

Mr. HANSON: Is that not the law, Mr. Sifton?

Mr. H. SIFTON: Yes, you are right. Now, dealing with what you might do with it,—with the Georgian Bay Canal charter. If you confirmed that charter, you would be endeavouring to get a canal for the Dominion of Canada, and in order to get that, you are willing to allot to the Canal Company the right to use the profit from the incidental power. The canal in itself is not likely to pay for a great length of time, but with this large water power which would be incidentally created by the construction of the canal, it looks possible to make enough money to construct the canal. If it turns out that you will do it, this great canal will go through a very productive section of this country, and the charges of the canal, which would otherwise be lost, would be taken out of profits from the sale of power which is incidentally developed on the route. Now, as soon as you do that, as soon as the House of Commons looks as though it might approve of this principle, we hear a great storm of protest from the province of Ontario, or rather, from the newspapers. For those who have not the privilege of living within our province, I might suggest that sometimes what appears in the Ontario newspapers is not always what the people of Ontario are thinking. However, there is a great storm of protest from the newspapers in the province against the granting of this lease, or the renewal of this charter, which will carry with it the right to use incidental power.

Mr. GEARY: You are aware that the province of Ontario protested; it was not the newspapers, but municipality after municipality has protested.

Mr. H. SIFTON: Mr. Geary, I will deal with the protests of the province of Ontario in a few moments.

Mr. GEARY: Do not say it is only the newspapers.

Mr. H. SIFTON: I just warned the members of the committee not to believe that everything which appeared in a newspaper carried the full support of all the people of Ontario. Are you opposed to that, sir?

Mr. GEARY: Not necessarily. I say you are making what is unwittingly a mistake.

Mr. H. SIFTON: I will have to leave that to the committee, sir. Now, we got a storm of protest from people who are interested in the old methods of the development of water-powers. They do not want—and you can take it from me in this way—a new principle established whereby the people who develop water-powers must use the profits from the development of these water-powers for the canalization of the rivers in the interests of the people of Canada. They do not want it. Their point of view is that canalization and the cost of navigation is the duty of the Federal government, and they are willing that the Federal government shall spend the money for canalization, or for the improvement of the rivers, leaving the water-powers, if it is possible—separate them, which I do not think it does. The exploitation by the lessees under provincial laws changes the situation to a great extent. I think a great many of the editors of the papers in Ontario have gone to considerable extremes in what they have said about what we propose to do, but as a matter of fact, the force behind it is the force of the power developers who wish the old method, which was current in the provinces, to be established under Federal authority, where navigable streams are up for settlement.

Mr. HANSON: Are you referring to the Globe, for instance?

Mr. H. SIFTON: I am an old Liberal, and I would hate to say anything about the Globe. My opinion is that I ought to let it go as far as it likes, because look what they did in the days of George Brown.

I would like to take up for a few moments this question of the suggestion that there is a contest between the Georgian Bay Canal and public ownership. This is a point which is very important. There is no issue between the pro-