

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Twelfth Legislature
14th Day

Tuesday, March 3, 1953

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

Before the Orders of the Day:

“FREEDOM OF SPEECH”

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I should like to read a letter dealing with freedom of speech and a certain incident which occurred in Moose Jaw, last night.

Mr. Speaker: — It is not in order to read letters before the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, then, I will speak without reading the letter. It is dealing with free speech, Mr. Speaker, and I understand there is a certain movement on in this province to try and abandon that free speech, and I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have fought for the four freedoms and that is one particular item, I think, Canadians in general prize — that is the freedom of speech...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am afraid it does not come under the Orders of the Day. that is a controversial matter, and I do not think it is in order.

Mr. Gibbs: — Which leads one to believe, Mr. Speaker, that one hasn't got freedom of speech here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must retract that.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, can I go on or not?

Mr. Speaker: — You must retract the statement that there is no freedom of speech in this House.

Mr. Gibbs: — Oh, I suppose I will have to retract that.

Mr. Tucker: — He has already said so much, Mr. Speaker, and obviously if his freedom of speech has been curtailed that is a matter of privilege, but as a member of the Legislature I am not sure what he was trying to get at.

Mr. Speaker: — Is it the wish of the Assembly that the hon. member be allowed to proceed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed!

March 3, 1953

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Swift Current may continue.

Mr. Gibbs: — Mr. Speaker, I think it would be most undemocratic if things like this should come to pass in the province of Saskatchewan. I understand that there have been various speakers going throughout the country to speak, and they have a right to be heard, because after all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, I was one who went out to fight for democracy and free speech and the four freedoms of the world, and I wish that to be maintained. I think that is one thing we cherish as Canadians, and if we are going to be muzzled, if speakers throughout our continent are going to be muzzled, no matter what they are to speak about, they have a right to be heard.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we, as a Government, if anything like this should come to pass...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! In the public interest I think you should simply state the case that you have, without commenting personally.

Mr. Gibbs: — This is my own version and I will say that I, for one, will do all in my power to see that free speech is maintained in the province of Saskatchewan as long as I live and I hope the rest of them do the same.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I do not think this should get into a general discussion on the Orders of the Day but I imagine, since the Leader of the Opposition has raised the question and wonders what the hon. member has in mind, he is probably referring to an unfortunate incident which took place, last night, in the city of Moose Jaw where, I understand, according to the press, certain irresponsible elements were responsible for disturbances at a public meeting.

As a matter of fact, I should like to say on behalf of the Government that it is my intention to make a public statement pointing out that in a democratic country, irrespective of how much we may differ from any speaker, no matter how much his opinions may be at variance with ours, it is part of our democratic tradition to give every person the right of free speech and the right to express his opinions. If those opinions are illegal, then of course there are proper means of dealing with them; but they cannot be dealt with by hooliganism or by public demonstrations and I want to say that in my public statement it is my intention to appeal to the general public – and I know that the great majority of the people will support me in it – that we should have complete freedom of speech, and that there should be no resort to disturbances at any meeting, irrespective of what our views may be with respect to what the speaker is saying.

I think that is the thing my hon. friend from Swift Current had in mind.

Mr. Speaker: — The grounds on which I called the hon. member to order were that if he had asked leave to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of public importance it would have been accepted before the Orders of the Day.

SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER PROJECT

Moved by Mr. Walker (Hanley), seconded by Mr. Brown (Bengough):

“That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to fulfil its commitment to build the South Saskatchewan River Project without further delay, and approves of the action of the Government of Saskatchewan in having renewed its offer to share in the cost of the project on the basis previously proposed to the Provincial Government by the Federal authority.”

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, in moving the motion appearing under my name on the Order paper, I do not intend to go over a lot of old ground. I do not intend to review a lot of ancient history pertaining to this proposed dam, but I do want to discuss some things which I think are relevant at this time.

Perhaps the most significant thing, Mr. Speaker, about this whole project at this time is the report of the Royal Commission on the South Saskatchewan River Project. Hon. members will recall that the Outlook dam at Coteau Creek was proposed first by the Federal Department of Agriculture some seven or eight years ago. Hon. members will recall that there was a report of the P.F.R.A., some four years ago, which was revised and brought up-to-date in 1951, and that that report was completely in accord that the project was feasible. That report was to the effect that there were no physical difficulties which could not be overcome by the application of ordinary engineering principles. That report was a favourable report.

Then, hon. members will recall that there was a period of nearly a year after the report was publicized, before the 1949 Federal election. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that a good deal was said about that report during the year just before that election, and finally, last year, there was the appointment of a Royal Commission for the purpose of determining whether the project was, in the words of the Order-in-Council, feasible on the following basis: “whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people, on the investment in the proposed South Saskatchewan River Project, would be commensurate with the cost thereof; and, secondly, whether the said project represents the most profitable and desirable use which can be made of the physical resources involved.”

We have had the report, based upon those terms of reference, and it is an adverse report. Now, that report is having an effect on public opinion across Canada, and it is to meet and counteract that effect that I think every forum of public opinion in western Canada should be mobilized to press now, harder than ever, for the completion of this project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The report was greeted with amazement on the part of the people who knew what was involved in this project. Those who knew what was envisaged here, in the heart of Saskatchewan, could hardly believe that three experts could come to such strange conclusions. The report was greeted by the Social Credit administration in Alberta, with jubilation. The Minister

March 3, 1953

of Agriculture there expressed gratification that the Royal Commission had recommended against the project. I suggest that in St. James Street, in the financial districts of eastern Canada, that report will be taken at face value to the detriment of the people of Saskatchewan. I suggest that, among people who do not know, that report will have an influence upon their thinking in regard to this great project.

And so this Resolution was presented here today, Mr. Speaker, to provide members of this House with an opportunity to analyse the Report of the Royal Commission and to present their arguments, really cogent arguments, in favour of proceeding with the project. It provides members of this House with an opportunity to express their unequivocal support for the project.

A year ago, before the Royal Commission undertook its work, I had the honour, Mr. Speaker, to move a resolution on this same subject. At that time, I urged that it was a mistaken principle of government, that it was a wrong concept of government, that this question should be referred to a board of experts. I said at that time that this was, in the highest sense, a political question; that this was a question which could only be resolved by the Government itself. Like all questions of great importance, it does not admit of a mathematical answer. I drew an analogy at that time from the building of the C.P.R. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if the government of that day had been asked whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people on the investment in the proposed Canadian Pacific Railway would be commensurate with the cost thereof, the answer would have been an emphatic negative. I do not think that in the light of conditions as they existed at that time, it was possible to demonstrate that this Canadian Pacific Railway was a sound economic undertaking. By the same reasoning, I do not suppose it was possible to demonstrate that the Hudson Bay Railway is a sound project. I do not suppose it is possible to demonstrate the courage and the vision and the faith which the people of Canada have in this country of ours, by sound logical mathematics. I believe that this is a question which transcends mathematical formula.

However, I drew the attention of the House to that question, and I disagreed with the wisdom of appointing a Royal Commission; and you will recall that the words of the resolution were, "That the government be urged to get along with the project forthwith." You will recall that it was pointed out that the Canadian Government did not refer the St. Lawrence Seaway to a Royal Commission; they took the responsibility themselves for that project. Neither did they refer the Canso Causeway to a royal Commission; they took the responsibility themselves for that decision. But they refused to take the responsibility for this decision, Mr. Speaker; they passed it off onto a group of engineers and scientists, who are not equipped practically or by training, to appraise a programme with vision. They are only able to base their opinions on the sound demonstrable logic of the past. And so I say, again, that the Federal Government betrayed a lack of faith in our western agricultural economy.

I say again that this project is essentially a political question. By political, I mean a question that must be solved at the political level – at the level of the Parliament and Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan; not by boards or experts. Having said that, last year, my hon. friend proceeded to make it a political question in an altogether different sense. He proceeded to make it a partisan political question. I think hon. members will recall that at that time he made reference, for instance, to

the Cass-Beggs Report. He made a great fuss in this Chamber about something which he purported to see in the Cass-Beggs Report but which he was never able to make anyone else see. I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that at Ottawa nobody is trying to pretend that the reason for the delay in this project has anything to do with the Cass-Beggs Report, or with any shortcomings on the part of the provincial Government, and yet a frenzied effort was made, last year, to inject a political note into the consideration of this question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has indicated already that he intends to complain and will complain about the wording of this motion. May I have the liberty of reading it to you again, Mr. Speaker:

“This Assembly urges the Government of Canada to fulfil its commitment to build the South Saskatchewan River Project, without further delay, and approves of the action of the Government of Saskatchewan in having renewed its offer to share in the cost of the project on the basis previously proposed to the Provincial Government by the Federal authority.”

I note that it has now become the strategy of the Federal Minister of Agriculture to pretend that no commitment has in fact been made. In the House of Commons on February 9, 1953, Mr. Gardiner said: “The matter has not yet been discussed with the Government of Canada”, — that is, the matter of the proposed dam on the South Saskatchewan has not yet been discussed with the Government of Canada — “therefore I am not in a position to say that it is going to be done, and I have not made any suggestion that it is going to be done either.” Well, Mr. Speaker, that comes very strangely, that comes as something of a saddening shock to the people who had reposed their confidence not once or twice, but many times in the Federal Minister of Agriculture, who have accepted his word that he was working for this project, who have accepted his assurance that it would be done. It comes as a shock to them to discover at this date that he has not broached the question with the Federal Cabinet, nor has he (so he says) given any assurance that the project would be dealt with. Surely, we in the west who were led to believe that things were going to be done about this project must have been living in a fools paradise. There is an explanation of why we expected this project to be proceeded with, and I am not going to labour the point, Mr. Speaker, except to quote one or two references. One here from the ‘Leader-Post’ in April 1949. The headline reads as follows:

“Melville: Gardiner Predicts 1950 Start on Dam.”

He said — this is a direct quotation:

“The present Dominion Liberal Government would not be spending \$2 million, this year, on detailed surveys if it had not made up its mind to proceed to spend the \$70 million or so the project will cost.”

We were also led to have some confidence by a news story in the Moose Jaw ‘Times’, April 26, 1946, by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, wherein he said:

March 3, 1953

“The Government did not need to be urged, nor did it need the endorsement of such organizations as the South Saskatchewan River Development Association or the Provincial Government or the municipalities. the project on the South Saskatchewan River was included in the Dominion Government’s programme.”

Imagine! Today, the Dominion Government has not even heard about it – even at this late date. But he said then:

“...it was included in the Dominion Government’s programme which had been announced several times. It was an actual programme and it included the Red Deer River project, Medicine Hat project and the South Saskatchewan River project.”

That is the Minister of Agriculture speaking. Surely, we are entitled to be surprised now when he says that he has never promised the project and it has never been broached to the Federal Cabinet. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that points up a very real reason why we in this House should say now to the Federal Government, “We expect you to fulfil your commitments.” And it does not let them out of their commitments for the Minister of Agriculture to say now that there were no commitments. He has been saying all his political career what they would do on this project. To say now that he has not made any commitments does not let him out. Those commitments were made, Mr. Speaker, and it behoves us in this House to insist that they be discharged.

