nothing in the amendment that I object to, but there is no need for it. There is no need whatsoever, as far as I can see. The thing is here in the original motion. It is cut and dried and set out there. That is all we want. We do not want a log of poems and stuff yards long because we want something done. It is right there in simple language.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why they are going to make this a political football. Let's get on with the job. We are all behind it . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? What did he say was in this amendment? I didn't hear the words.

Some Hon. Members: — Poems.

Mr. Gibbs: — I say, let's get on with it. If Jimmy Gardiner can do it, good luck to him.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, after the lecture that has been read to the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) and myself by the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) on how to conduct ourselves, how to be dignified, how to refrain from being vindictive, I shall, of course, conduct myself in the most restrained manner possible. I would, however, say that I thought teachers always understood that one ounce of example was worth a ton of precept, and the member for Melfort might have given us a little illustration, by way of example, of just how to have that dignity and that freedom from vindictiveness. Unfortunately, he seemed to be unable to do that.

Three things have been raised here, today, about which I would just like to say a few words. The first is the suggestion made by some of the speakers, and particularly by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) that somehow or other we ought to be very careful not to antagonize anyone — that if Mr. St. Laurent heard some of the discussions here, the whole thing would be thrown out — that some of the people down here in Ontario are not very keen about this — and I think he used the term that this is a straight "hand-out" as far as the Federal Government is concerned; whereas as far as the Provincial Government is concerned,

their investment will be returned to them over a period of time. Well Mr. Speaker, the last part of the statement is debatable, but I will not go into it. I doubt very much that the Provincial Government would get its money back over a period of time, but that is debatable so let us pass it by.

It is wrong, however, to talk about it being a straight “hand-out.” The Federal Government would get very considerable benefit, indirectly. For instance, if we had irrigation P.F.A.A. payments to the southwestern part of this province would be very considerably reduced. Probably, in the years ahead, it would make unnecessary a great amount of the relief that has had to be paid, in days gone by.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize — as every person who has to do with government in Canada recognizes — that we do not get things by hitting people over the head with a club. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to get anything by going with our hat in our hands, mealy-mouthed, crawling on our stomachs, as though we were asking — like *Oliver Twist* — for something to eat, or for something to which we are not entitled. Nobody from Ontario, or anywhere else, can talk about giving us a “hand-out”. The people of Canada would be putting money into this dam. Who does the hon. member think is going to supply the money to build the St. Lawrence waterways, that will probably cost anywhere from \$700 million to over \$1,000 million? That will be the money from the people of Canada, and there has been no Royal Commission! Nobody has come and asked us whether or not they can have the money, and nobody has had to go there with hats in their hand, and be careful not to offend anyone when discussing the question. No! The Government of Canada is going to proceed with the St. Lawrence waterway, which, in addition to being an avenue of trade, is also going to be a source of tremendous power development. It is going to be paid for by the people of Canada as a whole. So let us not think that this is a question of going “softly” to get somewhere. We do not want to be offensive, but the people of Saskatchewan and the people of the West have a just claim to money being spent under the P.F.R.A. for this project.

When the member for Turtleford says, “Well, Mr. Gardiner is a member of the Cabinet, and after all there is only so much he can do; he has to persuade other people”, I agree, that that is quite correct. But when he goes out, in 1945, and again, in 1949, and makes a specific commitment, the electors of this province are justified in thinking that he is making that commitment with the authority and consent of his colleagues. If he did not have their authority and consent, then he should have said so. If he is not able to carry them with him — and they agreed before — he can always say, “I am prepared to leave the Cabinet.” Or, if he did not have their agreement in advance, he can say, “I spoke out of turn.” The fact does remain that the people of this province were given to understand, repeatedly, that this project had been approved, that the site had been selected, and it was only a matter of final details before it was to be proceeded with.

I have noticed, when the members were speaking, and particularly the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff), while being very anxious that

April 1, 1952

this discussion should be non-political, spent a good deal of time making it as political as possible, and trying to put the onus for the delay in proceeding with the South Saskatchewan River project on the Saskatchewan Government.

The member for Melfort said that the Cass-Beggs report had placed this project in an unfavourable light. That, Mr. Speaker, is not in accordance with the facts. How could the report of a power engineer put the entire irrigation project in an unfavourable light? He was not reporting on it from a standpoint of irrigation. As I said in this House before, if the entire power project had been taken out, it would still be a good project, as was the St. Mary's in Alberta. The member for Melfort says that when we submitted the Cass-Beggs report we should have re-affirmed our faith in the P.F.R.A. engineer's report. Well Mr. Speaker, we did. The best proof that we were prepared to support the P.F.R.A. engineer's report was that we offered to put up \$33 million. That is pretty good affirmation of our faith in this project.

Let us look at the correspondence. I already read to the House the letter which I wrote to Mr. Gardiner on the 10th of February, following the conversations which we had had on the 2nd of February, and when someone talks about the delay — that is not much delay. We got the request on the 2nd of February and wrote on the 10th of February, agreeing to pay \$19 million for main ditches and lateral ditches; \$6 million on levelling; and \$8 million on the power installation. The letter I got back from Mr. Gardiner — and there was a little more delay here — Mr. Gardiner answered my letter on June 26th. I am not blaming him — it was an oversight. The session was on. 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 irrigation system, \$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 cost.”

There is no suggestion on Mr. Gardiner's part that we were hesitant or that the Cass-Beggs report had caused us to have any hesitation. He says, “I note that you are prepared to sign and negotiate an agreement as soon as the Federal Government announces its intention of proceeding.”

He also goes on to say:

“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 hoped to be able to announce the personnel of the committee of experts at an early date.

“I hope favourable decision will be made to the findings of the water board, etc. . . .”

There was no question about there being any delay. That was on June 26. That was almost a year after the Cass-Beggs report was in the hands of the P.F.R.A.

I replied to Mr. Gardiner’s letter. Mine also had some delay. I replied on August 2nd, and I said:

“Dear Mr. Gardiner: I have your letter of June 26 in regard to the South Saskatchewan irrigation and power project. You will recall that this was in reply to my letter of February 10, in which I advised that as a result of our earlier conversations with you the Saskatchewan Government was prepared to enter into an agreement on the sharing of financial responsibility along the lines indicated in my letter, in order that an earlier start might be made on the project . . .”

Then there was this paragraph, which I think is noteworthy:

“I now note that the Government of Canada is appointing a committee to review all the information on the project, and that the Prime Minister expects shortly to announce the personnel of the committee. We feel sure that you will agree that the data which has already been compiled by competent engineers and technicians has provided conclusive evidence that the project is both practical and feasible. Dr. L.B. Thomson, of the P.F.R.A. has in fact, expressed to us the view that no irrigation project in Canada has ever been so thoroughly and carefully documented as this proposal. We cannot appreciate the need for this further review, but are, of course, prepared to co-operate with the committee in any way we possibly can to expedite their work.”

Mr. Tucker: — Whose letter is that?

