

The Address—Mr. Gardiner

are waiting for some word that will give them some measure of confidence and hope throughout the winter. I propose to support this sub-amendment for the purpose of calling to the attention of the government, by this means, the fact that we must wait no longer not only to deal with this matter but to give to the veterans evidence of the fact that we remember those who have done most for the freedom of all the people of Canada.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES OF BILL NO. 17

Mr. Coldwell: Before the house rises for the dinner recess, may I ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) if it is possible for members of the house to get a copy of Bill No. 17, to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936. I have been trying to get the bill. I understand that it is printed and in circulation. I understand that people outside of this house have copies of this bill, but we members of the house are told that it is not available to us.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): I will ask my colleague the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) about the matter, and I will do my best to have the copies distributed as soon as possible.

At 6.15 o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) before the dinner hour, I could scarcely do otherwise than rise at this time to make some comments upon the suggestions which he made. At the beginning I wish to say that I have no criticism to offer on his having made the suggestions which he did; and to state that they were made in a spirit which seemed to indicate a desire to co-operate in having a number of matters settled in a reasonable way. I hope I shall be able to deal with the questions raised, which, as he said, were three in number, in the same spirit.

The debate which has now been going on since the beginning of the session has been commented on by all those who preceded me. I am sorry that I was not able to be here on the day on which the mover (Mr. Cauchon) and the seconder (Mr. Simmons) spoke, but I did have the privilege of reading the speeches in *Hansard*. I want to join with all those who have congratulated the two

speakers upon the very able manner in which they presented the question to the house. Then, I want to join with all those who have been congratulating those who have been associated with the debate from the beginning. I am sorry that my time does not permit of my going into detail with regard to the different matters that have been touched upon.

I will come at once to the three questions which were raised by the leader of the opposition before the dinner hour. He asked a question with regard to the South Saskatchewan project: Why was it so easy to decide upon the St. Lawrence project as a result of reports which had been made by engineers, and so difficult to decide with regard to the South Saskatchewan? I would recall to the minds of hon. members that the discussions with regard to the St. Lawrence have been continuing over a very long period of time. I suppose in my lifetime and in the lifetime of most hon. members at least a score of reports have been made on the possibility of constructing the St. Lawrence seaway. It is one of the first major developments that I can recall having heard of in the Dominion of Canada, and only at this time are we undertaking to proceed with it. Therefore I would suggest that there is very little reason for saying that the decision was reached with much greater ease than any decision has been reached with regard to the South Saskatchewan.

On the other hand the South Saskatchewan project is one which I think was mentioned almost as long ago as the St. Lawrence. In the first instance, I think the records indicate that something in the nature of a South Saskatchewan development was mentioned as long ago as 1854 or 1856. But one can scarcely say that there was any practical decision as to the possibilities of constructing a dam on the South Saskatchewan—a dam of the nature that we are now discussing—until a very much later period, as a matter of fact a period that is well within the memory of all hon. members who are sitting in this house now.

The old original project that was spoken of in relation to the development of the area that we are speaking of was one which eventually resulted in what was known as the Pearce report. The Pearce report suggested bringing water down from the northern branch of the Saskatchewan river and the Red Deer river, over the open country from Hanna to the South Saskatchewan river, and then siphoning the water under the South Saskatchewan river and irrigating some land on the south side of the Saskatchewan. That was the project which