

missed them at his royal pleasure, and how that system gradually developed into what is known to-day as the Cabinet system. But there is nothing in our constitution in this respect, nor is it a legal principle in British parliamentary practice; it is all a matter of expediency and convenience. When we talk of the Prime Minister and his Government being responsible to the House of Commons we forget that there is not an atom of constitutional authority to show anything but the fact that the Prime Minister and his Government are the instruments and the officers of the Parliament of Canada, not merely of the House of Commons. It surprises me that persons in this country who profess to be great authorities on constitutional law and practice should attempt to convince us that the Cabinet in the other end of this building is responsible to the House of Commons only, and not in the broad sense to the whole Parliament. I do not think I am mistaken in saying that there were occasions when the Prime Minister of Canada had his seat in the Senate. In England Lord Salisbury and Lord Rosebery sat in the House of Lords while they acted as Prime Minister. What would have been said if while they were in the House of Lords, corresponding to the Senate in Canada, they had told the House of Commons: "You have nothing to do with us; we are responsible only to the House of Lords, because we sit in the Upper Chamber"? They were responsible to the Parliament of England, just as our Prime Ministers are responsible to the Parliament of Canada. When a Cabinet is being formed there may at times be just as much reason for selecting some of its members from among those who sit in the Senate as from among those who sit in the Commons. There is no constitutional bar against a Prime Minister sitting in this Chamber and having half a dozen members of his Cabinet also sitting here. As I have already said, it is all a matter of expediency and convenience. I think it is only right and proper that some slight protest at least should be made against the misleading doctrine propounded in another place.

Now let me deal with the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty. Some persons, of course, are against the developing of our waterways. In his very interesting life of Sir Clifford Sifton, Mr. John W. Dafoe gives us a rather entertaining account of what happened when the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier decided to deepen the canals to fourteen feet. An important delegation from the district of Montreal waited on Sir Wilfrid and pro-

tested that if the canals were deepened as proposed, the port of Montreal would be ruined. Sir Wilfrid listened very patiently and very pleasantly. Then the delegation went home and he proceeded with the deepening of the canal. To-day we have some very vigorous protests against the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway. In Nova Scotia a good many persons say they are against the project. I have not heard them give any reasons for their opposition. As a matter of fact, from the port of Halifax we have a fleet of steamers plying right up to Port Arthur. Their principal cargo is sugar, and they bring down flour and feed. It is a considerable trade. Personally, in a general way, looking as I do upon the development of the St. Lawrence Waterway as an enterprise which eventually must go on and will go on, though maybe not immediately, I try to contemplate that waterway development as one of the greatest events in the history not only of Canada, but of the Maritime Provinces. There may be drawbacks in some respects, but I am disposed to believe that in a general way that development will be of great benefit to the province in which I live.

Now I want to give the House a general idea of the navigation courses from Sault Ste. Marie down, and to remind honourable members about the locks at Sault Ste. Marie. On one side is what we call the American lock; on the other is the Canadian lock. The capacity of the American lock is by far the greater, and it is a fact that a large part of the Canadian traffic now goes through that lock.

On the route from Sault Ste. Marie on the Canadian side there are in Canada 481 miles of navigation courses, and in the United States 671 miles. On the route from the United States lock at the Sault there are on the Canadian side of the lakes and rivers 477 miles of navigation courses, and on the United States side of the channel 674 miles. I give these figures because a great many people, I think, have an idea that we own the whole of the area of the rivers and lakes, and that all the navigation is on the Canadian side. As a matter of fact the greater percentage of the navigable courses is on the United States side of the lakes and rivers.

From Port Arthur to St. Mary's, across Lake Superior, there are on the United States side 217 miles of navigation courses; on the Canadian side only 29 miles. Through Lake Huron, for 215 miles the navigation courses are all on the United States side of the channel. In Lake St. Clair, which is only 18