

Mr. SIFTON: I do not claim it will be cheaper to bring wheat through our canal than it would be to bring it through the St. Lawrence deep waterway, if, as and when constructed. I say there is an immediate saving of at least three cents per bushel over the existing rate.

Mr. HEAPS: You said the country would not have to pay a cent for the construction of the canal. Who will pay for that?

Mr. SIFTON: The people who use it and get the advantage of it.

Mr. HEAPS: Who will get the advantage of it?

Mr. SIFTON: Who pays for the C.P.R.? Is it not the man who buys a ticket and takes advantage of the facilities provided by the C.P.R., who pays for it? The same people will pay for the canal.

Mr. HEAPS: Are the tolls going to pay for the canal?

Mr. SIFTON: Certainly. The total construction is mixed up—the canal and power—and it is our opinion that they cannot be separated. The Railway Commission controls both the price of the power and the amount of the tolls, and Parliament controls the proportion in which these two shall be allocated as between power and canal tolls. The company does not. The total construction cost will be ascertained and it is felt that the total amount collected from tolls, and for power, will meet that cost.

Mr. HEAPS: That does not tally with your previous answer, where you stated that the users of that canal will pay for the canal, and now you say that the people who use the power will pay for the canal.

Mr. SIFTON: I think our position is quite clear.

Mr. HEAPS: Am I correct in assuming that the people who use the power will have to pay for the canal?

Mr. SIFTON: I have just answered that; it is on the record.

Mr. HEAPS: Am I right in my assumption?

Mr. SIFTON: I submit my answer is on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: That has been answered half a dozen times.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Has the company any engineers here, who will be able to give us actual information about the physical features of the proposition? We have heard a lot of talk about the rights of the company, the rights of the provinces, tolls, duties, and a lot of entirely hypothetical questions. Can we have any information on the physical aspect of this question?

Mr. SIFTON: Mr. McLean, I suggest that if the committee want evidence on that question, they can get independent evidence from the Department of Public Works, who have had all the work on the Ottawa River under their control, by statute, since 1870, and who maintain a staff of engineers to take the flows and all physical conditions in regard to this area. They have experts in charge, and they have prepared this report and data, and so far as the company's constant negotiations with the Department for some years are concerned, they have given us grounds to arrive at the conclusion that we have never heard a suggestion from a responsible engineer appointed by the government that there was any substantial engineering difficulty which could not be overcome. I suggest, if there is any question you want to ask along that line, that you call these engineers.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): Is there any better evidence on the engineering features than is contained in that report of the Commission appointed in 1904, reported in 1908, and presented to Parliament in 1909? Is there any better evidence than that?

Mr. SIFTON: I don't think so.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): It is all there?