Hon. Member: — The elections are one way. We’ll get somebody that will.

Mr. Walker: — Now, I know, that probably an attempt will be made once more by those who are trying to practise political immorality, the betrayal of political promises; no doubt an attempt will be made by them again to say that, just because we insist upon keeping faith politically, we are somehow bringing politics into this matter. I say that if it is bringing politics into this matter to ask the Federal Government to keep its promises, then it is time politics were brought into the matter. Surely...

Mr. Tucker: — On question of privilege. I observed the very careful manner in which the member for Hanley phrased that statement, that an attempt would be made. I suppose what he had in mind was that he did not actually charge us with the intention of making that attempt; but I would like to make it clear that if he was trying to make out that we were ready to condone political immorality and so on, I suggest that remark was quite un-parliamentary and should be withdrawn. If he said he had no intention of attributing it to the Opposition, then of course I realize he could make that statement and get away with it. But it was certainly phrased in such a way that afterwards it could be said that that was levelled at us. If it was, I ask him to withdraw it, because it is completely out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I do not think the hon. member made a direct charge. I never heard it.

Mr. Walker: — If I may now proceed, Mr. Speaker, I shall not be surprised if my hon. friend feels a little sensitive, today, and does interrupt me

occasionally. I am not adverse to sitting down for a moment while he makes his little speeches.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is now attempting to connect me with the implications just made, and I suggest that he make it plain that he was not making that implication against the Opposition. If he was, he should be forced to withdraw it. Otherwise we can all engage in this name-calling again, Mr. Speaker. Now, you must make a decision, whether a man can suggest that he expects an attempt will be made to justify political immorality and the breaking of promises. Did he mean to suggest the attempt would be made in this House, or was he meaning to suggest they would be made outside of the House? The member should make it clear what he was suggesting.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member, as I heard it, was making a general charge of political immorality.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Chairman, I suggest on a question of privilege, that if the Leader of the Opposition does not know what the question of privilege is then he cannot expect me to tell him now.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is quite well taken, and a general charge of political immorality that takes in the members of the Opposition, cannot be made in this House, Mr. Speaker. I am drawing to your attention that you are letting the member for Hanley leave a vague hint against us that he is not clearing up, whether he is including us in it or not.

Mr. Speaker: — I heard the hon. member's address and I did not see anything there that was out of order.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to be in any way unfair to my hon. friend. I would just ask that he do not attribute to us a motive to make partisan politics out of a mere insistence that the Liberal Party keep its promises. If they will keep their promises then I suggest that nobody can make politics at their expense. I suggest that the honest course for them to do is to keep their promises.

I recall that my hon. friend, since he brings this matter up, went up and down this country urging the people of Saskatchewan to send a dozen Liberals to Ottawa and if we did then they would be able to keep their promises a little easier. Well, we did send them, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Tucker: — I never made any such suggestion as the hon. member has just stated. He knows it is untrue, and he should not make statements like that, Mr. Speaker..

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member insists I will withdraw that he made such statements, but I will leave it to you whether or not such statements were made on behalf of the Liberal Party. "Send us a dozen Liberals to Ottawa", we were told, "and things will be done for western Canada." I have here in my hand the Hansard for February 10, 1953, when a vote came up in the House of Commons as to whether or not the Federal Government ought to immediately proceed with this project, and I find among the people who voted against the motion the following: Bater, one; Boucher, two; Dewar, three; Gardiner, four; Harrison, five; Helme, six; Hetland, seven; Larson, eight;

March 3, 1953

McCusker, nine; Smith, ten; Studer, eleven; Whiteside, twelve. What an ignominious fate for the people of Saskatchewan! They took my hon. friends at their word and there is the result: twelve of them, recorded in Hansard as being unwilling to vote for the immediate construction of the south Saskatchewan Project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this question ought to be settled on a partisan level at all. I deplore the attempts which I have referred to on the part of some people who have tried to take partisan advantage from this very desirable, very worthwhile project. As far as I am concerned, I do not think that we ought to concur in the kind of tactics which we have seen in the past, whereby people have tried to make politics are going to sit back and let them make politics out of it without protesting; we are going to protest.

Mr. Speaker, since the most cogent fact before us regarding this project is the report of the Royal Commission, I believe we should give some consideration to that report. I am glad to know that the Province of Saskatchewan will, in the course of the next week or so, be filing a reply to the report of the Royal Commission. I am sorry that the debate on this motion cannot be deferred until that reply is available, because I have no doubt that the Provincial Government will do an effective job of answering some of the most damaging assertions contained in the report of the Royal Commission. I have no doubt that, if the Provincial Government had been given an opportunity to study the submissions made by Alberta, to study the submissions made by other people who were against the project, the Provincial Government could have corrected a good many misrepresentations and misapprehensions before they were incorporated in the Report.

On examining this report, I find that it is a bulky document with appendices amounting altogether to about 420 pages or so. I find that there are glaring errors in the whole report in the computations of costs and the outline of the value of the project to the Saskatchewan community. I note that there are glaring inconsistencies between the costs estimated by the P.F.R.A. and by other people, and the costs as they are found by the Royal commission. The P.F.R.A. estimated that the entire cost of the project, in 1951, would be \$105 million. The Royal Commission says \$310 million. There is too much difference there to be passed off as minor errors. For example, the Royal Commissions says \$139 million. The P.F.R.A. says the cost of the irrigation project would be \$25 million; the Royal Commissions says \$45 million. The Power Corporation estimates the cost of the power project would be \$10 million; P.F.R.A.'s estimate was \$13,800,00; and the Royal Commission, \$24 million – 2½ times the Power Corporation's estimates. Then the Royal Commission report did not include the cost of pumping stations which they estimate to be \$30 million and which the Power Corporation estimates to be less than one-third of that amount. The Royal Commission also added an additional item of \$9,100,000 for land acquisition and then a further \$62 million for the operational deficit during the period of construction, amounting in all to \$310 million.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that when this Royal Commission discovered such a startling discrepancy in their figures of cost, they might have

obtained more information. It is no answer to say that P.F.R.A. have made mistakes and that their estimates are not to be relied upon. Surely, P.F.R.A., which did a fairly good job of estimating the cost of the St. Mary's River project back in 1940, surely their figures are not to be lightly disregarded – certainly not err to the extent of 300 per cent!

I note that some of the most improbable figures have been included in estimating the cost of the project by the Royal Commission. I note that the Mannix Consultant Engineers, a firm in Calgary, estimated a \$15 million profit to the contractor, and I see that that figure is carried forward into the report of the Royal Commission as contractor's general overhead and profit, \$15 million. That does not mean the money which they will have to cover their miscellaneous expenses of the contractor, because there is a further item, contractor's general expense, \$12,301,400. There is \$15 million for which no explanation is given whatever. It is just thrown in. I do not know if any horses are included in that \$15 million or not. The Mannix Consultant Engineers estimated that the interest on the money during the time the project was being built would be \$5¼ million. The Royal Commission, without any explanation for the discrepancy, have given the figure of \$6,125,000 – an extra million dollars thrown in.

I notice, too, that the Royal Commission, on page 26 of their report, estimates the cost of riprapping material at \$11 per cubic yard to be brought from the site of the Frank slide in Alberta, while the P.F.R.A. estimated sufficient stone could be found within 30 miles of the locality, at \$4.20 per cubic yard. There is an extra \$4,700,000 tacked onto the cost.

The difference in the cost of the Power development I have already referred to – a difference between \$10 million and \$24 million.

Then a reference is made in the report to the cost of the Garrison dam. The Garrison dam will cost approximately \$290 million and, by making that reference, they hope to make it look ridiculous that ours can be built for \$105 million or \$120 million — \$290 million for the Garrison dam. The Garrison dam is almost two and one-half times as large as the proposed dam on the South Saskatchewan river. When that fact is taken into account it makes the P.F.R.A. estimates look fairly realistic after all.

I notice too, Mr. Speaker, that the Royal Commission was apparently so anxious to throw in additional millions of dollars of cost, and in one place they added an item twice. On page 25 of the report, they break the cost down as follows:

Main works and reservoir	\$139,000,000
Power Plant	24,000,000
Irrigation System	45,000,000
Pumping Stations	30,000,000
Land Acquisition	9,100,000
	\$247,100,000

March 3, 1953

Then over on page 38 they say:

Original capital cost	\$247,000,000
Add the cost of land acquisition	9,100,000

and then a lot of other things here which brings it up to \$310 million. So they added that \$9 million twice, just 14 pages apart.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Royal Commission quite definitely and obviously was looking for as many excuses as possible to recommend against the construction of the dam. I suggest that the obvious determination of the Federal Government to appoint a Royal Commission in the first place, and this kind of performance that has been perpetrated upon us here, indicates either a conspiracy or a tacit agreement that everything possible will be thrown in the way of building this project.

The report I submit is also seriously defective in reference to the benefits that would be expected to accrue to Saskatchewan from the construction of the dam. The report makes no reference to the stabilizing effect which this area of certain crops would have upon the surrounding community. It makes no reference to the stabilizing effect which that would have upon our agricultural production. It makes no reference to the value which our secondary industries would derive from this stabilized source of agricultural wealth. The report makes no reference to the social value to the community of providing opportunities for hundreds of new farmers, for hundreds of farmers who are not now able to find a place to farm.

I note that, on page 33 of the report, an attempt is made to assess the value of the project in terms of dollars and cents. Well, of course, admittedly the Royal Commission is faced with a difficult problem in determining how much the land will be worth as irrigated land as opposed to dry land. It depends a good deal on the price level of agricultural products during the course of the next 100 years. So on page 33, they attempt to estimate the productivity of this land as irrigation land. They refer to the year 3, year 20 and year 35 of the project. I will not attempt to deal with anything except the complete project in this reference. But on the basis of agricultural prices as they were from 1921 to 1940, they said that the productivity would be increased by \$4 per acre as a result of irrigation. On the basis of the price level that existed from 1921 to 1948, the productivity would be increased by \$9.66 an acre as a result of irrigation. And on the basis of 1951 prices, the productivity would be increased by \$21.45 as a result of irrigation. Then they try to determine whether the project is feasible on the basis of these returns. But they say it is unrealistic to talk about the return of \$21.45 an acre because, they say, that is based on 1951 prices, and everybody knows that agriculture is so prosperous and thriving in 1951 that it is beyond the richest dreams of avarice that agriculture cannot possibly look forward to 20 or 30 more years like that. Well, perhaps the report indicates that they are pretty close to the inner workings of the mind of the Federal Government in some other respects – maybe they know what is in store for western agriculture too. But those who have been engaged in agriculture, the last few years, will say that while price levels have been moderate to good in 1951 costs of production have also been correspondingly high, with the result that, in terms of cost of production, 1951 is not a particularly luscious year for agriculture. I think, perhaps, that when you

consider how much more it costs to farm today than it did 15 years ago, most people will concede that our agricultural industry cannot long survive if it has to take substantially less than it took in 1951.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is most unrealistic for the Royal Commission to say that wheat was 30 cents a bushel all through the 'thirties, and that we should base our recommendations in this report on 30-cent wheat. While Mr. Gardiner was able to say, in 1939, that a farmer can produce wheat for 30 cents to 40 cents a bushel and make money, even he would concede that he would probably want to raise that figure to 80 cents or 90 cents at least to be in line with today's costs. And so I think that the Royal Commission should have admitted that the clock cannot be turned back to 30-cent wheat or 40-cent wheat. The debt burdens, the various fixed costs which now enter into the cost of producing on the farm, cannot be rolled back. It is just unrealistic to talk about farm production on the basis of prices that we got in the 1930's. I think the Royal Commission might have taken cognizance of the changing value of the dollar in deciding what might be an average price level to project into the future.

