

plant and can either refuse to sell power after the thirty years to the province of Ontario, or they can double the price. There is no protection whatsoever for the people of Ontario. Now, compare that with the situation of buying power from the canal? They apply to the Railway Commission and the Railway Commission fixes the price, and the terms of the contract under which they buy power from the canal company. They always have the protection of the Railway Commission with regard to the price they pay for that power, and they can get an order from the Railway Commission to make that supply of power from the canal company permanent, perpetual and forever. It fixes the price without any possibility of ever being held up.

I submit, Mr. Glen, that that is the fundamental difference; it goes right to the root of the whole problem of permanent supply. I think the same thing applies to the suggestion of buying power at the Carillon. I think it was Mr. Bennett who stated in the House, as I understand him, that Mr. McGrath was here and was a party to the extension of this lease at Carillon, and he drew the inference from that that the Ontario Hydro were quite satisfied with this lease; were quite satisfied that private interests should develop the whole of the river at the Carillon site and quite satisfied to buy power, as I understand it, on similar terms, which would result in exactly the same thing, as I have just suggested that the Gatineau Power contract will eventually result in. I have not seen the contract; I am referring to the interpretation by the Toronto Telegram.

Mr. GLEN: There is no doubt that the province of Ontario are purchasing from this private company, the Gatineau Power Company, their power at the present time?

Mr. SIFTON: I have not seen the contract, Mr. Glen. I believe the Ontario Government is represented here, and I believe the Ontario Hydro is represented here, and they are in a position to answer that question definitely. I have never seen any such contract, I merely know what the newspapers say.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Both your brother and yourself have made the statement that the water-powers of this canal rightly belong to the public. I would like to ask you, and ask the Committee to consider, this question: To what public do they belong? Take the Carillon Power Company for example; does that belong to the people living within, say, a radius of ten miles of the Carillon, or does it belong, as your brother said yesterday, to those living within transmission distance, or does it belong to the whole people of Canada? That is a question that is going to be of more and more importance as times goes on. If you look at Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan you will find vast water-powers with nobody living anywhere near them, and some day there is going to be a demand for this power in excess of the supply. The question is, who is going to be entitled to that, in your opinion, and also I would like the Committee to consider this: how are the people who are entitled to the benefit of that power to be assured that each will receive his share? How are we going to be assured that, say, the city of Toronto is not going to get more than its share of the power available in Ontario? How are we going to be assured that the city of Winnipeg is not going to get all the power within one hundred miles, to the detriment of all the other smaller settlements? That is a question I think we should settle clearly in our minds.

Mr. SIFTON: That is a question that the members of Parliament are elected to decide. On the other hand, it is a problem to which our company has given considerable attention. It raises the big question, as you say, of public policy. So far as our company is concerned, we have no authority to transmit power long distances from power sites. We can sell the power wholesale, under order of the Railway Commission, at what they call the buss bar; at the power plant.