April 1, 1952

Premier Douglas: — That is my letter to Mr. Gardiner on August 2, 1951. I go on to talk about the Water Board and the St. Mary's Dam, and in the last paragraph I say:

“In view of the foregoing, we cannot see that any further delay is necessary. We would urge again that the Government of Canada should recognize its obligation in this matter, and undertake the immediate construction of this project which will undoubtedly benefit the nation as a whole, and Saskatchewan in particular.”

Mr. Speaker, is there any question of hesitation there? Is there any question of referring back to the Cass-Beggs report? We are saying, categorically, as far as we are concerned, both at the time we were asked, and later, “Let us get on with the job”, and we made it abundantly clear.

Now one other matter has been raised in the course of discussion and that is with reference to the report which the Saskatchewan Government was asked for by this committee. According to a question in the House, asked by Mr. Larson, I believe, and answered, I believe, by the Prime Minister, it was indicated that the report had not yet been forthcoming. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hesitated to have this correspondence come out, because the correspondence was with the secretary of this committee. But my friends talk about not playing politics with this important question! Surely there never was a better example of politics being played than what has just been done by Mr. Larson of Ottawa. He puts on the Order Paper a question to ascertain whether or not we had been asked for a report and whether or not we had tabled it, or submitted it, when the Federal Government must have known — and if they did not know they should have known — that we had been asked by the secretary of the committee to withhold our report. I would not have given the reason to the public and to the press as to why we had withheld our report, but they have now made it necessary.

I have written to the Prime Minister and I have given a copy of the letter, dated on Saturday, to the press. I think if I read the letter it will cover it much better than my going through the file, although I have the file here if anyone wants it. This is dated March 28, 1952:

“My dear Prime Minister: In answer to a question placed on the Order Paper by Mr. Larson, member for Kindersley, you are quoted as saying that the Saskatchewan Government has not yet presented a brief to the Royal Commission investigating the South Saskatchewan River project, despite the fact that the chairman of the said Commission requested us to do so on December 19, 1951.

“It seems to me that in all fairness the House of Commons should have been informed that the Saskatchewan Government met two members of

the Royal Commission, informally, on September 21, 1951; and that, at that time, our technical staff discussed with the secretary and two members of the Commission the type of information they required and the scope of the inquiry. During the latter part of December we were informed that the chairman of the Commission had to return to Salt Lake City, that one member of the Commission was ill, and that, consequently, we could carry on further investigation before making our submission. On March 12, 1952, Mr. B.T. Richardson (who is the secretary of the Commission) informed our technical staff that the Royal Commission was not satisfied with the estimates furnished by P.F.R.A. and that a meeting of the engineering consultants was being held in Washington, D.C. on April 7. Mr. Richardson invited the Saskatchewan Government to send an engineer to the proposed meeting, and stated that our report should be withheld until the results of this conference were made known. Mr. Richardson's statements of March 12 have since been confirmed in a letter dated March 22.

“There is no provincial Government in Canada which has co-operated more fully with the Royal Commission investigating the South Saskatchewan river project than has the Government of Saskatchewan. We have indicated our willingness to place before them all the data that we have, and to carry out extensive investigations regarding any matters on which they want further information. Any attempt to suggest that the Saskatchewan Government has not co-operated fully is not in accordance with the facts, and cannot possibly serve the best interests of the investigation which you initiated. If the Government of Canada wants us to file a submission without waiting for the results of the proposed conference in Washington on April 7, we shall, of course, comply. We thought, however, that by acceding to the request of the secretary of the Commission, that we wait until certain information had been received from consulting engineers, we were acting in accordance with the wish of the Commission.

“I do not propose to have the Saskatchewan Government placed in the impossible position of being blamed, inferentially, for not having submitted a report, while at the same time the Commission, itself, is suggesting that we withhold our submission until after the results of the conference commencing on April 7. I would therefore appreciate hearing from you as to whether or not you wish us to have our submission filed immediately, or whether you prefer to

April 1, 1952

have us withhold it as requested by the Commission.

Yours sincerely,
T.C. Douglas,
Premier of Saskatchewan.”

Mr. Speaker, was there ever a more impossible position to put a government in? The member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) stands up and says to us, “File your report.” The secretary of the Commission, who is supposed to know something about it, comes to the Minister of Agriculture and says, “There is no use filing your report because all the estimates are on the basis of the old P.F.R.A. estimates, and we are having a meeting in Washington to revise those estimates, and until we get the revised estimates there isn’t any use in submitting a report.” Now who are we to take it from?

We can bundle up the report we have ready and send it down, and we can say to the secretary, “We do not care what you ask us to do, you will take our report and like it.” Or we can co-operate with them and hold the report, as they have suggested. We are sending Mr. Tomlinson to Washington. He will sit down with their engineers to see whether or not the estimates need to be revised, and to bring those revised figures back and bring our report up to date in the light of those revised figures.

Now I take exception, Mr. Speaker, to this constant attempt of the people, (I am not saying the Federal Government itself, but certainly people connected with it) to try to cover up for them by putting the blame on somebody else. First of all, it is on Mr. Cass-Beggs. May I say, for a member who talks about not being vindictive, to refer to Mr. Cass-Beggs as being better known in Toronto as a C.C.F.er than he is a power engineer, and he was referred to by the press of this province as a very competent engineer who has just been appointed as Professor of Engineering at Cardiff University — one of the best engineering universities in Great Britain, does not go very well towards taking vindictiveness out of speeches.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Are you suggesting that it is being vindictive to point out that a man is a member of the C.C.F. Party?

Premier Douglas: — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that it is vindictive to say that he is a member of the C.C.F. Party, but when you add to that that he is better known as a C.C.F. member than as a power engineer, you are either making an unwarranted attack on the man’s capabilities and his competency, or you are betraying your complete ignorance as to what a competent power engineer is. I leave it to the House to determine which the hon. gentleman is.

As to the statements — “It is the Cass-Beggs report that has held it up.” I have shown from the correspondence that, in spite of anything in the Cass-Beggs report, this Government came out repeatedly and said, “Let us go ahead.” Now it is going to be the fact that we have not filed the submission. We have not filed the submission because the secretary of the Commission has asked us not to. No other provincial Government has filed a submission. Manitoba and Alberta have both been asked to file submissions and they too, like ourselves, are waiting for these revised figures, because it is now considered by the Commission that the statistics

and costs compiled by the P.F.R.A. are in need of revision, due, no doubt, to the fact that in the course of time, costs have risen and these figures all have to be revised.

I do not want to keep the House, but may I just refer to this amendment. First of all, I cannot agree, I am afraid, with the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) who keeps referring to this motion of the member for Hanley as being sarcastic in its terms. I think he said that it was mean or something of that sort. To me, it seems to state the facts clearly. It says:

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

Can anyone quarrel with that? That it has been delayed? Certainly, it has been unwarranted. Has anyone been able to show any reason why it has been delayed? And it goes on to say:

“. . . delay in proceeding with the South Saskatchewan River Dam project, in the face of ample evidence of its practical feasibility . . .”