But the Commission says: On the basis of the projection of the 1951 prices after year 33, there would be an annual surplus of \$400,000 a year. that is loading the entire cost, the entire \$247,000,000, onto the farmer and onto the power development. After loading the whole cost onto the farmer and the power-users there would be a surplus at the completion of year 33 of some \$400,000, so that – even after taking those figures for 1951 – figures which are not overly optimistic – there would be a surplus. And that is not taking into account any other benefits that would accrue from the project: the stabilized tax basis which the municipalities would have; the stabilized source of feed and fodder which this province would have.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that we take into account that the last ten years are not always going to be with us. I would just remind hon. members that, not far to the south of us, there has been, even in this past year, a drought of devastating proportions. I recall 1929 well enough to remember that we heard rumours and stories of drought in the southern United States a full year before we had it here. And I would remind you – undoubtedly hon. members notices an item in the paper, just a week ago, to the effect that southern Brazil was afflicted this year with a drought of such magnitude and such severity that the people were famine stricken; that they were deserting the prairie areas of southern Brazil and migrating to Paraguay and further south to escape the ravages of drought. They were leaving everything behind so sudden and headlong was their flight. I suggest that we ought to remember those conditions well enough to recall how invaluable it would be not only to the province of Saskatchewan but to all the people of Canada, to have a stabilized source of agricultural production in this province that would continue through wet years and dry.

Just about the time this report was brought down in the House it struck me as being relevant to this discussion because the amount of money mentioned was almost the same – Mr. Howe in the House of Commons, on February 16 of this year, said:

March 3, 1953

“So far Canada had 16 CF 100 fighters and 96 engines to show for a total expenditure of \$140,000,000 in addition to \$60,000,000 in Government Capital expenditure.”

So there is a \$200 million expenditure to produce 16 fighter planes. \$200 million is considerably more, I venture to say, than it would cost to build this project on the South Saskatchewan River, and I leave it to the people of Saskatchewan which they believe ought to get priority.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, as a result of this resolution, as many members as possible will examine the report of the Royal Commission. I hope that, having done that, they will find other defects and discrepancies in that report, that they will find other places where the Commission has erred.

I hope that as a result of this resolution other members of this Assembly will acquaint themselves with the value of this great national project, and I hope that, as a result of this resolution, all members will with one voice bring to bear upon the authorities in Ottawa their insistent demand that this project be gone ahead with. I ask members of this House to disregard this report as being of no great significance in deciding on the wisdom of this particular project. I ask that we insist that this is a project which is necessary to stabilize and equalize opportunities on the prairies of western Canada, and I urge that, in the course of this debate, hon. members opposite will join in the spirit of this resolution urging that some vision be shown of a great productive future for Saskatchewan made possible by expanding our capital investment in agricultural capacity, I ask that everybody, that all hon. members, try to glimpse a vision of a paradise for agriculture that can be made out of these western plains. So, Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by Mr. Brown (Bengough), the motion standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I quite confess that this is a subject on which I have no knowledge in a technical way at all. I have studied the report and I have lived close to the Saskatchewan River and seen the survey crews working there since 1943 — it is almost 10 years now since they started. The location of this dam is down the middle of the west line of my constituency, about five miles west of Loreburn and two miles north and about 18 or 19 miles south of Outlook. that is the location of the dam.

I am interested in it perhaps as much as anyone in this House. No doubt the members from the opposite side of the river whose constituencies run north and south from the river are also very much interested.

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as the purpose or the aim of this resolution is concerned, I do not think there is very much difference of opinion between members on either side of this House. I think what we want to do and what we want to accomplish, if possible, is to persuade the ‘powers that be’, which is the Government at Ottawa, that we want this dam built. We have heard estimates of the cost and there have been many contradictions in these estimates; but I think it is only natural,

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the time we are passing through – in 1947, the estimate, which I think is the one commonly accepted as coming from the P.F.R.A. compared to the cost of the project today, with the additional costs of changing methods of construction which this Commission has clearly pointed out in its report – that there must be a difference in the estimated cost. So I want to say to you, as far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we are 100 per cent behind this project, and our Party, which has been the Party in power at Ottawa for the last many years – they are the ones, the only ones, that have ever done anything towards trying to prove that this is a practical proposition and the radical thing to do. As for the rest of the members from the three prairie provinces, I think it was understood (at least I understood, in my limited knowledge) that they were all 100 per cent in favour of this dam. The people of Saskatchewan, and of Canada as a whole, I think are rather stunned, today, that such is not the case. We find the Province of Manitoba, which is looking forward to developing hydroelectric power in the lower reaches of this river, is opposed to this thing. We also find that some of the members from the Province of Alberta are very strongly disfavoured to the proposed dam on the South Saskatchewan river.

Now these things probably come as a shock not only to us in the west, but to the members of the House of Commons, where I think probably 80 per cent of the members come from east of the Great Lakes. This Party that sits in power today have started the project in an investigatory way, and have built it up to the stage at which it is today. We have had support from the Conservative party. I remember the hon. member John McNicholl, Mr. Speaker, who has probably done more than any other member in the House of Commons, not excepting any of the western members, towards education and justification of this project so far as eastern Canada is concerned. I think we, as members of this House and as residents of the prairies of western Canada, should be very grateful for that.

Now then, there are many things we might speak of here, this afternoon, but I am going to say, first of all, that I was rather astounded by the reasoning and by the arguments of the member who has just spoken. He is tremendously interested in this project because a great deal of his constituency will be benefiting from this dam, there is no doubt about that; but he said this: “This item”, quoting a certain part of the report in regard to cost, Mr. Speaker, “was appearing twice.” I think if he reads the report a little more carefully he will find that it does not appear twice – but that is not what we are going to argue about. He said this:

“This item indicates a conspiracy, or a tacit agreement, to build up the cost of this dam.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, he should have gone a little further. If you are going to have a tacit agreement or conspiracy, there must be two parties to it. Who was the other party to that agreement for conspiracy? That can only be the Government at Ottawa, who appointed this Committee, and I was rather astounded that the member for Hanley would go that far. What would he think, now, if I stood in my place on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, and accused this Government, when they hired an engineer known as Cass-Beggs to come out here and investigate the relative costs of hydro-electric development from the dam as compared with the existing sources of power and

March 3, 1953

development of electricity in the province of Saskatchewan, of entering into a conspiracy, trying to get something whereby they were going to discredit this dam, because they had to put up \$33,800,00 of the cost of this project? What would you think about me? I am not saying that at all, but that was the inference against the Government at Ottawa by the member for Hanley, who just spoke a few minutes ago, and I think it is very highly improper, and it is too bad. But he made that statement after pleading with us for some time that this is not a political question, and it should not enter into party strife or anything of that kind, but should be discussed on its merits! I agree with him 100 per cent that it should be discussed on its merits.

The reference of this Commission, Mr. Speaker, is not very long, but it is very wide. It says this:

“Whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people on the investment in the proposed South Saskatchewan River Project would be commensurate with the cost thereof;

“Whether the said Project represents the most profitable and desirable use which can be made of the physical resources involved.”

It is a very wide reference, and, of course, it has been proven that, when we first get a report or a statement to the effect that some of the hopes and aspirations that we entertain are probably not just as easy as they appear on the surface, we are prone to rush into print and get on the platform and pound these fellows into the ground, that they have the nerve – and I should say the ‘duty’, Mr. Speaker – to express these opinions.

I have read this report and I cannot for the life of me see where there is any great criticism coming to this Commission, because after all, we know that in 1943, we started to investigate the possibility of a dam in the Saskatchewan river. In 1947, Mr. Speaker, this project was revived and brought to the attention of the Government as a feasible and practical proposition. And what did the Government do then? Well, Mr. Speaker, they didn’t just rush to conclusions; they said this: “We will appoint an advisory commission to the P.F.R.A. – an advisory consultant commission.” Then they appointed Major General H.B. Ferguson of Washington, D.C.; Dr. Arthur Casagrande of Boston, Mass., and L.F. Harze of Chicago, Ill. These are the men they appointed to act in that capacity, and if my friend from Hanley, or any member of this House, will read the Commission’s report, they will find that every change in the estimated cost was arrived at in consultation with these men. I am, of course, speaking of the Commission which handed in the report which we are now discussing. There is no need of me mentioning the names of this Commission to the members, but they were Dr. T.H. Hogg, Chairman, formerly chairman of the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario; Mr. G.A. Gaherty, Calgary and Dr. John A. Widtsoe, Salt Lake City. The secretary of the Commission was B.T. Richardson, Ottawa. These are all outstanding men in their field, and they brought in certain recommendations after due regard to all the circumstances presented to them.

I think perhaps the greatest fault of this report, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Commission has not properly evaluated the general benefit of this dam, in both a moral and social and economic sense, of what it is going to bring to this western country. To us, the benefits from this dam would spread throughout the length and breadth of this western Canada; it would increase the income of the people; it would prevent relief in dry periods and many things like that. It would accommodate a larger number of farmer settlers in Saskatchewan and perhaps in other parts of the country, and this would be a great asset to the sparsely settled population of this province. These are some of the things that I think they have neglected to properly evaluate in this report.

Now then, before I say any more about this, I again want to go back to the political aspect of this thing because it was stressed – after pleading with us that we shouldn't talk about it – again and again. Certain inferences were made by the member for Hanley. I have here 'The Western Producer', and I think they express the thought very well, Mr. Speaker, so I am going to read it to you. It is quite short. I quote:

“Western members and a number of easterners as well claim that many of the Commission's estimates...”(speaking of the Commission's report which we are discussing)”...are far from being realistic. Some go as far as to say that the estimates were deliberately loaded so as to provide an excuse for the Government to back down on the project...”

Exactly the sentiment that was expressed here, Mr. Speaker. Now this is not the sentiment of whoever wrote the editorial, but he points out that there are certain interests, or certain men, in this country that look on it in that way, and we heard it expressed from the floor of the House, this afternoon:

“...so as to provide an excuse for the Government to back down on the project. discussion was more or less forced in the House by an opposition motion 'regretting that the Government had failed to provide in its estimates for construction of the dam.'” The motion, if it had passed, would have been one of non-confidence in the Government, resulting in dissolution. Government supporters, of course, voted against it and members of other parties will, in the coming Federal election campaign, tell their constituents that Liberal members voted against the dam. This sets the political hocus-pocus resulting in debate in which there is to be found little reason for pride or satisfaction on the part of some of the parties debating.”

