

Canada should file a suit claiming damages covering a period of ten years at \$35,000,000 a year and collect the amount from the United States through the government of Great Britain. The United States should be told that Canada will no longer stand for the violation of the treaty, and that it is the duty of the government of the United States to check up Chicago, this pirate of the lakes, for diverting this extra amount of water. Even if Secretary Weeks does give his judgment next week, it is not legal under the Boundary Waterways treaty, because Great Britain is the party of the second part to the treaty and one party alone to the treaty cannot give Chicago the right to illegally divert some 4,167 cubic feet per second without the consent of the other.

In conclusion I urge upon the minister that some definite action be taken, and that action should be taken through the British government and through the British ambassador at Washington and that a damage suit be entered to collect from the United States compensation for the damage and injury done. Well, let us send no more pilgrims to Washington. The Canadian government is responsible for seeing that Canada is protected from this piracy of Chicago, and it should take this matter up through the proper authorities, the British government or the British ambassador at Washington, and not shirk its duties and leave it to provincial and municipal authorities who however deserve credit for taking action when they could not get any results through Ottawa.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the House after listening to the long discussion of last session with respect to the illegal diversion of water by the Chicago drainage system will not be interested in hearing a rehash of that same matter this year; but I should like to put my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) right in one matter, and that is that this government have not agreed to the diversion of 4,167 feet, nor to the diversion of a single foot of water by Chicago.

I would also like to inform him that all official documents passing between the government of Canada and the government of the United States in respect to this matter have passed through the hands of the British ambassador at Washington, so that in protesting against the illegal diversion of these waters we have been using the proper channel of communication. More cannot be said than that.

With respect to my hon. friend's complaint as to individuals going down there unau-
[Mr. Church.]

thorized, of course, the government of Canada cannot very well stop individuals from going to Washington, nor can they stop them from making statements if they get an opportunity to do so, but I can assure him that they are not speaking on behalf of the government of Canada. In so far as representation of this government is concerned, it is quite true that we have had representatives watching the proceedings, and that policy has been pursued by this government for the past two years. We deem it wise to keep informed on every move that is made with respect to this matter, and for that reason Mr. W. J. Stewart has attended most of the sittings of the Senate committee and the hearings before Secretary of War Weeks with respect to this matter.

One other matter. The diversion itself is the result of an application made by the city of Chicago and granted by the Secretary of War for the United States. Objection has been taken by congress; objection has been taken by every city and state surrounding the city of Chicago; objection has been taken to the polluting of the rivers below Chicago by American representatives themselves; and what we are doing is to protest that they are not entitled, not to 4,167 feet, which my hon. friend has mentioned but to not one single foot of the water diverted. That has been the position which we have maintained religiously throughout the whole of this controversy. Of course, they may proceed to divert this water in spite of Canada's protest, and if Canada is to go to the extent of serving an ultimatum, that, of course, may be done; but my hon. friend knows full well that only by force can that sort of thing be backed up, and that is not the course we have decided upon. We believe that the pressure we have been able to bring to bear upon the American authorities through the British ambassador will have its effect, and I believe that is very apparent at the moment. My hon. friend will remember the decision handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States no later than last fall which declared the diversion illegal. A very vigorous fight is also being maintained in the committee of the Senate by those who are very strenuously opposed to this diversion. I hold in my hand a report from Mr. W. J. Stewart who was at the hearing before Secretary Weeks a few days ago, to the effect that they do intend to take active steps to stop this diversion, allowing, of course, a reasonable time for the city of Chicago to make other arrangements.

One other matter I should like to mention. It is undoubtedly an acute situation which prevails on the Great Lakes to-day. The