Can anyone quarrel with 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.”

Now I cannot see anything mean or sarcastic or political about that.

Now, what is the amendment? I am in perfect agreement with the first part of the amendment. It says:

“This Assembly believes that the South Saskatchewan River Dam project will be of great economic and social value to Canada as a whole . . .”

and so on. It will provide water power, it will provide irrigation, it will provide water for the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina, etc., but the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is this:

“. . . therefore this Assembly requests that the Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada consider proceeding with the project without any further delay.”

We are both being approached at the same time, to please consider proceeding without any further delay. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is like a team of horses, with one of them lying in the mud, and the other one pulling on the traces. You come along and say, “now boys, we will not argue as to which is in the mud, we are just going to ask you both to get pulling.”

April 1, 1952

It may be non-political, but it makes the fellow who is pulling on the traces a little irritated when he is asked to pull, when he is tugging with all his might, while the other one is lying in the mud and refusing to pull at all!

As far as this Government is concerned, we have done everything that is humanly possible. We have co-operated, over a period of years, and have had made such engineering surveys as were necessary. We have indicated, in the letters I have written, our willingness to put up certain amounts of money. There is no sense in the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) saying, "They haven't seen the money, therefore it doesn't mean anything." When this Government signs an agreement, as was indicated by Mr. Gardiner we will do, that agreement will be binding on this government or any government that is in office in Saskatchewan, and that will commit the people of Saskatchewan to an expenditure of that amount of money. Maybe it will mean more money because it is a commitment to do three things, to level the land, put in the lateral ditches and the power installation, irrespective of what the cost may be. The estimate of that comes to \$33 million — but it may be \$50 million.

We have done everything we can do. We regretted the delay; we regretted and opposed the setting up of this Committee, or Royal Commission. In spite of that we are co-operating with them and are sending a man all the way to Washington. It was none of our business, to sit with them and revise the P.F.R.A. figures, with which the Royal Commission are not satisfied, but we are prepared to co-operate to that extent. What is the use of someone coming along and saying to us now, "Will you please proceed with this project?" As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to do with proceeding with the project. The ditches, the levelling and the power installation would not start until about three years after this project is commenced. The Federal Government could start any time it liked, as long as they had our agreement indicating that we were prepared to pay our share when the time came.

In Alberta, they proceeded with the St. Mary's project without one scrap of paper, without any indication from the Alberta Government that they would do anything. It was only when the project was almost completed that the Federal Government then said to the Alberta Government, "Now would you accept certain responsibilities with regard to levelling and lateral ditches?" Here we are, before it is even started — long before it is started — indicating our willingness to do that. Therefore, it is not for us to proceed. All there is for us to do is to sign an agreement and we have indicated our willingness to sign that agreement. Mr. Gardiner says, in his letter of June 26th, that he understands that as soon as the Federal Government is ready to go ahead, the Government of Saskatchewan will sign this agreement.

I think that this amendment, by inference, by implication, suggests that there are two governments holding up the South Saskatchewan River project. I say, Mr. Speaker, there is only one government holding it up, and that that government has a responsibility. I do not propose to let that Government hide behind the skirts of this Government, or anybody else.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while I can support the first part of the motion, I cannot support that last sentence, because in an attempt to be non-political the mover and seconder have been political. They have taken the responsibility and the onus off the back of the Federal Government and have tried to put it on both our shoulders, and there is no onus upon us. We have indicated our willingness to go ahead, and we stand prepared now to proceed. If Mr. Gardiner will send me a wire as of tomorrow morning, or put an agreement in our hands, I will undertake, on behalf of my colleagues, that within 48 hours of getting that agreement it will be signed and returned to the Federal Government. Then they can go ahead to their hearts content.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in what the Premier said at the last of his remarks. He suggested that he could support the amendment if it had been a straight request to the Federal Government to get on with the scheme. Well, I would recall to him that that was exactly what was moved as the first amendment to this proposition. We moved the amendment just to take out the criticism of any government. Actually, the motion would have read, if our amendment had been accepted, as follows:

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

A straightforward request. First of all, we regretted the delay and asked the Federal Government to proceed. Now the Premier voted against that when we moved it, and then he gets up here, today, and says if this amendment had been in those terms he could support it. Well, I do not know what to make of that sort of manoeuvring around, Mr. Speaker. Why did the Premier vote against our amendment, which was designed to do the very thing that he says he would support?

In this amendment, as it is drawn now, there are two dominant ideas. One is the very thing that we were ready to support wholeheartedly, and that we asked the House to join in supporting; and that was that we regret the delay and we urge that the project be proceeded with but we thought that it might be a good thing that this Legislature should not go on record as passing a vote of lack of confidence in the Federal Government because it had delayed. We did not see how that would advance the project a bit — to say to the Federal Government that you have taken unwarranted action in having this matter looked into. And I think that anybody who wants to look into this thing in an unbiased way would say that if you want to get action from the Federal Government, the way to go about it is not to say that they have taken action that is unwarranted, but to simply say we regret that there is this delay and ask them to go ahead with the project.

April 1, 1952

Now that is what we asked to be done. But the Government opposite are not satisfied with that, Mr. Speaker. They are not interested in getting the dam proceeded with. They are interested in something else besides that. They are interested in censuring the Federal Government, or else they would have agreed to our original amendment. Now then, is that true? Is that the Case? That these people opposite to us, the Government of this province, are more interested in passing a political vote of censure on the Government of this country, which is a Liberal Government, than they are in passing a resolution to get this dam proceeded with? Well, from their attitude toward every move to try to get a straightforward resolution put through here recommending that immediate action be taken on this proposition, from their determination not to accept that, but to keep this censure of the Federal Government in the resolution, the people of the province will know that the members opposite are very interested in trying to make as much political capital out of this as they possibly can. And actions speak louder than words!

The Premier can get up and talk about how he is anxious to proceed, all he wants, but when he will not accept either an amendment from this side of the House which makes this a straightforward resolution asking for action, and does not have the objection that he raised at the last of his speech — and then — when that is turned down, another amendment is moved from that side of the House and he still will not accept that, well I must say I was disappointed. I thought myself that the members of this House — and I certainly thought that the members of the C.C.F. Party in this House — thought enough of this project that they would forget politics and support that straightforward resolution which was suggested by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) and later moved by the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). But apparently their political need is so great that they cannot possibly give up the chance of making a little bit of political capital out of this particular proposition.

