

within their own territory, because the water that goes into Lake Michigan runs out into our country, and any drainage from that lake is being taken from us just as surely as if Lake Superior itself were being tapped. The American and the Canadian peoples must neither directly nor indirectly interfere with the international waters to the detriment of either country.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That principle has been recognized by the Supreme Court.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: Yes. But suppose some years from now Chicago says there is an emergency. Who could deny that there was? There is nothing in this treaty to say that before an emergency is considered to exist both countries must be in agreement on the matter. Chicago need only allege that there is an emergency, and then it is entitled to a board of arbitration, which board is bound to give relief, because the treaty recognizes that Chicago is entitled to more water in the event of an emergency. In my opinion that cancels any beneficial effects that would otherwise flow from the clause. If such a board is set up, the Americans will say to it: "There is an emergency or you would not be here, and the emergency is one that demands more water, or you would not be here. You can give us more water for as long as you like, or for ever."

To my mind, that kind of question should never be left to a board of arbitration, even if it were thought advisable to leave it to a body of some sort. If such a board were set up, we should appoint one member, the Americans would appoint another, and the third would possibly be a foreigner. Well, I think the foreigner would be influenced far more by the contentions and prestige of a country of one hundred and thirty millions than by those of a country of only ten millions. It would be like going to law with Satan before a court in Satan's domain.

I have been given this argument, that if Chicago wants to take more water we shall be supported by all the states bordering on that great international highway in our stand against further diversion. But I do not want to depend on American help. I prefer to depend upon the strength of our contract.

Some people say that even if we take every possible care with the contract, the Americans need not live up to it. My answer to that is that the Americans are just as likely as any other nation in the world to respect a treaty, but if you give them an opportunity to take advantage of any uncertainty they will act the same as any other nation and take that advantage. And so I say that so far as

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON.

is humanly possible the treaty should be made bomb-proof.

Hon. A. D. McRAE: Honourable members, I did not intend to speak at this time, as the subjects I propose to draw to your attention might more properly come up when each of the issues is before the House for general discussion. Faced, as I understand we are, with the prospect of an early and extended adjournment, due to lack of business before the House, I offer my observations to-day in the hope that this honourable House may see fit to take at least some of them under immediate consideration and thus do its part in helping to solve the serious issues which confront the country.

May I say that I think the people of Canada have but a very vague and quite erroneous impression as to the responsibility of this honourable House with respect to government. I make bold to suggest that some honourable member with long experience both in this and in the other House, as well as in the Government, should make a very clear statement on the responsibility of the Senate and the scope of its authority. In this way, I am sure, we should hear much less criticism of this honourable body by reason of the long adjournments which are necessary from time to time for lack of business.

First, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Government on the remarkable accomplishments it has effected so far. I am sure I express not only the views of the party to which I belong, but of thousands of other Canadians in all parts of Canada, when I say that we are indeed fortunate in these times to have at the head of our Government a man bold, courageous and efficient, whose high principles exemplify what is best in our Canadian citizenship. Undoubtedly, Canada in its Prime Minister has the right man in the right place at the right time. This does not necessarily mean that we agree with him in everything he does, but by and large his record is one of which he has a right to feel proud.

We should be blind indeed if we were to overlook the fact that the great issues confronting the Canadian people have yet to be solved. If any doubt remained as to this, the speech the right honourable the leader of this House made yesterday should have removed it. With that speech I am entirely in accord.

Mr. Roosevelt never made a truer statement than when, addressing Congress a few days ago, he said, "We cannot go back from here, we must go ahead." With that I agree. If this course is to be pursued there must be