

country. I was very glad to hear the remarks with which his name was coupled by the various speakers when addressing this chamber, and alluding to his distinguished lineage. They might also have gone further and added that he is one among the peers who have taken the deepest interest in the practical subjects that affect the great body of the people. Anything that tends to the benefit of the people has met with the warmest sympathy of His Excellency.

My hon. friend in commenting on the speech seemed to think that the remark in reference to the settlers from the United States was rather out of place. It was introduced after special consideration. It was one of the four paragraphs that are personal to His Excellency, as will be observed, and was predicated on the assumption that the effect in Europe would be very marked when it is known that settlers from the United States are coming to Canada. In Europe, as we all know, the United States, is very much more widely known than Canada, and is regarded as the happy land for all refugees from the older countries. When it is known abroad that the United States is sending settlers to Canada it will be evidence that there is more to attract the settler in this country than even in the favoured land south of us.

One of the most important paragraphs in the address is the reference to the international waterways. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that interference with the waterways dividing the United States from Canada has frequently been a subject for comment. A few years ago we were considerably exercised over the fact that at Chicago they were building a canal which was diverting the waters of Lake Huron into the Mississippi and taking them on to the Gulf of Mexico instead of discharging them into the St. Lawrence. Commissions of Inquiry were started and remonstrances were sent in, I believe, at the time without effect. Another very important diversion that affects Canada is that east of Sault Ste. Marie, where the waters of the St. Mary's river have been diverted south to what is known as the Hay Channel, a distance of about ten or twelve miles entirely through the United States. Then, again, recently attention has been called to the fact that in the State of Minnesota attempts are being made to divert the waters that are now

tributary to Rainy lake and Rainy river to the southward, the object being to construct a water-power with a view to developing electric energy. Then, again, hon. gentlemen will probably remember a few years ago complaints were made that dams were being built on the St. John river before it reached the New Brunswick boundary, disturbing and interfering with the waters that would naturally have their flow through Canadian territory. These are facts which show that we, in Canada, are deeply interested in the preservation of the waters that divide the two countries, and it is very fortunate for us that the proposition for a commission on the present occasion emanates from the United States. Congress at a recent session authorized the president to invite Great Britain, through the Dominion of Canada, to unite in appointing a commission, consisting of three persons on each side, to consider this question of the waterways, and to report on the best method of preserving intact the waters that are common to the two countries. The proposition, under the Act of Congress, was that one of the commissioners should be an officer of the engineers of the United States, another was to be a hydraulic engineer, and a third a lawyer having some knowledge of international law, and the rights of riparian proprietors. We have appointed as our three, Mr. King, who is the geographer of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Coste, who was for a long time engineer of the Public Works Department, and who had been recently employed as a hydraulic engineer in the vicinity of the Welland canal, and Mr. Mabey, of Stratford, Ontario, now of the city of Toronto, a lawyer of some eminence.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is that the Mabey that Sir Oliver Mowat dismissed for being an annexationist?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not think so; he was made a K. C. recently.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That does not make any difference.

Hon. Mr. FULFORD—Myers is the one he dismissed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The next paragraph of the address refers to the proposed autonomy for the Territories. The Bill is now