I must say that I was amused by the attitude of the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy). He must have spent a lot of time looking up all the possible epithets that he could possibly throw at me. He could not have thought of them all by himself, I am sure. He must have had the assistance of some of these people — the experts — to advise him. And there must have been more than one to have gathered them all together because the Minister had great difficulty getting them all across in his speech. But it is coming to be recognized by the country that every time the C.C.F. Government gets into difficulty, has something proved against it, it immediately resorts to calling names and to ridicule. I must admit that I did not hear the other day, when I was drawing attention to some of the manoeuvring of the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) about the Flin Flon road; and the promises made by the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) to the good people of the seat of Rosthern, and then the way they wiggled out of it, Mr. Speaker — I must admit that I did not hear the suggestion of the Minister of Highways that I was an overgrown bully, but when I read it in the paper I must say I had to laugh. Here is this Government across here, that gets in such a position that when it cannot bring forward any answer to the charges brought against it of playing politics with roads and playing politics with everything they touch, then they cry out, “Oh, you are a bully.” Well, that certainly must make the people of this province sorry for the Government, that they have

got into this position that they figure they are being bullied. I am sure that everybody must be very sorry for them, Mr. Speaker.

In regard to this matter there is some suggestion that this project should have been gone on with years and years ago . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — The Minister of Highways says, “Hear hear.” I guess it will be gone on with before this highway through Rosthern — No. 12 — is blacktopped, which the Minister promised the people up there when trying to get some votes, that, “it would be done in due course, under a 10-year policy, etc. etc.” The final report of the investigation on this project, submitted to the Federal Government is dated April 2, 1951. That is less than a year ago. And up to that time they had not got the final reports in with regard to the location of the site. They did not have the reports in with regard to the feasibility of this project, from the standpoint of agriculture, from the standpoint of the engineering problems involved, and in regard to the climate, or all these different factors. They did not get this final report from P.F.R.A. until less than one year ago.

Now there has been some attempt made by the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) to ridicule the Minister of Agriculture (Federal) because he said that they had to be very careful that this dam was placed in the position that it would not go out some time and drown the whole country, including the city of Saskatoon. That may be very funny to the Minister of Social Welfare, but if he will talk with the engineers who have had to do with this project, they know that that has been a very real concern to all of them. If you back up a lake over a hundred miles long and have it 200 feet deep, there is a terrific weight of water behind that dam and on the river bed close to the dam, and unless . . .

Some Hon. Member: — That was before the election.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . That has been explained, right from the start it has been the attitude of many people in western Canada. Mr. Gardiner has been one and I have been another. We felt that it should be possible to find a place to put that dam in, where it would be safe and where it would hold the water, and we have steadily upheld that idea and worked toward it. But the idea of people who may be in public life, that a thing is desirable, and the idea that they would like to see it done, has to be translated into an actual feasible engineering proposition. And we are told that the South Saskatchewan river there is running in the bed of an old river that apparently flowed there hundreds of thousands of years ago and that there is actually a tremendous amount of gravel and sand down to the old bed of that old river, and then when you get down to the bed of that river you still do not hit solid rock. You hit shale, which is permeable by water.

This has been a matter which has bothered the engineers very much, because they realize that there is a tremendous weight of water sitting on that river bed and it is not possible to go right down to solid rock. Therefore, the pressure, under that dam, if there is the slightest infiltration of water under it — the water might go under the dam and wash the whole thing out. It is all very well for the Minister of Social Welfare

April 1, 1952

to jeer and sneer at that situation, but it was a thing that engineers had to contend with and they had to find a place where they felt that they could put that dam in, where it was likely to stay.

The Coteau Creek site was only arrived at, as the site, after a great deal of investigation up and down that river, and they did not get their final decision in to the Federal Government until, as I say, less than one year ago — a year ago tomorrow. Now what becomes of this story that this matter should have been proceeded with years and years ago? Of course, nobody can be impressed with that argument. It is just, again, some political eye-wash, the usual stuff that the C.C.F. think they can put across and arouse political animosity by bringing it up.

In the course of this debate, as has been said, had it been the desire of the members opposite, represented by the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) to merely ask that this matter be proceeded with — I was even quite ready to go along with the regretting that there was the delay, quite ready to go along with it, nobody regretted it more than I did — if that had been the intention, everybody would have supported it and that would have been the end of it. But in this resolution there is an attempt to blame the Federal Government for what it has done and to call the delay that has occurred “Unwarranted.” “That it is absolutely without proper justification.” Well, as has been pointed out by the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff), the cause of this delay has been the report of Cass-Beggs, which threw cold water on this scheme and there is some suggestion attempted to be made that, because he threw cold water only on the power aspect of it, that no attention should have been paid to the matter. But, if he is the eminent engineer that the Premier says, and comes along and says, in this important particular, “The engineers of P.F.R.A. have been unduly optimistic and have not taken into account all the factors that should be taken into account” what is the natural attitude of the Government looking over the reports of P.F.R.A.? P.F.R.A. is made up of civil servants working for the Federal Government, and here this Government is asked to get an engineer and asked to get a report covering the power angle of this thing. They retain a man whom they put forward as an eminent engineer. He comes along and makes a report which throws doubts in the field that he has gone into, on the work done by the P.F.R.A. Well, if P.F.R.A. are wrong in that particular matter, they might be wrong in some of these other important matters. They might be wrong on this all-important thing as to whether that dam, when it is put there, will stay there.

It is all very well for the Premier to say, “Well, this power angle does not matter, because we were willing to take a chance on it. We were willing to put up \$33 million.” But, if the whole work of the P.F.R.A. was thrown in doubt by this eminent engineer (according to the Premier) well then can you blame the Federal Government for saying that they would like to have some other people look at the other work done by the P.F.R.A., and see if it is reliable and well-founded or not? And that is exactly what happened, Mr. Speaker. This Cass-Beggs report aroused doubt about the whole project, in the minds of the Federal Government, and they decided to have it looked at by some independent people.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — He must have been an eminent engineer to have influenced P.F.R.A.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I suppose when this Government undertook to put him forward as the man to make this report, the Federal Government was willing to at least take it that he must know something of what he was doing.

I think that what the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) said is true — that in the city of Toronto, Cass-Beggs is better known for being an outstanding C.C.F.'er than he is for being an engineer. That is no great reflection on him. The work he did as a C.C.F.'er, and as a candidate, brought him into the public eye very much. The work he did as an engineer naturally did not bring him in the public eye. I do not know why the members are so touchy about that particular thing, because I think it is perfectly true. I have always felt that I tried to be the best lawyer I could, but I will admit that I expect I am better known throughout Canada as a politician than I am as a lawyer, but I think perhaps I am a better lawyer than I am a politician, Mr. Speaker. But the fact that I am better known as a politician does not prove anything one way or the other. That is what my hon. friend said, and I think the implication there is that that is probably why the C.C.F. got him, because they knew he was a prominent C.C.F.'er. He may have been a good engineer at the same time, nobody said he wasn't. But I do say this — that they put him forward as a man speaking for them in this matter, and he brings forward a report that does throw doubt on the work done by the P.F.R.A. Well then the Government decides to take another look at the whole proposition.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not want to mislead the House, but he spoke of the report as being the report of civil servants. I think he will remember that the three consulting engineers — General Ferguson, Casagrande and Allen — were all secured by P.F.R.A. outside of the public service, two from the United States and one of them from Edmonton.