That is the most comprehensive and potent statement I have heard expressed by anybody, and it exemplifies to the 100th degree the hocus-pocus that was put forth from the floor of this House, this afternoon, by the member for Hanley.

March 3, 1953

Now then, what does it really mean – what does this dam really mean? Well, Mr. Speaker, this dam is a big undertaking. It is an undertaking that is going to cost many millions of dollars, and it is also going to take many years to complete. There is no doubt about that. We do not have to build one dam, Mr. Speaker, we have to build four dams to complete this project. We will have, first, the main dam; then we will have to have a dam across Coteau Creek; then you have the Third-Meridian dam that is going to stop the water from cutting out Moose Jaw, Regina and many of the other places that are along the Qu'Appelle Valley. That is also a dam, and a big dam, Mr. Speaker. Then you have the railway crossings; we have two railway crossings of the Qu'Appelle; we have the C.P.R. crossing the Qu'Appelle Valley east of the bend of the river, and then we have the C.N.R. railroad which crosses on the bridge just below the town of Elbow. Now that must be either diverted someplace else or it must be raised up; in any case it is a tremendous expense and big undertaking to do the job.

As a matter of fact, if you read the Commission's report you will find, later on in its reference to this project, that they recommend that the railroad and the bridge be abandoned, and that the railroad be re-routed across the Third-Meridian dam, which will be some distance down in the Qu'Appelle Valley I imagine, if they are going to get anywhere near the third meridian, Mr. Speaker. I know very well where that is because I practically live on it, and they must, of course, move that Third-Meridian dam at least 15 miles down into the Qu'Appelle Valley from the bend of the river.

These are the things that have to be done; and the C.P.R. railroad track, for a long distance, will have to be raised and raised considerably in order for them to cross it; so we have a very big undertaking that has to be done. The material required, according to what has been figured out by the P.F.R.A. engineers and also this Commission, is 57,500,000 cubic yards of material. That can be located very easily or very handily in the locality, of course. Then the dam would be 205 feet high and the lake itself would be 140 miles long.

Then we have another consideration entering into this thing which is in addition to the direct benefits from the dam, and that is the fact that an irrigation system can very easily be put into operation down the Qu'Appelle Valley for about 230 miles (or something like that) and that would be of great benefit to the farmers, both those who are there now and those who may come in to carry on agricultural pursuits, which probably, our farmers in that part of Saskatchewan at the present time are not so keen on undertaking. Those are additional benefits as well.

Now then, the estimated cost, as has been told us by the member for Hanley – and I am not going to burden the House by repeating it; but there is some reason why this estimated cost has been raised to practically double what it was before. I am just going to read you what the Commission say, for it is expressed in clearer language that I can command.

It says this:

“The preparation of an estimate of cost of the South Saskatchewan River Project was regarded as a fundamental step by the Commission in dealing with its terms of reference which required it to inquire whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people on an investment in the project would be commensurate with the cost...”

I want members of the House to note this:

“Several estimates of cost had been prepared. They had been based upon the engineering studies made by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Branch of the Department of Agriculture. These studies were supplied to the Commission in a single large volume, ‘the General Engineering Report.’ This report represents the expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of dollars of investigatory work carried out over a period of years, and is still subject to alteration and enlargement. The Commission did not review the basic engineering studies of the P.F.R.A. except to confer with the senior engineering consultants of the P.F.R.A., namely, Major General H.B. Ferguson, Washington, D.C., Dr. Arthur Casagrande, Boston, Mass., and L.F. Harza, Chicago, Ill., on certain aspects of the project wherein the engineering difficulties were obvious and which would influence the cost. This conference was held in Washington, D.C., in April, 1952, and as a result the Commission decided to obtain an estimate taking into account the views of the senior consultants...”

That is a very important remark, because, after all, these men had advised the P.F.R.A. since 1947:

“...and, as far as possible, the experience of firms engaged upon comparable construction projects.”

They suggested that, as far as possible in any information they did not have, they endeavoured to get it from some engineering firm or some contracting firm which had had actual experience in doing that kind of work:

“In preparing an estimate of cost, the Commission relied upon the General Engineering report on the project supplied by the P.F.R.A. The estimate was prepared for the Commission by Mannix Ltd., of Calgary, Alberta, which availed itself in turn of the experience and professional knowledge of a number of United States firms which have been engaged directly for a number of years on large engineering projects

March 3, 1953

comparable in scale, if not in precise detail, to the South Saskatchewan Project. Notable among these firms were Morrison-Knudsen Co. Inc., Boise, Idaho, a firm which is one of the prime contractors on the \$289,000,000 Garrison Dam project on the Missouri River...”

Then it goes on to point out the experience of these men and what they have been doing. Then it does on to mention some other things, Mr. Speaker, and I think this will be of interest to the members of this House as the member for Hanley has mentioned some of them, though he did not mention them all. I quote again:

“Several of the major changes which have been made by the P.F.R.A. and their consultants since the original estimates were made...”

Now that is another thing, Mr. Speaker, the P.F.R.A. have made several changes in their estimates from time to time:

“...it was decided, at the meeting of senior consultants on the project arranged by the Commission in Washington, D.C., in April, 1952, to recommend a steel lining of 1¼-inches thickness in the three conduits between the intake structure and the power-house, a length of 2,750 feet. This liner would require 33,000,000 pounds of steel plate, at an estimated direct cost installed of \$11,200,000.”

There is one of the increased costs that my friend from Hanley did not mention. In other words, it would be a much better structure. Experience is the greatest teacher on anything, and there is no doubt that these dams, built many years ago in the United States and other places, show, today, where there are weaknesses in their construction, and the new projects which are now going up will benefit by overcoming and eradicating and doing away with these weaknesses so the dams will produce better service for the purpose for which they are being constructed.

Then it says:

“It was also decided to use Kalicrete concrete...”

That is a concrete, Mr. Speaker, which is not susceptible to any of the minerals or acids which attack ordinary concrete – and that was not in the P.F.R.A. estimate:

“This would increase the direct cost by approximately \$1,273,000.

“The design of the left embankment trim was altered from a structure requiring 2,113,000 cubic yards of fill to 6,316,000 cubic yards of excavation.”

Now that costs money too, and the member from Hanley did not mention that. As a matter of fact, when speaking of increased costs he mentioned riprap. Well I am going to mention it too:

“Riprap: The other estimates proposed using field stones from various areas in Central Saskatchewan. Mannix Ltd., did not regard this as practical, nor did they feel that it could be done for \$3.50 per ton (\$4.20 per cu. yd.) Mannix Ltd. based their estimate on bringing rock from the Frank Slide in Alberta, at a direct cost of \$11 per cu. yard. They estimated the total amount of riprap required to be 702,000 cu. yds. Based on this quantity, the estimate would be \$4,774,000 higher than P.F.R.A.’s estimate.”

Now these are things that nobody says anything about. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit the Fort Peck dam. It is not very far from here and you can drive down there in five or six hours from the city of Regina, if the Highways Minister has the road in good shape. It is an enlightening thing, it is an education for anyone to see what has been done there. I say to you, when I saw what had to be done there, where the riprap had been hauled in from ‘way west of Havre, Montana, that these small ‘niggerheads’ (as we call them) on this land, and rocks that lie spread over the length and breadth of the prairies here, I do not think would be suitable as far as that dam in Montana is concerned; they would not be worth anything here. I do not think you would ever see them; they would sink into the mud and be washed into the mud by the waves from the dam on a lake 140 miles long, when the wind blows the right way. I saw the riprap, and they have rocks there that you could get only two in a boxcar. They are blocked up in squares; sometimes they are not exactly square and they are staggered all along the side of the dam. They are staggered so that the waves cannot come in contact with any earth to wash it out.

I think when this Commission, advised by the advisory commission which the Government appointed in 1947, says that this riprap from field stones and from rocks scattered from over the prairies here would not be as satisfactory, I believe they know what they are talking about. In spite of the fact that it is going to cost an additional million or two, I feel it would be money well spent.

These are just a few of the things that I want to mention. There are innumerable things in this report, Mr. Speaker, if you read it, that show conclusively that there has not been haphazard work done by this Commission. They are not biased; they have improved the dam – the building and the structure – by their recommendations, which would result in a far better dam than was ever intended in the first place. But it will cost more money. Not only that but it will cost more money if you follow the P.F.R.A. estimates, because their estimate was made in 1947 and I do not think there is anyone here that would even think about building a dam, today, on that basis.

March 3, 1953

Another thing, this report says clearly that the labour, if figured at current wages in Saskatchewan, based on a 40-hour week, is another increased cost. I do not know whether the P.F.R.A. based their estimate on that basis or not; there is certainly nothing in print that I have seen that can give us any information on that point.

But these are some of the things that are in this report. I could stand here and speak for another hour on this thing because I have done a little work on it; but I am not going to take up your time, Mr. Speaker, because it is not necessary. I can only say to you that so far as this dam is concerned, it will be built. You and I, Mr. Speaker, are getting on in years, but I still think we will live long enough to see that dam going up, and I am going to say another thing – when that dam is built, it will be built by a Liberal Government in Ottawa and nobody else. There is one thing absolutely sure and that is that it will never be built by a C.C.F. Government, and we do not need any ‘conspiracy’ either, as the member for Hanley suggested there is at the present time. I think perhaps – and I am not blaming the Government – but I am satisfied in my mind, from what information I have (I do not need to disclose it) and that is when the Cass-Beggs report was brought to the attention of the Privy Council of the Government at Ottawa – and I am commending this Government for the Cass-Beggs report. I do that for the reason that that is the only time that this Government has ever used any caution or been careful at all insofar as spending money is concerned. If they had got first-class reports, such as the Cass-Beggs report, about the cost of the operation of the tannery, box factory, brick plant, etc., they would have been millions of dollars ahead; they wouldn’t have thrown away a lot of that money which has been thrown away, and which they continue to throw away.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I am going to support this motion, but there is just one thing more I would like to say. It says in this resolution, “to fulfil its commitment”. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the record up-to-date really indicates that there is no commitment, because no commitment could be made by any Government to spend \$200 million without first having all its facts for perusal; they had to have all the engineering reports and everything pertaining to this project.

Here is another thing that I happened to think of, and I just want to mention it before I sit down, and that is the fact that, out of 454,950 acres approximately that can be irrigated from this dam, only two acres out of five can be irrigated by gravity. I never heard that from the P.F.R.A. report, but no doubt they had the figures. But that is how it is, and it costs money to pump water, Mr. Speaker. Out of the 454,950 acres, there are 179,800 acres that can be irrigated by gravity and all the rest, namely, 275,150 acres, will have to be pumped. That means that the pumping will be into the reservoir, if feasible, and then it will be used from the reservoirs to irrigate the land that is higher than the original dam. This water will have to be lifted from 15 to 120 feet on 275,150 acres. I do not know whether the P.F.R.A. had all these things figured out. This Commission has done it, and I think we should give them a vote of thanks for this information they have given us. They say here:

“One of the costly features of the South Saskatchewan River Project is the requirement

to pump water to three out of five acres in the planned irrigable area of 454,950 acres.”

