

But it is said to be available for that purpose and to be satisfactory because you can get a depth of water the same as in the Welland canal. The government has not expressed any settled policy in regard to the matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And the committee endorsed that as the proper route.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, I forgot that.

Section agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—Rights of province of Quebec.

Mr. CAHAN: I desire to move an amendment as follows:

That section 4 be amended by striking out in the second line of the said section the words "the rights, if any," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any rights."

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does not my hon. friend think that he might strike out or alter those words "for the development of hydro-electric power?" It seems to limit the rights of the province in the use of the waters to the development of hydro-electric power. The waters could be used for mills or other undertakings.

Mr. BENNETT: That seemed to be what the province desired, for the reason that it was the question at issue that the courts might have to decide. It was settled in that way with my friend the Secretary of State, for reasons that he will explain to him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But that is a limitation, there is no doubt about it.

Mr. CAHAN: The question of using the waters of the St. Lawrence for watering cattle or driving an old-fashioned grist mill is not in controversy. The only question in controversy is this of the use of water for hydro-electric power, and the amendment is made at the suggestion of counsel for the government of the province of Quebec. He says:

I am prepared to advise the Quebec government that this bill is acceptable.

That is, before it was amended. He adds:

I would prefer "any rights" to "the rights, if any."

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, that does not bind us altogether.

Mr. CAHAN: No; but the hon. gentleman is not now expressing the opinion of the Canadian parliament so much as expressing a view that he thinks prevails in the province of Quebec. Anyway this clause cannot affect any other right than that dealt with by the general terms of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: This does not take other rights away.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Ever since I came to Ottawa I have taken the ground that the water powers belong to the provinces, and I have waged battle on that ground on a good many occasions. I do think that this to some extent restricts the right of the province to the use of the water for hydro-electric industry only. Frankly I do not think any other rights would be very much affected, because the courts will decide ultimately what are the respective rights of the province and the Dominion. But I do not see why you seek to restrict the province to the right to develop hydro-electric engineering only.

Mr. CAHAN: What would you suggest?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I would give them a general water power.

Mr. BENNETT: That was not the question at issue; there was a single question. This is a matter which affects the province of Quebec and without their consent it is very doubtful whether we should have introduced this measure, because in a complicated matter of this kind it is very desirable not to bring about a conflict. Good will and cooperation are essential, and the province of Quebec narrowed the controversy to a single point, which was explained by my colleague, namely the rights of the province with respect to the development of hydro-electric energy as against those of the Dominion. That being the only question at issue it does not detract from or add to the other issue, and that is the only franchise this particular company obtained.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is quite true, but you are creating precedents all the time, and after all my hon. friend is very fond of precedents. If the question should arise in the future, as it may, in connection with the development of power not for hydro-electric energy but for some other purpose, it will be pointed out that a precedent was created in this particular bill.

Mr. BENNETT: All that is done is to say that this is without prejudice to the rights of the province of Quebec as asserted with respect to the development of hydro-electric energy. That is all. I think any hon. gentleman who will look can see that. This cannot be a precedent with respect to Ontario or Manitoba or some other province.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not so sure that it could not be so used.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.