Mr. Tucker: — I think it is understood that Major General Ferguson, retired, of the Corps of Engineers, of the Army, is a general consultant. They are consulting engineers. Then there was Dr. Allen, consulting engineer geologist and Dr. Casagrande. They were consulted by the P.F.R.A. engineers and so on, in regard to this report. But the basic work was done by the employees of P.F.R.A. and these other people were merely consultants.

Premier Douglas: — Well, so was Cass-Beggs.

Mr. Tucker: — Let the Premier have it that way if he wishes. If one group of consultants takes the attitude that this is quite feasible in every way and here is a set-up that we can expect from the development of power; and another consulting engineer comes along, brought forward by the Government of the province in which this is being built, and throws doubt on the whole thing, then what can a government do? If this dam were put in, and if it went out with terrible loss — not only of property, but of life — what would happen? The argument would immediately be made that the validity of a lot of work done by the P.F.R.A. people was questioned by

April 1, 1952

Cass-Beggs before they ever went ahead with the project and when the validity of their work was questioned in one particular branch, why did they not take a look at the whole thing again? That would be said by everybody. And so, the Government, in taking this attitude that they want to take another look at the matter, and refer it to an independent group, did no more than could have been expected when you people sent forward the Cass-Beggs report as your contribution to that project.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — May I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker? Was there anything in the Cass-Beggs report that threw doubt on the stability of the dam that would be built?

Mr. Tucker: — I thought I explained that. I must explain it again, Mr. Speaker. Well I will, because, after all, if the Minister did not understand it then perhaps there may be somebody else in the House who did not. I said this: That there are many different branches of this work, one of them was the stability of the dam, another was whether this land would take water to grow products properly under irrigation, another was the question of climate, whether you could develop different agricultural side-lines which would make irrigation profitable; and the other was the question of the development of power from this thing. The P.F.R.A. people had made certain reports as to the amount of power that you could expect from this project. Cass-Beggs looks into the whole matter and throws doubt on the value of this thing, from a power angle.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — From a purely power angle?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, yes, I did not say otherwise. But if the word of these people is impugned in one important matter — the power angle — it throws doubt on all the rest of their work. That should be plain, even to my friend, the Minister of Public Health. If it is not plain to him, then, of course, I cannot help it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — It is not even plain to the speaker himself.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not know whether you can speak for the Speaker or not. I think the Speaker is more intelligent than to not be able to follow that simple argument. I would not reflect on the Speaker that way . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, I meant the present person who is speaking.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . because I think it is so simple, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a reflection on you to say that you did not follow that argument. The Minister of Public Health knows that too, but I, in my own heart, know that you would follow an argument like that very well, Mr. Speaker. I would never think that you would not.

In regard to the argument that the Premier put forward, which was supposed to crush down and answer all possible arguments — it was the argument to answer all arguments. In spite of the fact that they employed Cass-Beggs and Cass-Beggs put in a report that throws doubt on the work of P.F.R.A., not only in power but in everything else, because if they have

made a mistake in power, they might have made a worse mistake in other matters; but having brought this forward, having had the Dominion Government decide to look at the whole matter again, then the Premier gets big-hearted. Regardless of all this he said: "Go ahead with the thing, spend your money, put it in, regardless of whether the thing is feasible or not, we will spend \$33 million if you can put a dam there that stays there long enough for us to put a powerhouse on it." Now isn't that generous of the Premier? If this work is done he will never be in any danger of having to put the powerhouse there and spend this money, nor will any Government of Saskatchewan be in that position unless this is a feasible proposition; because this work that the province is going to have to pay for — as he just pointed out himself — does not come into the question until the dam is established there and is standing there safely and solidly. Now he can very well say, "All right, you take your chance with your \$100 million. We will put up the \$33 million if you can put the dam there and make it stay there."

That is supposed to answer all arguments! Because he said, "We will put the \$33 million in there if you go ahead and build the dam first of all." That does not answer the fears of the Dominion Government, it does not give any guarantee to them. The fact that this Government is willing to come along after the dam is established there, and after it is solidly established there, and say, "We will put in a power house, we will put in the canals and so on to use the water." And, as has been pointed out, the Dominion is spending this money as a public project without any hope of immediate returns. I think it will get many returns from a national standpoint. I think this money is well justified in every way, from the standpoint of national development, and I would be ready to argue that with anybody. But, the province is not going to put its money in until this is all done, and then it puts its money in to establish a power plant and to use the water, and from that it expects to get, substantially, its money back ultimately. So that the fact that doubt has been thrown on the matter — and then the province comes along and says, "You go ahead with it, we will put up our share." That does not undo the damage that was done by the Cass-Beggs report.

Somebody has raised the question, and the Premier also raised it, "Did not Cass-Beggs do right, when he was employed, in bringing forward his honest opinion of this whole set-up?" Of course he did right, but if Cass-Beggs is right and the P.F.R.A. people are wrong, then is anybody really to blame if it is decided to take another look at this proposition? Should anybody be condemned? If there has been some work done on this thing that may not stand up to examination we can still continue to support it and advocate it, but is it right for us to condemn the Federal Government because it, on the strength of the engineer's report of this Government, decides to take another look at the proposition? And that is what we are invited to do by this resolution, and that is why we wanted to take that condemnation out of the resolution.

Something was said about our saying we should take an attitude of friendship toward the people in the rest of Canada on such matters. The Premier then immediately went to the other extreme and suggested that when we suggested that we should go crawling to them — well, there again is an attempt to make an argument ridiculous by giving it an extreme

April 1, 1952

interpretation. Surely, to say to the people in the rest of Canada, "We do not agree with this delay. We think that you should go ahead with it; but you think that it should be investigated. All right, we ask you to go ahead with this thing as fast as possible, but we do not say that you are unjustified — that you are wrong in what you did." To say that we should not say that to somebody we are asking to go into partnership on this scheme, is that suggesting that we are crawling to them? If we say to them, in a spirit of friendship, "Here, we would like you to go ahead with this as soon as you possibly can and we are not beginning to throw bricks at you or find fault with you", that is not crawling to people, fellow-citizens of ours.

Now on this question of no submission being filed yet with the Royal Commission, I tried to follow what the Premier said on that matter and I cannot say that I followed him to my own satisfaction.

Some Hon. Member: — Let him explain it again.

Mr. Tucker: — I understood him to say that the suggestion that no submission was required was a verbal suggestion made by the secretary of the Commission.

Premier Douglas: — It was confirmed later, in writing.

Mr. Tucker: — Did you read that letter?

Premier Douglas: — No, I did not.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that is why I wonder if you . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I said in my letter to the Prime Minister, "Mr. Richardson's statement of March 12th has since been confirmed in a letter dated March 22nd."

Mr. Tucker: — Has that letter been tabled?

Premier Douglas: — No, I would be willing to table it, but I would prefer not to. I will let my hon. friend see the correspondence and if he wants it tabled I would be glad to do it, but I think there are probably statements there that might not help the general thing you have in mind.