Then they go to work and they point out that we would have to have a number of pumping stations, which, of course, my friend from Hanley mentioned, and then they list the cost, as follows:

Pump Lift		Cost per acre
15 feet		\$0.78
30 feet		1.57
60 feet		3.13
120 feet		6.27

Now the highest lift will have to be used in part of this acreage. There is no doubt about that – and you take the four prices listed above and average them and you will have a \$3.07 per acre pumping charge that will have to be paid by someone, to irrigate his land; whether it is the farmer or the Government, someone will have to pay it.

Then this report goes on to inform us that the \$3.07 per acre of area requiring pumping, or a cost of \$2.07 per acre throughout the entire area – if you take the \$3.07 on the 275,000 acres and spread it over the total 454,950 acres, you have a cost of \$2.07 over the entire area. That is set out in this report, and I think anyone who takes the time to read and study it will concur in it, because I have hardly ever seen anybody, particularly a government, ever start anything, whether it is building an airfield or a dam – I had a little dam built by the P.F.R.A. up in my constituency just about a mile from town, and it was quite a few years ago they did it. It was going to cost just so much money, but when they got through with it (and they worked hard), I know the cost was 35 or 36 per cent more than what they estimated it would be before they started. I do not think there is one expenditure that this Commission mentions but what there is a good reason for, and I believe there is more information and more facts in this report than we have ever had.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am going to support this resolution; we have supported it for years. The Government at Ottawa, which is a Liberal Government, has gone a long, long way towards laying the foundation for a practical scheme for irrigation in Saskatchewan. I do not think they are going to throw this ‘out the window’ by any means. As the Government of Canada, they will have to justify the expenditure of that money; there is no doubt about that. You cannot compare it with the St. Lawrence water project, for there is no comparison at all. There is not a thing about the St. Lawrence project, Mr. Speaker, that has not been investigated by the Governments of Canada and the United States in the last 15 or 20 years. Not a thing – and I know what I am talking about. There is not a thing that has not been checked over two or three times, and so far as projects in the other provinces are concerned, they have also been considered, so to speak, for many years. They do not start anything until they have all the information that is required.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

March 3, 1953

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, like the two previous speakers, I find that this long talked of, long proposed project does affect my constituency very materially, and for that reason alone I would like to speak on this motion and, of course, also because of the fact that it will have a very distinct bearing on the economic life of this province when the dam is completed. And again I cannot agree with the member for Arm River – I know that the Liberal Government at Ottawa will never build it! As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who were pretty sceptical about this scheme, for many years. first of all, I was rather sceptical of the fact that the Liberal Government at Ottawa had any intention of proceeding with it. Secondly, I was rather sceptical as to whether or not the thing was an engineering possibility. However, as the experimental work was carried on; as investigations were carried on – I suppose that the Federal Minister of Agriculture was sincere in the statements he was making that the P.F.R.A. engineers had definitely indicated that this was a feasible project.

Now I happen to know some of the P.F.R.A. engineers, and I happen to know that they are held in very high esteem among the engineering people of this province, and, so far as I am concerned, if I had the assurance of those men that they would put their names to a report stating that this thing was feasible, then I would be prepared to accept that statement, rather than the statement from the Royal Commission which was set up by the Federal Government about two years ago. I shall have more to say about the Royal Commission a little later on.

Now it is not my intention, this afternoon, to deal with the feasibility or otherwise of this project. As I said a moment ago, I, like thousands of others across this province, had accepted the statement of the Federal Minister of Agriculture, and that of the P.F.R.A. engineers that this thing was possible and feasible. And again, when I run back over what has taken place, my mind goes back to a day in Regina, in April 1946 when the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner was speaking to a Board of Trade luncheon in the Hotel Saskatchewan. I was present that day, and I still recall the words which he used that afternoon. The member for Hanley quoted them, but I am again going to repeat them as they were reported by the ‘Leader-Post’ and I know that they were correct. Now that was a dry, windy day and time has proven that the speech was windy as well. It was one of those days that brought back to our minds rather vividly the dry ‘thirties, when this province was faced with, and plagued by, drought and depression, and I want to assure you that Mr. Gardiner did not forget to remind us of those days in the very bombastic speech which he made that afternoon. I am going to quote what he said:

“The Federal Government did not need to wait for suggestions or pressure from provincial governments, municipalities, societies, or any other group, before proceeding with its water conservation plan. The Dominion Government had already mapped out a programme, and it was a programme involving \$110 million and this would be used largely, in providing storage of water, and partly...” (Now note this!)...”and partly for the distribution of this water when needed. The Dominion Government thus did not need the endorsement of

the South Saskatchewan River Development Association to begin work on the Saskatchewan River. It had already decided to go through with it.”

And then, speaking in the House of Commons in Ottawa, in May, 1946, Mr. Gardiner said: “We are prepared to dig ditches to make the water available, as soon as there is an organization at the other end of the ditch to use the water.” There was no question of the Provincial Government paying for the cost of taking the water from the dam to the farmers; none whatever at that time – they were paying the whole shot.

And then in June, 1948, just before the provincial election in this province, Mr. Gardiner reported to the “Leader-Post”, as follows: Government, through the P.F.R.A....” – and again note, ‘as planned by the Dominion Government’ – “...could never be carried out as a provincial project alone. The people in Saskatchewan could not raise the money required, because of the sparse population,” he said.

Government Member: — Somebody stole the plans of the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: —You will note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gardiner made it quite clear, first, that the Federal Government had decided to go through with the project; second, that the Federal Government would dig the ditches and take the water to the water users; and third, that the project was too big for the province to handle, because of its sparse population, thus making it a Federal responsibility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was the type of propaganda with which this province was deluged from 1905 to 1949 – and I say deluged, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put in evidence the file I have of some of the clippings, just some of the clippings that we have had during that period on the South Saskatchewan Dam, and mostly by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner. I must say that is the type of thing with which this province was deluged throughout those years. But once the Federal Election of 1949 was over, there was a change in their tune. They immediately started to hedge for time; immediately tried to throw some responsibility for the cost of this project onto the shoulders of the Province.

Speaking of time, I have a couple of clippings here. This first one – “GARDINER PREDICTS THE DAM TO START IN 1950” – that was at this nominating convention in Melville. Then in 1950, “The Start On the Dam Seen for 1951” – and so the story goes; kept putting it back year after year after year; and when that got a bit stale, of course, they dragged out the Cass-Beggs’ Report, but that fell flat. They found they were not able to fool the people with the Cass-Beggs’ Report, because the Cass-Beggs’ Report was a report on the feasibility of power for that project. Cass-Beggs, in his report, did not undertake to deal with the main reason this project was to be gone ahead with, that is, a project for irrigation. However, the people of Saskatchewan, by this time, were getting fed up and they were not accepting that. So the next thing was the setting up of the Royal Commission, and it is rather interesting to note the reasons that Mr. Gardiner gave, for the setting up of this Royal Commission. As hon. members will recall, he was taken to task about it in the Federal House of Commons, and this is what he

March 3, 1953

said – you will find it in page 3,603 of Hansard, May 31, 1951:

“What does the Government permit me to say to you tonight? They permit me to say this: They know that I am convinced; they know the people out west are convinced; they think likely that, when we are all through, they are going to be convinced also; but they won’t need to be sure that they are right when we make the decision to go full-blast ahead. They asked me to do one thing more for them. I said, ‘What is that one thing more?’ There are one, two or three experts that we would like to have take a look at this thing. You are not going to ask you to get any more engineering reports...” (He got a lot of those)...”because we think you have all the information. You will submit that information to one, two or three experts that we will agree upon, and let them tell us whether they are as much convinced as you are...”

Now I want you to note this, — ‘that you will submit that information to this Commission’ – and see whether he did or not.

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

That was Mr. Gardiner’s House of Commons statement on May 31, 1951. Well, now that the Commission has turned in an adverse report which has been fairly well dealt with today – what did Mr. Gardiner say then? According to an interview reported by the ‘Leader-Post’ on February 16, 1953, Mr. Gardiner said he did not know whether or not the P.F.R.A. information on the project had been used by the Royal Commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that Mr. Gardiner, as the Minister responsible for the P.F.R.A. and that report, should have seen to it that that information was placed before the Royal Commission, and he should also have seen to it that some of these experts appeared before that Commission and made a report to them. Someone said, across the way, that that information was placed before them. Well, even Mr. Gardiner said not.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you said you did not know.

Mr. Douglas: — Even Mr. Gardiner said it. Speaking in the House of Commons on February 9, Mr. Gardiner said:

“P.F.R.A. officials have never recommended that the South Saskatchewan Dam be proceeded with. He himself had never promised the dam would be built, and no decision had been made on the South Saskatchewan Project. It had not been discussed in Cabinet.”

Mr. Gardiner said, in the House of Commons that, as far as he knew, this information was available to the Commission, but he was not sure it had been used. Now he should have been sure. He should have been doubly sure that that information was placed before that Commission, but he was not sure it had been used. Now he should have been sure. He should have been doubly sure that that information was placed before that Commission. I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, what further evidence could we get to prove that, for the last ten years, the people of this province have been led down the rosy path of deception by the Liberal speakers and the Liberal press in this province.

Now Mr. Gardiner goes on, in the House of commons, to tell them that he is now of the opinion that we have reached the time when this matter should be discussed with the Government of Saskatchewan. I say that before Mr. Gardiner again comes to discuss this matter with this Government, he should first be sure of the recommendations of his own engineers – apparently he is not sure of that; and secondly, he should come clothed with some authority from his own Government.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: —Now I want to say a word or two about the personnel of this Commission. Last year when I spoke on this resolution, I criticized that Commission. I pointed out that one of them, naturally, was an irrigation expert – quote the proper thing to have. The other two men were both hard rock engineers; I referred to them in that category. I noticed that the Federal Minister of Agriculture, speaking later, criticized me because I had objected to them because they were power engineers. I want to make it quite plain, Mr. Speaker, that I did not refer to them as power engineers, last year; and I did it for a very good reason. I did it because one of the gentlemen is the president of the Calgary Power Corporation, a corporation that is directly interested in the use that has been made of the waters of the Saskatchewan River, and for that reason I did not make any mention of that fact. But I want to mention it now, because one of those men, as I said, is the president of a company not only interested in the use of the waters of the river, but interested because his company parallels lines of the Saskatchewan Power corporation. When I was in Macklin, last summer, I happened to be discussing, with some of the people in the town, power installations that were going on on the Alberta side of the border. Now here is what I found Mr. Speaker: I found that, on the Alberta side of the border, where the power is being installed by the Calgary Power, it was costing the farmers \$1,385 to install power; on the Saskatchewan side, the cost was \$552. Now here is something else I found: On the Alberta side, father and son, living in the same yard, were installing power, and it cost each one of those people \$1,385 to install their power. On the Saskatchewan side, where we had father and son living in the same yard, both installing power, they both had the power installed for \$552. So it is very evident, Mr. Speaker, why this company would be interested in seeing that this project was not gone forward with, because we are hoping that, if it is gone forward with, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will be able to take some advantage of the abundance of power which would be produced on this project.

