

in practice to be efficient for that purpose, should be included in this charter. The wording of it is as follows:

A majority of the directors shall be natural born or naturalized subjects of His Majesty and domiciled in Canada.

The third suggested amendment is the one with regard to the export of power, as follows:

The exportation from the Dominion of Canada of any hydraulic, electric, or other kinds of power developed in connection with or for the purposes of the works hereby authorized is hereby prohibited.

This clause is self-explanatory. It would constitute a statutory prohibition, which, in respect to this company would remove authority from the Governor in Council to authorize export permits. It has been declared, I understand, as a matter of public interest that no permits for export should be granted. This would really make it statutory.

Those three amendments, I submit, answer every public objection to the charter, except only the argument for public ownership, which has already been referred to.

There have been many objections not based on fact, but based on a misunderstanding of the charter, but I do not think it is practicable to go through the whole list and deal with them.

As regards the so-called provincial rights, the company takes the position that it agrees with the stated opinion of the Minister of Justice as regards the law. In the second place we base our position on the practice of the Department of Railways and Canals ever since Confederation, as stated by the Minister of that Department in the debate on this Bill in the House.

The charter, with these amendments added, is really a very simple document. It is a canal charter, and the company is a canal company. The principal object of the company is found in its present form in Clause 1 of the Act of 1910. That clause is as follows:

To lay out, construct, maintain and operate a canal or canals from a point on the river St. Lawrence at or near the city of Montreal by way of the Ottawa River, Mattawa River, Lake Talon, Turtle Lake, Trout Lake, Lake Nipissing and the French River, or any of the branches or tributaries, with such deflections from the general course of the said rivers, their branches or tributaries, as may be necessary to overcome obstacles to navigation, to the navigable waters of the Georgian Bay.

Now, stripped of its terms as to route, this is a very simple clause. It is:

To lay out, construct, maintain and operate a canal or canals from a point on the river St. Lawrence to Georgian Bay.

I submit that the words "or canals" clearly mean that the company cannot select any small section between those points at which to build short canals. The authority is to create a continuous waterway from Montreal to Georgian Bay.

I wish to state now, categorically, that the company has not now and, since the passing of that section, never has had, either the legal authority or the intention to construct anything short of a through waterway.

An Hon. MEMBER: Is the depth of the canal provided there?

Mr. SIFTON: It is not provided in the charter but it is provided for on the plans which were filed with the Government. The lock sites on those plans are, twenty-four feet over the sills, 650 feet long, and 65 feet wide. This would give passage for any normal boat of ten thousand tons. I am informed by shipping men that specially constructed boats, for instance, to operate in the coal trade from Nova Scotia up the canal, and built for that trade, could be constructed so that they could carry 1,500 tons through the canal.

[Mr. Wynne Sifton.]