Mr. Tucker: — I am ready to accept the Premier's assurance on that — that it is not desirable to table this correspondence, because I can believe that might be true. It is again the question of trying to get this project advanced in the best way, but if the Premier says that the secretary confirmed the fact that this Government was told not to submit this report — I am surprised to hear that because I discussed this matter with the secretary of the Commission and I asked him if it was true that this Government had not yet put in a written submission as asked, and I certainly understood from him that this Government had been asked to put in a submission and that they had not done so. He never told me that he had, in any way, suggested that they should not put in a submission. He also gave me a copy of a letter dated March 3, 1952, signed by Mr. Gaherty,

one of the commissioners, which bore that out, and this letter, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

“As you know, a good deal of time and money has already been devoted to 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 inquiry.”

Now I would have thought myself, that the Government would have paid more attention to the desire of the chairman of that Commission than to any verbal statement of the secretary. That is what I was going by and that letter was written by Mr. Gaherty to the Prime Minister, and I take it that when he said that this Government was invited to file a submission and they had not done so, I expect that he was going on the basis of this letter from Mr. Gaherty. In regard to this matter there are one or two things in this letter which I would like to refer to. He says:

“We have undertaken to obtain an estimate of the cost of the owner, (that is the Federal Government) of the main dam and its appurtenant works. In 1947, these works were estimated to cost \$66,360,000, and in the interval construction costs have risen sharply. We regard an up to date estimate as indispensable to a proper appraisal of the project.

“So far, there has evidently been no general agreement among the engineers and consultants associated with this project on the true overall costs.”

Now, I do not think that that particular angle of things would have been raised at all if it had not been for the question that was raised by Cass-Beggs. When he brought out the problem of power, and the fact that P.F.R.A. might be wrong on that, then the question arose, “Is their estimate about the cost right?” And here we have the opinion of Mr. Gaherty that there is no general agreement among the engineers on the true overall cost. And then he goes on to say:

“The engineering phases of the project involve a number of very disturbing features and obvious risks.”

Now I would commend this to the attention of everybody who says, “Let’s go ahead with it. It does not matter whether it is feasible or not.” Here is the opinion of this gentleman, Mr. Gaherty, who is one of the outstanding men in this work. And he says the engineering phases of the project involve a number of very disturbing features and obvious risks.

April 1, 1952

It is all very well to try to make a joke out of what the Minister of Agriculture (Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner) said about this matter. It is all very well for the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) to make fun of him. But here is the opinion of this eminent gentleman (Mr. Gaherty), who says:

“The engineering phases involve a number of disturbing features and obvious risks, and it is our intention to call the engineering consultants into a general conference as soon as it can be arranged. We expect Dr. Hogg to be available for this conference early in April.

“You will recall that the terms of reference of this Commission included the question that the project represent the most profitable and desirable use which can be made of the physical resource involved.

“The project is an extremely high cost undertaking for which the benefits of irrigation and power will not begin to be realized for eight to ten years.

(That is along the lines of Cass-Beggs you will notice.)

“This leads to the question of whether benefits can be realized more quickly in other ways and at less cost to the country.”

This refers to electricity and power and is directly based, in my opinion, on the Cass-Beggs report. This letter was written, Mr. Speaker, on March 3rd, less than one month ago. And this whole trouble is based upon the report of Cass-Beggs. It has brought up the whole question again, the engineering risks involved, the question of the cost, the whole thing has been brought out by his throwing doubt on the one angle, and it is an important angle — the question of power. Now how the Government, being responsible for that report, can then ask this House to condemn the Federal Government because it says it is going to pay some attention to the feasibility of this matter, seems very strange to me.

As has been said, I am very anxious to do everything I can to show that I believe in the feasibility of this proposition. I think that we have got clever enough engineers today that they can solve all these problems, and I believe they can be solved. I believe in the feasibility of this project — as a layman, of course — and its desirability, more than ever, and so far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite see fit to insist on keeping a political implication in this resolution, I am not going to vote against it, even if I expose myself to supporting that political implication, because I put the desirability of this project above any desire to play politics. But we have given the gentlemen opposite a chance to come out flat-footed and whole-heartedly, without political implications, for this project, proposing the other amendment, which would have done that, but they have shown that they are

very desirous of making all the political capital out of it that they can. They have another chance, now, in a resolution suggested by an Independent member of this House, again to take the political aspect out of it and vote for this project as a project.

I will be interested to see, Mr. Speaker, whether they are concerned about this as an economic project for the benefit of Saskatchewan or whether they are more concerned about wringing every last drop of political advantage out of it they can. But I want to tell them before they vote, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think it is going to do them any good, because the country will know that we were willing to drop any idea of politics in this matter, and even if they will not take the political implications out of it, we will still vote for it, in order to have this project proceeded with. We just wonder if the C.C.F. care as much about the scheme as we do. We will see how they vote on this amendment, and that will give some indication.

Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrobart-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, people in my constituency, through the various elections have heard the unreserved promises of Federal members and those speaking on behalf of them, that the dam was going ahead without any hindrance at all; and that everything was perfectly in order — all of the preliminary work that was necessary had been completed, etc.

I wish my people were able to sit in the galleries here and listen to the words from the opposite side. I never heard a more laboured attempt to endeavour to prove a point, after all that was said.

I may say that I am going to vote against that amendment for the simple reason . . .

(Interruptions)

Some Hon. Member: — Your halo is slipping, Walter!

Mr. Tucker: — That is what we expected.

Mr. Wellbelove: — I thought I had the floor, but of course with the people over there, one never knows who has the floor.

I can only vote for this resolution for the simple reason that I took those promises on face value at the time they were given. I was foolish to do it, I will admit that, but taking those promises on face value, from those who were supposed to be in a position to give unreserved opinions, I can only vote for a resolution which “regrets the unwarranted delay.” The unwarranted delay is based, Mr. Speaker, on statements given without any reservation at all, by people who are supposed to be an authority on the subject, and then I take it that the statements they made were given to us as being ample evidence of the practical feasibility of the plan. Again I would have to vote for the motion as it stands because I took it that the plan was feasible. We have all been given to understand that. And to vote for that amendment would not bear

April 1, 1952

out that understanding.

The Cass-Beggs report was brought up before as the main objection and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) has laboured that point again. That has died down to a certain extent and I was surprised to see the spontaneous question of the Federal member for Kindersley in the Federal House, where he asked if the Government of Saskatchewan had tabled their recommendations, but he did not mention the Governments of Alberta or Manitoba. I thought it was rather significant at the time, but I get a little idea now as to what has been happening. I am pleased that the Premier gave us the evidence he did, this afternoon, and I want to get a copy of that so that we can let it be known in our local papers just exactly what has been going on, because I am sure this other thing is going to be played up.

I am not going to prolong this discussion, but to keep faith with the people who are supposed to be in a position to give us proper information, during the last two or three elections, I have to vote for the motion, not for the amendment.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatived 27 to 17.