Mr. J.E. McCormack: — Do you suggest that this chap deliberately used his influence in the preparation of that report?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — No, I did not make any suggestions. I simply stated that it was unwise to appoint a man who might be interested,

March 3, 1953

and if I had been in that man's shoes, I would have refused to serve in that capacity.

Mr. McCormack: — That is not the question I asked.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I have answered your question. I said, very definitely, that I did not make any insinuations as far as that man is concerned. I simply endeavoured to point out a straight fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this too much, but I do want to commend the member for Arm River for the very fine defence he made of this c. I was rather surprised, however, that he would make that defence of the Commission as against the men who have served on the P.F.R.A. for so many years. As I stated, a moment ago, some of the top engineers of that organization are very competent men. I think we all, in Saskatchewan, should have a great deal of respect for these men, and a great deal of confidence in their judgment. I certainly was rather disappointed when I found that he was prepared to lace above the recommendations of these men, an Alberta firm which made an estimate on this project and make it in a very abort period of time. I know a little bit about preparing estimates and I would hesitate, Mr. Speaker, to accept as reliable an estimate on a project as great as this, prepared in such short order as was done by the firm which did this work for the Royal Commission.

It was stated, of course, and the member for Arm River tried to prove, that this increased cost suggested by this Commission was reasonable, and while he did not say so, he intimated that the P.F.R.A. had not made estimates...

Mr. Danielson: — I do not want to be misquoted by the member. I just want to say that I did not say that. I said that the increased cost of every item I mentioned was largely – and that was stated in the report – that the cost of the material and the volume of material would produce better structure for the dam and all these things. I did not say anything that would justify that suggestion. I quoted from the report.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Now I am sure that I so not want to misquote the hon. gentleman. That is the last thing I would want to do; but I do state, and I think he will have to admit, that he made out a good case for the men who submitted the report for the Royal Commission. Now I just want to knock those arguments into a cocked hat; that is all I want to do, Mr. Speaker.

I have in my hand the first report submitted by the P.F.R.A. on this development – I say the 'first' because it is the first that I had my hands on, 1947. I want to point out that in this report they gave the estimated cost at \$66,360,000, but, as the years went on, they realized that the cost of materials had increased, the cost of equipment had increased, wages had increased; and on the basis of that they raised their estimate until – I have not the exact figures here, but I know it was over \$100 million. So, they did take into consideration all these things.

The member for Arm River mentioned, of course, that there were four dams; there is the railway bridge and other projects which would be ruined because of this project. I want to point out that in their estimate

of the cost, they included all of those things. They are all included in these estimates, and I would say they did a very complete job in determining the estimates, and it took them several years to complete this. Now that raises a doubt in my mind, when you can take an engineering firm, who have had no great experience in this project, and was able to go over it in a short time and make an estimate of the cost. The fact that it was pretty sketchy was proven by the member for Hanley when he said that they had included one item on two occasions in those estimates. I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the estimates given by the firm were entirely too high.

Well so much for that. I just want to say a word or two about the benefits that might be derived from a project of this kind. I have mentioned the benefits which we might expect from power. I also want to point out that one of the great stumbling blocks which agriculture must face in this province, from time to time, is the matter of drought. In my lifetime in this province, over the last forty years, I have seen periods of drought and I have seen periods such as we have come through lately, of regular cycles, but we have them in cycles – dry periods followed by wet periods, and so forth. We also know that those periods are going to continue. they have continued through the last forty years I have been here, and I remember a number of years ago, at Outlook, in the little park, they were fixing up this and they cut down some of those elms. I have forgotten the age of those trees, but I remember the children were small, and I was pointing out to them how we could determine the age of the trees by the rings in the trunks. It is quite evident; if you looked over those rings, you could determine the periods of drought and the periods when we had ample rainfall over several hundreds of years, and that has been going on throughout all that time and will continue to go on. So I say that from an economic standpoint in this province, it is most desirable that this project should be proceeded with. And any project which will be helpful to agriculture in this province, is going to be helpful to the whole Dominion of Canada.

I am not prepared to say whether the St. Lawrence Seaway is a feasible project, or whether the Canso Causeway is a feasible project; I do not know. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Arm River say that he knew. I do not know how he does, but I am glad to know that he has this information. I certainly do not think that any one else in this Assembly has.

I want to point out that, if we are to solve the agricultural problems in certain areas of this province, we have got to solve the problem of ample supplies of moisture, and the only way that we can hope to do it is by the impounding of the waters of the South Saskatchewan River, which is the only large body we have in the drought area of the province; and I say that it should be proceeded with at as early a date as possible.

I am glad that we were able in this province to assure the Federal Government that we were prepared to proceed with what we considered (not what we considered, but with what Mr. Gardiner told us he considered) would be a fair share of the cost. We have done our share, and I say it is up to the Federal Government now to proceed with this project. I feel that

March 3, 1953

every bit of influence we can place upon them should be placed upon the Federal people to proceed with this project – not ten years hence, or twenty years hence, but now, because in spite of what the Royal Commission have told us, I still continue to place more faith in what the engineers of P.F.R.A. have told us, and unless we have, as I said a moment ago, been completely deceived by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, then that information is there not only for us but for the Federal Government to proceed with at the very earliest moment.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up too much of the time of the House, this afternoon, in discussing this matter, but I do feel that I should say a word or two respecting the South Saskatchewan River Development Project, because I, on the first hand, represent a constituency which would not be directly concerned or directly involved in the development project, but I do feel that I represent people who would be very much concerned with the development, insofar as an improved economic and social condition in the province of Saskatchewan would be the result of the development of this project, and would affect those people as much as it would affect the people in those areas which would be directly concerned with it.

Secondly, I feel that I should make a remark or two respecting it because I have always felt that development of a project such as this, or rather the failure to develop a project such as this is an indication of the respect, or lack of respect, that agriculture presently holds among those people who control our Canadian economy, and as such control our Saskatchewan economy.

I think there are two important points raised in the resolution moved by the member for Hanley; important points that should be restated. First of all, in respect to the commitment. The member for Hanley has suggested that there implied commitments; that there were stated commitments on behalf of and by the Liberal Party, and by people closely associated with the Liberal Party, that the Liberal Party as the Government of Canada would complete the building of this project. Now the member for Arm River has suggested that there were no commitments made either by the Government, or commitments which could be construed as having to be necessarily fulfilled by that Government. Well, I suggest that if the member for Arm River is going to adopt the attitude that commitments made, stated and paid for by the Liberal Party in paid advertisements, do not commit that Party when elected to Government, he must have a pretty low opinion of the Liberal Party. But I suggest that there is more than an implied commitment to proceed with this project; there is a moral commitment by the people who accept the responsibility of guiding the affairs of this country.

I doubt very much if I can better express that moral commitment, which must be accepted by people who accept the responsibility of giving guidance to our economy, than the statement which appeared in the press by Dr. Spence who is, at present, a member of the International Joint Water Commission, and who was a former director of the P.F.R.A. in the province of Saskatchewan. I do not intend to quote all of his statement which appeared following the tabling of the report, but just the last paragraph of it, which I do think indicates the moral commitment that the Grit Government in Canada must fulfil. He concludes his statement by saying:

“We must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false security by a succession of good crops. Drought will strike again – it always has. Time is running out.”

And based upon that philosophy that ‘time is running out’ it is essential that some effort be made by the Federal Government, which is in a position to make the effort, immediately, to prevent a recurrence of what we went through in the ‘thirties.

I think the Federal Government has a moral responsibility to see that the people here in Saskatchewan do not once again go through the economic mire that they went through during the ‘thirties. They have a further moral responsibility and as such a moral commitment, to fulfil our responsibilities to the hungry people of the world by making it possible for Canada to increase its food production, which can be done through the medium of irrigating land in Saskatchewan.

The second point raised in the resolution is our approval of the renewal of the offer of the Provincial Government to pay the share of the cost suggested by the Federal Government =. I think that when we endorsed that we are indicating that we clearly see the difference in the attitude of the Provincial Government and the attitude which has been adopted by the Federal Government. This Provincial Government has, at all times, indicated its willingness and preparedness to meet any contingency which may arise, to assure that this project will go through to its ultimate completion. The Federal Government apparently has, by its action, undertaken to use every possible excuse to see that this project, in the first instance, is delayed, and possibly in the second instance, not completed at all.

The hon. member for Arm River suggested that if this project was to be built, it would be built by a Liberal Government. Well, I suggest that I have more confidence in the people of Canada than that they will wait another 100 or 150 years before they see the project, before they are prepared to elect a government to Ottawa which will fulfil its responsibility to all the people of Canada.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are many inconsistencies within the report itself. The hon. member for Arm River has suggested that he agrees with much that is in the findings of the Commission, as outlined in its report. Well, I feel that the report itself is inconsistent with statements made by those people on the Commission when they were having public hearings in this province of Saskatchewan, and I think that I should make reference to some of the statements made by Dr. Widtsoe at the public hearing held at Outlook, on September 9 of this year. I do not intend to quote all of his statements, and I may be accused of taking statements out of context; but I do not do that, Mr. Speaker. Rather I take several of the pointed statements which indicate the tenor of the remarks that he was making at that particular time.

In referring to the soil which we have here in Saskatchewan; because the report does indicate that possibly irrigation in itself is not as well adaptable to this area Saskatchewan it may be to some other areas, referring to it, in one instance, as a ‘fringe area.’ But in referring to the soil in that area, Dr. Widtsoe said, “the best soil on earth; the best soil under

March 3, 1953

heaven can do nothing unless it gets the aid of water and sunshine, and some of the other things necessary,” and he further stated: “You have a wonderful fertile soil in Saskatchewan, particularly in this area.” He goes on to state that ‘the dream of making Saskatchewan a great grain-producing state, growing grain by dry farming is not a sound dress. It is not a sound dream scientifically; it is not a sound dream economically. A great commonwealth cannot be built on dry farming; you might also write that down in your books, — it cannot be done. For Saskatchewan to grow to its destined proportions, — I use the word ‘destined’ deliberately — it must use the water that flows through it to fertilize the soil, and that can be done. You have more water in one stream in Saskatchewan than we have in all the streams in my State of Utah, if brought together in one stream; yet we have been able to build a State and a great State, out of that water,” — suggesting that possibly a similar situation could occur in the area of the South Saskatchewan River Project, if it were completed. Then he goes on to state: “It is not a question entirely of whether irrigation is good or not; that is a settled fact.” — further that “some day it will be built, either here or somewhere else; it is a foregone conclusion. Any man with ability and intelligence will know, and may tell us so if he chooses, that irrigation is bound to come to Saskatchewan. That is a foregone conclusion; that is not a question.” And further, “the best that we can do is to make use of the water we have and irrigate a certain portion of the land, and build up a system of agriculture for our province which is partly dry-farming and partly irrigation. We have done that in the western United States. It can be done; we know how to do it.” And further — “The whole point depends on you. It does not depend on these men. It does not depend upon the people in Ottawa. It depends upon the people who live here. Unless you give the right kind of help, unless you lead out in the right way as you have done today, and even more so, it will never be built. But if enough people come here who understand, and who have the courage and the faith, it will be done.”

