

St. Lawrence it will be necessary to come to this government for such protective precautions and provisions as were provided for before, or better if possible. Well, you know what is stated here, that the contributions were given because of the expectation of getting certain things from the government which happened to be elected.

Mr. GORDON: From now on they will have to go to the parliament of Canada.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If hon. members then talked in innuendos and implications I cannot help it. Let anyone else put any other interpretation upon it if he wants to. I put my own interpretation upon it, and I will go further and say that if we had been returned to power, if Quebec had given the charter, they would have presumably sought to get the balance of the water. I do not know that they would have got it. I do not think, speaking for myself, that they would have, except on very good terms in connection with the locks that would be and had been necessary. But that did not happen anyway, and we do not need to speculate on that. My hon. friends opposite are sitting on the government benches, and the problem is up to them. The Prime Minister has said very little about it this afternoon, but he is going to say more on some more appropriate occasion. That is what he has been doing for the last two or three years; it is always, something is going to be done for Canada to put us on our feet.

That pretty nearly covers, Mr. Speaker, the hurried notes that I made while hon. gentlemen of the C.C.F. were speaking. I did not know any more than the Prime Minister did that this matter was coming up this afternoon. Referring to the request of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) that the government should expropriate the Beauharnois property, I want to compliment the Secretary of State upon his reply last year to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) who invoked the government to seize—seize, mind you—this Beauharnois property, and then create an issue of the matter and let the case go to the privy council and be decided on its merits. The Secretary of State got up and bluntly stated in reply that he did not see any difference between that and any other kind of banditry. He took the ground that the government was not justified in committing an act of despoliation and burglary just to create a specific issue to go before the privy council. Besides, our own supreme court, so far as the case went before them, showed a decided inclination to the view that both the power and the water belonged

[Mr. Motherwell.]

to the province of Quebec. Do not make any mistake about that. Nobody has challenged that view in court and nobody is likely to. That was also the view held, and is so stated, by the present Prime Minister of Canada, that the water and power do belong to Quebec. After preaching wrongly for a year that this power did belong to the people of Canada, what is the use of hon. members to my left now coming along and saying that Canada should now expropriate something which we already have? That shows the hypocrisy of my hon. friends, the duplicity of them, the humbug of them—trying to fool and exploit the people. Their political war material is running short. They are parading around the country and are not receiving, apparently, the response they expected. They are boiling up again with some alleged new dope. They take a great deal of credit, and are the only ones, according to their views, who stand up in public and protect the inalienable rights of the people of Canada. They are running short of new ammunition and they want to warm Beauharnois over again. That is what they are trying to do, and I am going to raise my voice, supposing I never say another word in this parliament, against that kind of humbug and duplicity on the part of hon. members who pretend, without justification, to be better than anybody else. Instead of that they are, in my experience, a good many degrees worse.

However, I will make some exceptions to that statement. I have always taken the ground that there were two or three over in that corner to whom my remarks would not apply. Then hon. members in the corner have complained that guarantees were given by the government to save the project from ruin. What would have happened to it if they had not done so? I do not wish to be understood as taking the brief for the government—God forbid that anybody should do that. But what would have happened to the project? Hon. gentlemen in the corner of the house have raised such a row throughout Canada that you could not sell a Beauharnois bond if you gave it away. Either the project had to become a piece of wreckage or the government of the day had to step in.

I do not like to think that I am saying anything which pleases the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Ryckman), but I have to be fair.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Do not let me stop you.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have to state the facts. Because of that I must point out that