(Closing Debate on Original Motion)

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take long enough to reply to all the silly and unwarranted statements that have been made from the other side of the House in this debate so far.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that in the beginning, this debate was referred to as the debate on the “dam resolution”, and I lament the fact that it degenerated into a debate on the “dam Cass-Beggs report” by the members of the Opposition. I was astonished, Mr. Speaker, to note that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) by that long, windy and empty tirade in which he attempted to attribute political motives to those who are sponsoring and supporting this resolution, succeeded in convincing the daily press of this city that the real subject for debate in this Legislature was the Cass-Beggs report. For the Cass-Beggs report was head-lined in the “Leader-Post” as having been debated in this Chamber. I was under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the real subject which this Legislature is being asked to pass an opinion on was whether or not the Federal Government was justified in a further unwarranted delay in continuing with this project.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution made quite clear that there are four points of issue in this debate. First of all, the fact that there was considerable economic and social value in the project. The present Royal Commission has been appointed to look into that very question. I devoted almost three-fourths of my remarks in an attempt to establish, both by quotation from the P.F.R.A. report, and by quotations from eminent authorities in other places, that the economic and social value of the project was unquestionable. I find that that aspect of the question has not been seriously disputed here.

I attempted to establish a second fact that there was ample evidence of the feasibility of the project, that there was unwarranted delay, and, finally, that the Government of Canada be urged to proceed without further delay.

Now, as to the matter of the feasibility of the project, I did not think that was brought in question. I quoted from the P.F.R.A. report, in which it was stated that it was feasible. I did not quote, however, from Mr. Gardiner on that matter. He is reported, in the Saskatoon "Star-Phoenix" on June 2, 1951, as having said, at Outlook:

"I can tell you tonight that we know that our engineers are satisfied the dam is feasible."

So that nobody can (and certainly not my hon. friends opposite) question the feasibility of the project.

Then I tried to establish that there was unwarranted delay, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition attempted to attribute that delay to the fact that there was a report — the Cass-Beggs report — which he attempted to attribute to this Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we should judge how successful, or how unsuccessful, he was in the attempt. First of all, I draw to your attention that this "terrible" Cass-Beggs report had been submitted to Mr. Gardiner and to the Federal authorities sometime in June of 1950. But it was not until June of 1951 that the Federal Government discovered that they were alarmed about the situation — having read the Cass-Beggs report — and that therefore they would need to have another look at the project. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that one year's delay alone is an unwarranted delay, even if the Cass-Beggs report was, as a matter of fact, the reason for the second look at the project. That one year of completely lost time was an unwarranted delay, and no one can deny that. I think it is for the people of this province, who have had this project promised repeatedly on the hustings, to say that that was an unwarranted delay.

I point out, too, Mr. Speaker, that it has not been gainsaid in this debate that the Cass-Beggs report was a report dealing with the power aspects of the project, and as the Premier has just mentioned, they went ahead in Alberta, without any ancillary power development in their project, so that it need not have been raised as an issue here.

In another part, the Leader of the Opposition says: "Oh well, if the power aspect of it was put in question naturally that would cause them to take a second look at the irrigation part of it." Well, Mr. Speaker, in another part of his address he said that this \$60 or \$70 million that the Federal Government was going to spend was not self-liquidating, and that it would not be self-liquidating. You cannot have it both ways. If it is conceded by him, and conceded by the Federal Government that the expenditure of this \$60 or \$70 million is not a self-liquidating investment, has nothing to do with power, then how can he allege that an unfavourable power report was the reason for this failure to proceed with the main project?

April 1, 1952

The "Leader-Post" took much the same line in an editorial of March 27th, and at the end of the editorial they admitted that the "Federal Government's potential investment normally would not be a self-liquidating expenditure." Nobody ever expected that it would be self-liquidating or recoverable, and to use that as an argument, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is to try to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan.

Of course nobody established that the Cass-Beggs report was an unfavourable report. I have read the report. The Leader of the Opposition read passages out of it, and I have scrutinized those passages very carefully. True, the report is realistic. But nobody has established that it is an unfavourable report to the power project. The Leader of the Opposition is more interested, Mr. Speaker, in making politics — trying to play politics with this project. He is trying to fasten upon the shoulders of this Government responsibility for the dereliction of his bosses at Ottawa, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is one thing for the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) to throw a lot of epithets, but as I said in the House, I have no bosses in Ottawa, and I ask that he be told to withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member should withdraw that remark.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the term "bosses"; I will put "the senior partners" at Ottawa. I suggest that that kind of flim-flam that somehow this Government is responsible for their delays, just does not go down with the people I represent, or the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Member: — You will not be there much longer.

Mr. Walker: — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that vicious attempt did not succeed in convincing anybody. I have here a clipping taken from the "Leader-Post" dated March 21, 1952, and I note that the Canadian Press, who no doubt have heard and read the reports of my hon. friend, were not convinced at all. They say, speaking of Professor Cass-Beggs:

"Cass-Beggs will take a new post. As a consulting engineer, Professor Beggs, five years ago, surveyed the possibilities of rural electrification in Saskatchewan, providing information on which the farm electrification programme was based, in the province.

"More recently he made a study for the P.F.R.A. administration with the Federal Government.

"In 1950-51 he supervised an investigation into the developing power leads of Saskatchewan, and reported on the required programme of construction and development — three different studies."

Mr. Speaker: — May I draw to the member's attention that it is just about six o'clock. Do you wish to continue after recess?

Mr. Walker: — I am prepared to call it 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Walker (Hanley) continues: — I have attempted to demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, that the delay in proceeding with this project was unwarranted, and I have referred to the pathetic attempt of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, to blame the delay upon the Cass-Beggs report. I have quoted from a Canadian Press despatch from Toronto, where undoubtedly they see the press reports, and undoubtedly they are acquainted with the facts, and they have not been convinced or persuaded by that line of propaganda that my hon. friend stirred up in this Chamber when this resolution came before this House.

I want now to call as witness, the Editor of the "Leader-Post" as to whether or not this delay is unwarranted. I find that the "Leader-Post" editorial of March 22nd said in part, as follows:

"When the Federal Government first announced that a Commission was being appointed to check on the engineering and economic data, to make doubly certain of the project's soundness, this newspaper expressed doubts that it was necessary."

The whole burden of my remarks has been that it was not necessary, and the "Leader-Post" admits that it was doubtful.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! May I draw the attention of the hon. member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak), to the ruling not to read newspapers in the House.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I call as witness, the Editor of the "Leader-Post" to prove something of the kind of gyrations that you can expect from a partisan editor, because in the next sentence he says:

"At the time, little was known about the Cass-Beggs report on the project by Professor Cass-Beggs, of Toronto, an authority on power."

The Leader-Post tries to indicate that at that time they were not aware of the doubts cast by the Cass-Beggs report. So anxious they were to "cover the tracks" of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) that they swallowed, hook, line and sinker, that red herring that I spoke about last week.