He was speaking to an audience, I am informed, of somewhere between 800 and 1,000 who turned out in the small town of Outlook to present their views before that Commission. Those people did turn out and they showed courage and they showed faith.

I possibly should make one more short quotation from Dr. Widtsoe’s remarks at that gathering:

“You cannot build a great state on copper, on oil, on waterpower. The only way to build a state is to start with the soil, and no province and no state will ever be quite successful unless it stands firmly upon the soil.”

There is no question, in the inference that can be taken from those remarks, but that Dr. Widtsoe did recognize that irrigation was essential to building up a sound agricultural economy here in this province.

And what does the Commission indicate in one of their findings respecting irrigation? Dr. Widtsoe had no reservations as to the value of irrigation in building people a sound agricultural economy, and yet, in one of their considerations which led to their recommendation, the Commission states,

that "in Alberta the increased productivity arising from irrigation seems to have been consistently exaggerated." They are in their considerations, in arriving at their recommendations, suggesting that irrigation had, in the province of Alberta, been exaggerated. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if the value of irrigation in the province of Alberta has ever been exaggerated. I suggest that, rather, the Commission did attempt to minimize the increased productivity than can result from irrigation.

My hon. friend from Arm River suggested in his remarks that the estimates in the Commission's report were based on facts and the result of the study of competent people who should be in a position to know the facts. In relation to the figures submitted relative to the construction cost, I suggest that the member for Hanley has indicated very clearly that they are subject to a great deal of doubt. Also, in the Commission arriving at whether it was an economic project, they took into consideration, or attempted to take into consideration, the returns that would accrue from this project; and they took, for instance, (as an illustration of how they were high on one side and low on the other), as to the economic values that would accrue from this project, they say that after the dam had been built for 35 years, the gross returns per irrigable acre, based on 1951 prices, would be \$21.45 per acre. And yet, the actual figures in Alberta on irrigated land for 1940, taking 1940 prices, which are, in terms of dollars and cents, lower than 1951 prices, varied from \$27 up to \$116; but they suggest that in the irrigable areas of this proposed project, the gross return per acre would only be \$21.45. So, I suggest that there are great grounds for doubt there, not only on the cost of the project but also on the economic returns which would accrue from such a project.

It also seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission's conclusion that better use of the physical resources might be considered and might be undertaken, must have been based upon the submission of Alberta to the Commission. As was pointed out in the reply which the Saskatchewan Government attempted to give to this brief submitted by the Alberta Government to the Commission, they indicated in there that they had little time in which to study it and little time in which to give a proper analysis to it, in the short time at their disposal. But I think, Mr. Speaker, we must be realistic in this matter. I think that in an analysis of the brief submitted by the Alberta Government, relating it to the situation as it exists in Alberta and as it exists in Canada, we arrived at one or two general conclusions. The first conclusion that we must arrive at is that water usage is not the issue, that decision as to the respective usage of the water has been arrived at, and that is not the issue involved; secondly, one of the things we can conclude from reading these briefs and these submissions is that Alberta, apparently, in its wisdom or otherwise, is attempting to woo away from Saskatchewan Federal money and Federal dollars which should more properly be spent in the province of Saskatchewan. I do not think that in their brief, which the Commission must have placed some weight upon, that they have proved that it is not in the national interest to immediately proceed with the South Saskatchewan River Dam.

I do not want anyone to take the inference from my remarks that I am suggesting that greater expenditures of Federal money should not occur in the province of Alberta; Alberta is, to some extent, in the same situation as we here in Saskatchewan are. Our future depends upon the soil, and the productivity of the soil in Saskatchewan, and it does, to a lesser

March 3, 1953

degree, in the province of Alberta. Any investment that can be made in Alberta to bring up the productivity of that soil and increase the production of Alberta, is all to the good; but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it must not be done to the detriment, and through the lack of bringing economic security to the agricultural industry within the boundaries of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggested that I did not want to take too much time here this afternoon, but in concluding, I would like to suggest that when we endorse this resolution – as it has been intimated that the Opposition are going to support it, or at least one member of the opposition is going to support it – that we are intimating to the Federal Government that we are no longer expecting them to be continuously finding excuses as to why they will not start and complete this project; and we are, through this resolution, asking the Federal Government to accept their responsibility, as it has been indicated that this Government are accepting their responsibility towards this particular project.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House very long in regard to this matter. I only enter the debate for two or three reasons. One of them was that after the very admirable presentation of the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), I could see the idea shaping up that some of the members in support of the Government were going to attempt to make the point that we endorsed the finding of the Royal Commission.

Now there was no such intention on the part of the hon. member for Arm River, as he pointed out when the point was attempted to be made. He dealt with certain specific items in the report as to items of increased cost which are due to a change in what was deemed probably necessary to establish a dam there that would stand up through the coming decades. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Arm River did not intend, in any way whatever, to indicate that he was in agreement with the findings in the Royal Commission's report. He did not deal fully with the other aspect of the matter, and that is the part of the report which dealt with the benefits to be expected from the building of the dam.

The main fault I found with the Royal Commission's report was that they based their estimate of cost entirely upon present-day levels of costs and even anticipated a rise in costs, and then when they were estimating the benefits they tried, it seemed to me, to estimate costs on the basis of prices ranging somewhere between what they were in 1921 and 1948. I may have misunderstood the Royal Commission's report in that regard, but that was my understanding of it, and it seemed hard to understand, because obviously, if your costs are going to be on the basis of present-day costs, then you can depend upon it that receipts in regard to farm products and prices of farm products are going to be also at the present-day level. In other words, if the value of the dollar today is away below what it was in 1921 that will effect not only the cost of what you are trying to do, but it will also affect the price of what you sell – the products of the dam project. It seemed to be that that was the great defect in their attempt to weigh the value of this dam.

On page 33 of the report, they deal with the different proposed bases upon which they would estimate the value of the project, and say if 1951

prices may be taken as the norm, estimated returns would be sufficient to repay current costs and provide net income to contribute to capital costs and to the farmers' profits. Then on page 34 they say:

“On the basis of the projection of the 1951 prices, the deficit would be approximately \$2,900,000 in Year 20” – (that is 20 years after the project is completed) – “zero in Year 33.”

In other words, the actual deficit would be down to zero 33 years after the project was completed.

“After Year 33 an annual surplus of \$400,000 would emerge. Again ignoring compound interest, the accumulated deficit in Year 33 would be \$109,000,000.”

In other words, at the end of Year 33 you would have an accumulated deficit leaving aside compound interest, of only \$109 million, which is a great deal different from the picture that was given by this Royal Commission basing itself, as it appeared to me, on prices prevailing between 1921 and 1948. I think that was a fundamental mistake in regard to assessing the value of this project and that was the place where I found the greatest fault with it. I cannot understand how that could have happened and, as I say, I may have been misunderstanding the report; but that is the way it looks to me – that they did not weigh the advantages against the disadvantages on the same basis.

As far as the Liberal Party in the province of Saskatchewan is concerned it has stated its position over and over again that it is favourable to this project. We have stated that the report of the Royal Commission has not changed our position at all. Now, I can see what is shaping up in regard to the coming Federal campaign by the suggestion that Federal members voted against this project when it came before them in the House of Commons. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that that sort of thing may get votes, but it is not honest. The vote was on an amendment to the motion to go into Supply and when that is turned down it is the most complete lack of confidence that can be shown in the Government. If the motion to go into Supply is defeated, the Government must resign. If the whole programme is so defeated it must do this or go to the country at once. Now then time and time again – members here know this to be true – there may be items which a government has seen fit to do or not to do with which they are not in agreement, but they are in agreement with the overall policy. If a motion is made that is going to defeat the government they are going to say, “Well, am I going to throw in jeopardy the whole policy for the sake of one particular item, especially when I think that, in the long run, the party that I belong to is most likely to bring about the creation or the doing of that particular thing in which I believe?”

Now, that is what happened in Ottawa. These members all expressed themselves as favourable to the dam, but they said if we vote ‘yes’ in favour of the amendment to the motion to go into Supply it defeats the Government. It is a motion of lack of confidence, and so our vote is not one of voting against the dam; it is one that we have confidence in the Government that we are supporting. That is known, of course, by the members opposite and it is coming to be known I think by the people in the country. The ‘Western Producer’, as the hon. member for Arm River pointed out, said

March 3, 1953

that this suggestion was just political hocus-pocus, which indicates that this sort of thing that the C.C.F. have engaged in over the years is coming to be understood as quite insincere. As the hon. member for Arm River said, the editorial in the 'Western Producer' appeared on February 26, just a few days ago, and it apparently anticipates the very sort of a campaign that I have mentioned, because it said:

"Here the motion, if it had passed, would have been one of non-confidence in the, resulting in dissolution. Government supporters, of course, voted against it and members of other parties will be able in the coming Federal election campaign to tell their constituents that Liberal members voted against the dam. This bit of population hocus-pocus resulted in the debate in which there is to be found little reason for pride or satisfaction on the part of some of the participants."

Now, there is the opinion of the editor of the 'Western Producer' about this continual attempt that has been made over the years by the C.C.F. Party by introducing motions like this which constitute a want of confidence, then going out and saying that people who voted on them did not vote on the question of confidence but they voted on the particular item.

Premier Douglas: — Could I ask my hon. friend how twelve members from Saskatchewan could upset a Government which has a majority of over a hundred?

Mr. Tucker: —Yes, well I have been told, Mr. Speaker, that if one group is going to vote entirely on sectional grounds over and over again, then others will do the same. In other words, Saskatchewan has no particular right to say 'we are not going to support the government unless we get exactly what we want', unless they give the right to others to do the same. If there was a free vote in the House of Commons on this question where the government was not ready to back the idea, I have very grave doubts whether it would have carried at all or not, because, after all, Alberta has indicated they are not favourable; Manitoba has thrown great doubt on whether they are favourable. Why should British Columbia or the rest of the country vote in favour of it, if it was a free vote? And the only way we can ever hope to get this project is to convince the people in the rest of the country that it is the right thing to do for the sake of the country as a whole. If Saskatchewan is only going to vote for the things that are favourable to itself and is never going to support the Government on the general programme, then what chance have we got of having the Government supporting something that is desired by Saskatchewan and expect other members perhaps to lose votes in their own part of the country to put through something we want when every time anything comes up that is not exactly what we want we are going to vote against it.

Well, you will find out. I do not suppose it will ever happen that the C.C.F. will be in power in the Dominion, but they would find out, if they ever were to get into power, if they were going to carry on a government at all, that they would have to support the general policy of the government. If every time any part voted against something they did not agree with themselves, then of course government in Canada would become impossible, because, of course, we are a country with such varied interests.

