

Let me quote an extract from the report of a committee which was set up by this government. It gives a fair indication that things could have gone better. This was a committee set up by the present government, the Kirkpatrick committee, I believe. The minister will correct me if I am wrong. I understand that there was set up a committee known as the Kirkpatrick committee, appointed by the dominion government in the spring of 1942, and the following is a part of that committee's report:

We believe in general that the production of the crude oil from these sands is a practical project as a war measure. We also believe in general that the project would have more than a reasonable chance as a post-war commercial enterprise.

That was as late as 1942, and it is fairly good evidence that there is a good chance of this being developed if handled properly. I am not standing up here this evening to defend Mr. Fallow, not by any means. He is a minister of the crown of Alberta and he belongs to the same political party as I do. I do say to the Minister of Mines and Resources however, that in the report which he gave us this afternoon he has not refuted one of the statements, one of the accusations made by the minister of public works of Alberta. I was somewhat interested in that letter which the minister read and I was going to ask him this afternoon, only he thought I should not interrupt him then, to table the complete letter, because Mr. Fallow, in a part of his statement in Edmonton, referred particularly to one part of the letter which I noticed, namely, about the laying of the pipeline, the water line. I am not going to attempt to give his exact words, but Mr. Fallow stated in general that the pipeline was laid and the ditch was backfilled without any test having been made of the pipes, when they tried to run the water through, the pipes leaked and the dirt had to be taken up again and the pipes fixed and the dirt put back in a frozen condition, and still it was not satisfactory.

The letter which the minister read this afternoon did not contradict that statement. In fact, it tended to give the impression that it was a true statement of the situation, because the man who wrote the letter, Mr. McClave—I am speaking purely from memory—took no responsibility whatever for it. I believe he said that he let the work to those whom he considered to be responsible men inasmuch as they had had some experience in laying oil pipelines and therefore he concluded that they would or should know how to run their business. But that does not refute the argu-

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

ment made by the Hon. Mr. Fallow. That is why I say that, in fairness to Mr. McClave and the committee, the whole letter should be tabled lest we get the wrong impression. At any rate, the impression I got from the letter was that the Minister of Mines and Resources had written to Mr. McClave trying to find out something about the statements made by Mr. Fallow.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is mistaken about that. He states that the letter from Mr. McClave is in reply to one sent to him by Doctor Ells. As a matter of fact, at that time I did not know that there was such a man as Mr. McClave in existence. I had no correspondence with him, but Doctor Ells, who was interested in the matter, had written to him and this reply was given.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Was that after the statement of Mr. Fallow came out?

Mr. CRERAR: After the raising of the pipe?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): No; the letter that Doctor Ells had written to Mr. McClave asking for information. Was that after the statement that Mr. Fallow had made?

Mr. CRERAR: It was before that. It was prior to Mr. Fallow's statement in the legislature. I did not wish to interrupt my hon. friend but simply to correct that impression. However, I may have a word to say a little later about his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I am glad the minister has made that reply, because I would not want to accuse Mr. McClave or Doctor Ells of anything of which they should not be accused. But that was the impression I got when the minister read the letter, and that is why I thought it should have been tabled, so that there would be no misunderstanding about it. That is what I intended to ask him at that time; but I will say frankly to the minister, and I think he will agree with me, that the statements Mr. Fallow made were very serious charges, and I think it is the duty of the government to set up a royal commission, as Mr. Fallow has suggested, to investigate the matter. I am sure that one of the first witnesses they would call would be Mr. Fallow himself to substantiate the remarks he made, because I do not think any responsible person in this country either in this government or outside should be permitted to make such statements and have them go unchallenged. Of course, when I say that, I know the hon. Mr. Fallow is agreeable to that, because I discussed this very matter with him and said to him what I am saying