This kind of political somersault is not new of course, with the Editor of the "Leader-Post."

Now I want to refer, for just a moment to the "Star-Phoenix." They have injected themselves into this debate. I am indebted to my hon. friend from Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) for referring to the Star-Phoenix. I had it here, and was going to read it myself, Mr. Speaker. I want to just

April 1, 1952

refer to the opening paragraph of an editorial on March 20, in which the “Star-Phoenix” says:

“Mr. Robert Walker of Hanley talked a lot of nonsense, the other day, in a speech on his own motion, censuring the Federal Government for the delay in getting along with the South Saskatchewan dam.”

Mr. Speaker, my first impulse is to applaud, also, but unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I cannot bring myself to applaud my own speeches. My first impulse is to applaud because, after some four years in public life in Saskatchewan, I succeeded in getting my name into the “Star-Phoenix.” But I draw it to the attention of the House, but not for that reason. I do so to demonstrate the kind of agility that editors of the “Star-Phoenix” abound with, because they say that it is “nonsense” — this resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what had I put forward? I had tried to establish that this dam was feasible. I quoted the Federal Minister of Agriculture. I had tried to establish that the Federal Government, in none of its other big projects, had referred the question of desirability to a judicial Commission, but that they had taken upon their own shoulders the responsibility of deciding how public money should be spent. I described this reference to a Royal Commission as an abdication of the constitutional responsibility of the Canadian Cabinet. I had alleged, Mr. Speaker, that that device (and it is just a device on the part of the Dominion Government) was aimed at stifling this project, because I said that if this Commission had been asked for by Mr. Gardiner, then we might assume that it was with the hope and the desire to get a favourable report. But we had Mr. Gardiner’s own confession that the Commission was asked for by those people in the Canadian Cabinet who were not sold upon the desirability of this project. We have Mr. Gardiner’s own confession in the House of Commons which I quoted from when I moved this resolution, to the effect that:

“The Cabinet knows that I am convinced; they know that the people out west are convinced. But they are not convinced. They want one more report.”

It is the people who are opposed to this project that have asked for this report. I suggest that if they have not got enough political honesty themselves to come out and say that they are opposed to this project, then they are being disloyal to the principles of democratic government. I say that this attempt to put the responsibility for destroying this project onto an independent Commission is the most bare-faced kind of political trickery, because, Mr. Speaker, if this Commission is going to bring in a favourable report and the Government of Canada is against it all the time, are they going to spend \$125 million of the taxpayers’ money just because three experts have given it their approval? That would be taxing the credulity of intelligent Canadians beyond the limits. I suggest that they are hoping for an unfavourable report and that they will then shelter themselves under that report.

I find, Mr. Speaker, that six months ago the “Star-Phoenix” took the same view. On June 2, 1951, in an editorial, the “Star-Phoenix” said this:

“The Federal Government’s decision to pigeonhole the South Saskatchewan dam project is only less amazing than Mr. Gardiner’s reasons for doing so. The project has been studied, surveyed, analyzed, discussed and debated for more than four years, and on June 24, 1950, Mr. Gardiner assured an audience at Outlook that ‘I can tell you tonight that we know that our engineers are satisfied that the dam is feasible’.

“Now Mr. Gardiner says more experts are to be called in to study, survey, analyze and debate, because he implied some of his colleagues in the Government are still doubtful.”

That is exactly what I have said, Mr. Speaker. “Has the Government lost confidence in its own engineers?” That is the question which I raised. “Or is there some other reason for stalling?” I described this conduct, Mr. Speaker, as being a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan. I had not thought about that phrase particularly before I delivered it and I guess I thought of it as I was speaking, but here is what the “Star-Phoenix” said:

“The argument it has used amounts to a direct slap in the face for the people of Saskatchewan.”

A much more forceful expression than my expression. And now they describe it as nonsense!

I suggest that this sort of thing — papers posing to be reputable purveyors of public information — degrading themselves to become stool pigeons of the Leader of the Opposition and his political overlords is a most disgusting spectacle. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan cannot be fooled by that kind of cheap political tripe. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, too, that if any attempt has been made to bring politics into this debate it is by the purveyors of such fish-mongering nonsense as this.

We have had the Leader of the Opposition (I am disappointed he is not in his seat) saying, a week ago Tuesday, that I had attacked the Federal Minister of Agriculture. He did not quote what I had said. I suspect that he had thought up his epithets before he got up — before I had made my speech. We had the spectacle of him today imputing dishonesty to the Federal Minister of Agriculture. That is what he did in this House. Mr. Speaker, the wiggling and squirming of the Leader of the Opposition is beyond words. I have difficulty in finding words to describe it. He told us, Mr. Speaker, that nobody could promise this dam, because the engineering work was not done until 1951. He told us that it was just ridiculous to charge that Mr. Gardiner had promised this project before the engineering work was completed. It would be dishonest to do so, he said.

April 1, 1952

Well, Mr. Speaker, from the files of the "Leader-Post" of 1949 what do we find? April 29, 1949 — "Gardiner predicts dam start in 1950." That is three years ago. I quote:

"Dominion Government will be in a position next year (that is 1950) to start construction of the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation and Hydro projects, Agriculture Minister Gardiner predicted at a public meeting here, Thursday, which followed his unanimous nomination as Liberal candidate for Melville constituency in the coming Federal election."

Mr. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — He won that election too!

Mr. Walker: — My hon. friend thinks that winning the election justified that kind of thing. My hon. friends have no other code of morality, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that that kind of immorality is catching up with them. It doesn't win elections like it used to.

Mr. Dundas: — We'll sure win this next one, I'll bet.

Mr. Walker: — And again we have a press despatch from the Regina "Leader-Post" written by Hugh Boyd, Ottawa, June 14, 1950:

"Start on dam seen in 1951."

Another year! And that sort of thing has been going on for the last ten years in western Canada. I haven't seen their prophesies for 1952 but I suggest that, since an election is probably due in 1953, we will get a repetition, in 1953.

But for my hon. friend to try to impute to the mover and seconder of this resolution a desire to make political capital is, in my opinion, the pinnacle of political dishonesty. There is the evidence as to who has made political capital out of this project. To my hon. friend from Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) who thinks it is making political capital to say "we regret the unwarranted delay", I suggest to him that he is still wet behind the ears.

Mr. Dundas: — Well, you are wet behind the ears too! Yea, you're smart . . .

Mr. Walker: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the unheard of thing, that when people of Saskatchewan demand a little bit of political honesty, the fulfillment of political promises, that it becomes political on the part of the people who are asking them to carry out those promises. A most preposterous proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dundas: — He doesn't take any notice of you.

Mr. Walker: — I had hoped that when this subject had been debated in this Legislature, that it would be possible for all the people of Saskatchewan to have their views expressed in this resolution. I think the view of the overwhelming majority of the people of Saskatchewan and

of each and every member of this Legislature is to concur, not only in the words of the resolution, but in the reasons and the arguments in support of that resolution as well.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.