

priation such as are given in the Bill before us.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—What company is that?

Hon. Mr. POWER—The Ottawa and Quebec Power Company.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—Where is the location of their operations?

Hon. Mr. POWER—Their operations were to be near the Ottawa river and the works were to be near the head of the Remoux rapids on the Ottawa river. Chapter 188 is 'An Act to incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.' Section 12 of that Act gives the same powers of expropriation as are given in the Bill before the House. Then I take the next year, 1904, and I find chapter 65 of the Acts of 1904 is, 'An Act to incorporate the Cedars Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.' Under section 12 of that Act the company has the same rights which are given by section 17 of this Bill. Chapter 107 of the Acts of the same year is 'An Act to incorporate the Okotoks and High River Lumbering and Developing Company,' and section 9 of that Act gives the same power that are given by the 17th clause of this Bill; and, unless I am very much mistaken, we have already passed this session an Act giving similar powers. I do not think it would be fair to single out this particular enterprise for exceptional treatment.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—I do not think we should single out this company and treat it differently from any other company, but it really seems to me time the attention of parliament was directed to Bills of this kind. I quite agree with the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Russell, that it is all very well, where there is a great public undertaking, to come in and take private property, and that no doubt was the reason why many Acts contain this particular clause. But to apply this particular clause of this Bill to purely a private company seems to me to be going far beyond what is just and fair. It makes no difference that a man is to be compensated for his property if he does not want to part with it. This is a private company, organized entirely for the benefit of the persons incorporated in it,

Hon. Mr. POWER.

and we should give the company no more right than an individual. If I came to parliament and wanted power to expropriate the property of the Senate for the purpose of carrying out some project the position would be the same as in the present case. If the company cannot get it, then it cannot get it, and that may be no very great harm. I do not think the Parliament of Canada is bound to do an injustice simply to enable a private company to expropriate the rights of another person, even if those rights are paid for, and even if the parliament declares that this company, which is a private company purely, is going on with an undertaking for the general benefit of Canada. If we continue to stretch the constitution to the extent to which it is stretched, what earthly right can there be guaranteed to a province, and what is the use of my hon. friend bringing forward the rights of Quebec. It seems to me that on no occasion, except for a public undertaking of an undoubted character in which all the country can share, should individual rights be taken, whether they are paid for or not, so long as the individual does not wish to part with them.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (de Lanaudière)—I do not understand how this can be called absolutely a private company when you have a declaratory clause stating that the works are for the general advantage of Canada. That clause has been unanimously passed. This company will develop power for the use of all the industrial enterprises that may be on the borders of this canal. If you do not wish to grant this company the power of expropriation, you render the Bill absolutely void, because any single proprietor along the course of the undertaking could block the whole enterprise. We have discussed this over and over again. This is not like a private concern, such as a saw-mill or a store; this is an undertaking to supply power to the public generally, under certain regulations, and at certain prices, for the benefit of the whole surrounding country. I do not see why you single out this particular company from all others unless there is a desire to kill the charter and prevent the Bill becoming law, because the Bill would not be worth the paper it is printed on without the power of expropriation. I submit, therefore, that the clause