

if anybody looked at the position as it was then, they would say that old Sir Robert, if anything, had a better chance of getting his guarantee than of not getting it.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): That is one of the reasons why he did not go on with the undertaking.

Mr. SIFTON: I do not know what his reasons were, but from our point of view, when he approached us with a view of getting us interested in this business, we stated our *sine quo non*, that we would have nothing to do with applications to Parliament for financial assistance, and unless the English group wiped that out of their heads, we would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): And you will give your assurance that you will not ask for a guarantee, as Sir Robert Perks did?

Mr. SIFTON: I am not so sure that if he had gone about it in another way he would have obtained it. I think this was at the extreme tail end of the fashion for governments to guarantee transportation securities. It was going out of fashion just about that time. We will not ask for any guarantee.

Mr. HEAPS: How many horse-power do you expect to be developed, according to the interpretation of the charter?

Mr. SIFTON: According to the Public Works survey, which I think is as good an estimate as we can get, the exact figure is 761,880 electrical horse-power. That is the government estimate of the actual amount of power which is necessarily incidental and part and parcel of this canal project.

Mr. HEAPS: And you would have control of that power—

Mr. SIFTON: We would not have control. The Railway Commission controls it, and we would have to pay for it. We control the producing of it, and turning of it into use. They control how we sell it, and at what price.

Mr. HEAPS: There is also a granting of three million horse-power—

Mr. SIFTON: If you consider the statement I have just read from the Government report, the development of this power is part and parcel of the canal.

Mr. EVANS: Your brother made the statement yesterday that the directorate would always be Canadian. I would like to ask how you would provide for that?

Mr. SIFTON: Well, Mr. Evans, what he said was this; we suggested an amendment which would provide for a permanent Canadian control. You have the amendment in the Bank Act, which has been through Parliament many times, and which provides that the majority of the members of the Board of Directors shall be British subjects domiciled in Canada, either natural born or naturalized British subjects. The company suggests that that clause be applied to our charter.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): Is that not merely a bait held out to the people that this is a Canadian concern?

Mr. SIFTON: I do not think so.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): How are you going to control the shareholders of that company?

Mr. SIFTON: The control of the chartered banks has never been questioned. That is the only clause in that Bank Act which protects the chartered banks of Canada from being absorbed by large New York interests.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): But does it?

Mr. SIFTON: In my experience, it has done it. I know of large American banking interests who have considered the purchase of the control of Canadian banking institutions, but they have refused to go on with it on account of that clause.

[Mr. Winfield Sifton.]