

and until such time as they can arrange to get direct current for commercial and domestic lighting elsewhere, they be allowed to continue this diversion.

What is Canada doing in this matter? Last Friday on the orders of the day I asked who was representing Canada and I took objection to the number of private individuals going down there and saying they were representing this country. These people, without consulting the government in any way, have gone down to Washington as self-appointed representatives of Canada to protest to the government of a foreign country and a foreign Secretary of War with regard to the enforcement of a bona fide boundary waterways treaty made between Great Britain and the United States. I never heard of such a proceeding as going over the heads of the Canadian and British governments and the British ambassador. It has hurt Canada's case before the government and the people of the United States and has resulted in a counter attack on the Hydro and Niagara Power systems. Now, there never was any illegal diversion by Canada of waters from the Niagara river; in fact, the people of Canada are taking less water from the Niagara river than the treaty gives them and a large part of what they do take is exported back to the United States in the form of electrical energy for commercial purposes. As a result of these gentlemen going down to Washington and saying they represented Canada an attack has been made on the light and power projects of Ontario on the Niagara river which never were attacked before, in the hope that attention might thereby be turned away from the diversion of water from the Great Lakes for the sewage purposes of Chicago.

We on this side of the House would do anything possible to help the government to accomplish some definite result because our interests over there are being sacrificed by the manner in which the Chicago people have taken the law into their own hands. I do not criticise the minister; he has been active in this power development proposition all over the country. But I would like to find out from him, first, what he has done to call the attention of the British government to the breach of this waterways treaty; second, what has the British ambassador at Washington done; and, third, who appoints all these private people who are going down there and saying they represent Canada? Just think; they are going down there to represent Canada before the government of a foreign country regarding the diversion of water and

the matter of an international treaty between Great Britain and the United States concerning those boundary waters. How do these representatives get passports? They do not represent Canada, and the United States will pay no heed to their representations unless this House and this government get busy and stop the piracy on the lakes. The various harbour works all along the Great Lakes have been interfered with by this diversion, both on the Canadian and the American side. At Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo the levels are away below what they have been for years, and on the Canadian side, on the St. Lawrence river and lake Ontario from Prescott west as far as Toronto and Hamilton the levels have dropped many inches and in some cases from two to three feet, causing great injury to trade and navigation, and to the development of Canadian ports and power interests. A lot of power plants and waterworks on lake Ontario and the Niagara river are also in jeopardy by reason of this diversion. The levels have also fallen on the Detroit river, lake Erie, lake Huron, Georgian bay and the lower St. Lawrence.

Mr. Speaker, a treaty should be respected as a treaty, especially when it is made between the United States, the Mother Country and Canada. Canada has adhered strictly to the letter of the treaty. It is not using even all the water it is entitled to in the Niagara river, while the United States government is allowing Chicago to divert this vast volume of water. Hon. members will find a complete history of the whole case, the legal and engineering side, and further details with regard to this diversion by Chicago on page 706 of Hansard of March 26, 1924, in the debate on my motion which occupied a whole day last session. The government of Ontario and Canadian municipalities are very much dissatisfied with the way things are going, and probably you cannot blame them for acting themselves although some of them think that Washington and not Ottawa is the capital of Canada so far as this matter is concerned. I do hope the minister will take the question up with the proper authorities. Canada has no right to appear before the Rivers and Harbours committee; Canada should not be represented before any committee or before the Secretary of War of the United States. There is a proper channel through which to take this matter up. It should be taken up through the British government and the British ambassador at Washington and the United States should be told in no uncertain voice that a treaty cannot be treated as a scrap of paper when it is made between Great Britain and the United States.