It is very easy for the C.C.F. in this province to say 'we are in favour of it' – yes, we all are, all parties in this province – and then to say that because of this happening the Liberals were against it. I am glad the 'Western Producer' called this sort of tactics "political hocus-pocus" that reflects very little credit on the people who have tried to do that sort of thing.

Something was said about myself; I was honoured by the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). I was supposed to have made some sort of a feverish attempt to do something last year. Well, all I sought to do last year, was to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was unfortunate that it had been decided that a Royal Commission should be appointed to look into this matter, because the way the matter then stood with the reports of the P.F.R.A., I was very happy to have the matter decided by the Government on the strength of those reports. I think I said, Mr. Speaker, that the appointing of a Royal Commission might possibly be a very bad thing and that whoever was responsibility for that happening might find that he had done a very bad thing for our province in causing that Commission to be appointed. I was pointing out at that time my honest opinion in regard to the matter, because I realized that, if this matter was put before a Royal Commission, there was no certainty that the finding would be one way or another, and I regretted that the whole thing might be put in jeopardy.

I pointed out at that time, Mr. Speaker, what was absolutely the truth and cannot be denied, that when the report of Professor Cass-Beggs was sent to Ottawa it was summarized and made available to the Cabinet, and it was at variance with regard to the field it covered with the report of the P.F.R.A. In other words it indicated the P.F.R.A., in dealing with the value of this project from the standpoint of the development of electrical energy, had been too optimistic.

When this report came in from Professor Cass-Beggs, a man of considerable standing in the engineering world, indicating that in this particular field P.F.R.A. had been unduly optimistic, then the question arose that perhaps the whole project should be looked at again because perhaps in other fields the P.F.R.A. officials had also been too optimistic. I say here that when I said that, at the time it was the Cass-Beggs report that raised questions about whether the P.F.R.A. reports on the whole scheme should be looked at or not, it was the cause of that questioning and, therefore, the ultimate cause of the setting up of the Royal Commission, or one of the causes, I was stating nothing more nor less than the truth, Mr. Speaker.

The unfortunate part of the thing is that this Government later decided that Professor Cass-Beggs had been too pessimistic in his study of the situation. They got the Power Commission to re-examine the question, and Mr. Tomlinson and those associated with him went before the Royal Commission and indicated in what respects Professor Cass-Beggs had been too pessimistic about the matter. But the trouble was the damage had been done: the doubt had been thrown on the P.F.R.A. report and the decision had been made by the Government of Canada as a whole to have a Commission take another look at the situation. All I was pointing out last year, Mr. Speaker, was that the report of Cass-Beggs, which was procured by this Government and submitted by this Government, was the reason, as far as I could find out, why we had this Royal Commission appointed. The Government here felt, I

March 3, 1953

suppose, that they got a good man to make that report, and having got the report they had to turn it in. All I stated, last year, was the exact truth, Mr. Speaker, and to try to make out that I made some frenzied attempt to somehow do something that was improper, I do not yet see why that should have been stated in this debate which was supposed to be on a non-partisan level.

In regard to the position that was taken by ourselves from time to time during the last ten years, I am going to be quite frank with the House about this matter. I have spent practically all my adult life in Saskatchewan. I saw what people had to go through in the 'thirties. I used to see the Saskatchewan River with all that water going down towards the Sea through parched lands, no use made of it, and I used to think what a wonderful thing it would be if we could get some of the water onto our wonderful land in Saskatchewan instead of it going to the sea unused. I naturally was very favourable to some programme of trying to make use of as much as possible of the South Saskatchewan River waters to benefit our people.

When I found out that Mr. Gardiner was a very strong believer in some dam on the South Saskatchewan to make use of the water for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, when I found that he had, seemingly, been working on this matter for a long time and was a very sincere believer in it, it was one of the reasons why I felt like supporting him more strongly than I had before, because I felt that he had got something that would do a great deal of good for our province; he is a member of the Government of Canada and in a position to advance this plan with people who can do something about it. I think that that statement of his that he never mentioned it to be Cabinet has been misunderstood, because the estimates are considered in the Cabinet and these things must have been considered in Cabinet for him to get estimates through of several million dollars. Items were put in the estimates for this matter year after year, so I think in some way there is some misunderstanding there.

It has been pointed out by the Minister of Highways that he (Mr. Gardiner) had stated in effect that he had been pressing the Government to go ahead with the scheme, and they had asked him for one more thing. Now that indicates that he had been discussing it with the Government. So there is no doubt that there is some misunderstanding with regard to that particular statement.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was a great believer in this scheme, and I also saw that the way to get it done was to get the Government of Canada to agree to it, and all the time I was in Ottawa I supported it all I could myself and I thought Mr. Gardiner was supporting it all he could. When we came to the by-election of 1949, the Government was in office, Mr. Gardiner had been supporting this scheme right along, he had got items in the estimates to have it looked into, to have all these studies made, and I stated at Hanley, as has been pointed out, that if you vote for Mr. Boucher the Liberal candidate you are showing that you think in that regard he is doing the right thing. Well, if that was wrong, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how it was wrong.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — You said 'you don't get it'...

Mr. Tucker: — No, no, I did not say that; I never use language like that. I said that it won't do any good to repudiate Mr. Gardiner and elect a C.C.F.'er because that is showing you are electing somebody who will sit in the Opposition and you are voting down the supporter of a man who has been working on this scheme and whom we must look to to try to get it through the Government. That is all I said, Mr. Speaker. If my friends across the way had never said anything that varied from their own honest beliefs and varied from the truth any more than that, then I am sure they would have an easier conscience than they have today.

Now, then, Mr. Gardiner himself – what is his position? His position is that if there is any man who is recognized by all parties, including the C.C.F. Party, as having been day in and day out in favour of this scheme, having had money voted to have it investigated, to find out where it could be safely built, to have the matter investigated in such a position that it could be proved that this was feasible, that year in and year out tried to work in favour of this proposition, I think it would be Mr. Gardiner. Then he quite properly says to the people of Saskatchewan 'if you want me to stay there and continue to work for this, if you approve of the work I have tried to do for you, then elect others to go down there and back me up. Don't repudiate me by electing people that are fighting against me.' Are we to say that it is wrong in a democracy for a man who happens to be a member of the government to say "This is something that I would like to have done for my province; this is something that I am working on; this is something that I would like you to give me all the support you can on."

Premier Douglas: — They didn't!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, the trouble is that we cannot dictate to the rest of the country. One of the greatest difficulties, as has already been pointed out by the hon. member for Hanley, is that to our great surprise the Social Credit Government of Alberta, a neighbouring province, was against this programme and, after all, they are entitled to a good part of the water that flows through the Saskatchewan. We are entitled to our share of it and they are entitled to their share of it. Then the Liberal Government, I think, or the Coalition Government, of Manitoba, to the surprise of most of us, indicated that they felt in some way it was going to affect their position and their right to their share of the water. Is it to be said here, today, that when our neighbouring prairie province are not satisfied to supply this project, and when the rest of the country has to be persuaded that it is a good thing from the standpoint of expenditure of money, that just because every single member of Saskatchewan be he Liberal, C.C.F. or Conservative does everything he can to support the project that it is necessarily going to be accepted? To blame the little group of Saskatchewan members because they have not got this scheme accepted as soon as we would like to have seen it accepted, is not fair to the people who have worked year in and year out to try to get it accepted. Mr. Speaker, when I am told...

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, how is he going to explain Mr. Gardiner's statement to the people of Saskatchewan that work on the dam would be commenced as soon as money and materials were available?

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, in the first place I really think that, at the time that Mr. Gardiner made that statement, he thought he would have

March 3, 1953

no difficulty in doing as he said. I would point out, as the hon. member for Arm River has pointed out, that it was never at any time thought by him that the Government of the province of Saskatchewan would set forward a report that would throw doubt on the worth... (Government interruption) ... Oh, I know the hon. members opposite do not want to accept that, but that is what happened, Mr. Speaker. The Cass-Beggs report threw doubt on the work of the P.F.R.A. and I do not think for a single minute, Mr. Speaker... the Premier says "Oh". When he brings forth Mr. Cass-Beggs...

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, did I say "Oh"?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, I heard you.

Premier Douglas: — Even Mr. Gardiner never once tried to use that reference and I cannot understand you today...

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I do not care if Mr. Gardiner used it at all or not. My sources of information are not restricted to Mr. Gardiner. I know something of what has happened in regard to this dam, and when the C.C.F. Government of this province bring forth a report of a reputable engineer which throws doubt in the field in which he is dealing on the whole work done by the P.F.R.A., it does not lie in their mouths to say "Why was not Mr. Gardiner able to go ahead as he originally planned."

I say again that I find it unfortunate that there should be included in this motion a suggestion that the Government of Canada has shown bad faith when we have to go to that Government and persuade the members from all other parts of Canada that this is a good thing. We are now, I believe, far less than a tenth of the Dominion of Canada; the province of Saskatchewan, on the basis of population, is entitled to less than 17 members out of 265. We have got to persuade the people of the rest of Canada that this is something we should have in the province of Saskatchewan. I think we have a good case; I think if we go about it right we can convince them, and I am satisfied we will convince them. I have great faith in the sense of fairness of Canadians in the rest of the country. I am satisfied if we go to them with a good proposition and convince them that it is fair and right that it should be done, we will get the support of our fellow Canadians. But this is not a political matter. It is a matter of getting money voted in suitable amounts that will benefit, in the first instance, largely Saskatchewan. So I regret that there should be included in this motion a suggestion that the Government of Canada as a whole has broken a promise. All that has been brought forward in support of that has been the statements of Mr. Gardiner stating what he thought. In the light of what he thought and believed, I am satisfied that it would be possible. But when we set out to ask the rest of the country to do something that is really worthwhile for Saskatchewan I do not think we should start out by accusing them of breach of promise and bad faith. It has been made quite clear by the hon. member for Arm River that our vote in this matter is a vote in favour of this project being immediately commenced, showing that we are behind it, and that in this particular thing there is no division of party in Saskatchewan and so we are going to vote; but I regret that it was found necessary to inject this political element into it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with that explanation I say that the Liberal Party in this province ever since this project looked to be feasible, has been behind it 100 per cent and we are still behind it, and will continue to work for it and we will do our share to see that Saskatchewan has this wonderful

engineering project as soon as possible.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the time is very limited and I just wish to take a bit of time now to make reference to some of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I never heard a more perfect condemnation of the Federal Government than he has just made now. This suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that we have to go across Canada to British Columbia, to Nova Scotia, to Newfoundland to get approval for a project in Saskatchewan is ridiculous to the extreme, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to draw the member's attention to the fact that it is just about two or three minutes to 6 o'clock.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — I understand, Mr. Speaker, and I will be adjourning the debate in just about one minute. If we were to adopt the same principle in Saskatchewan, before we went ahead with any development in northern Saskatchewan we would have to canvass the whole province to see if it was advisable whether we should proceed or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope to deal with some of the observations made by the hon. member for Arm River and also the hon. Leader of the Opposition and also to contribute a bit more to this general debate on the South Saskatchewan River Project in which, of course, I am vitally interested and associated with. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask leave to adjourn the debate.

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