

INDIAN ACT—AMENDMENT

On the Order:

Second reading of Bill No. 9, to amend the Indian Act.—Mr. Coote.

Mr. COOTE: The minister (Mr. Stewart, Argen-teuil) has asked that the bill be allowed to stand.

Order stands.

YUKON TERRITORY OFFICIALS—INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

On the motion of Mr. Black (Yukon):

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, statements and communications concerning exemption or partial exemption from payment of income tax on payments or remuneration, whether paid as salary, living allowance or otherwise, by the government of Canada to officials of Yukon Territory, and showing what exemptions (if any) from income tax have been allowed to Yukon officials on amounts paid them by the government of Canada during the past seven years.

Mr. BUREAU: I would ask the hon. gentleman to let this notice of motion stand. There are certain provisions in our act preventing the disclosure of any return made by individuals, and not being thoroughly familiar with those provisions, I am not ready to discuss the matter now. I would therefore ask the hon. gentleman to let his motion stand so I may have an opportunity of seeing the Commissioner of Taxation.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I have no objection to letting the motion stand if I am assured that it will come up again, and that I shall have an opportunity of discussing it if it is opposed.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

GREAT LAKES LEVELS

EFFECT OF DIVERSION OF WATER BY CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take some definite and immediate action to prevent the illegal diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes through the Chicago drainage canal and that action should be taken to prevent further waste and to secure specific enforcement of the treaty between Canada and the United States as to this matter, inasmuch as this diversion is not only seriously lowering the lake levels, but is a danger to the public works of Canada and its provinces and an interference with the harbour developments of our country and with navigation and is such a direct violation and breach of the treaty as calls for immediate action by the government of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last session this same resolution came up with reference to the diversion of waters through the Chicago

drainage canal. Under the Boundary Waterways treaty 1909, made between Great Britain and the United States, Chicago was allowed to divert 4,167 cubic second feet of water from the Great Lakes. Now that city is asking in effect for a diversion of between 16,000 and 17,000 cubic second feet. I do not intend to-night to again go into the whole history of the case, as I laid the facts before this House last session and they will be found in Hansard of March 26, 1924. But I am very much dissatisfied that the government of Canada during the past twelve months has taken no adequate steps to stop this illegal diversion by the city of Chicago. I contend that instead of sending to Washington a minor official of the Department of the Interior, to appear before the Rivers and Harbours committee of congress, and also before Mr. Weeks, the United States Secretary of War, to protest against the illegal action of the Chicago authorities, the government should have made its protests and communicated with the British government, which through its ambassador at Washington would have protested to the government of the United States. This is not a matter for individual citizens of Canada, but for the two governments concerned. Principles are bigger than individuals, and we shall never get any relief from this chronic state of affairs until we proceed through the proper channels of communication, and have all the cards laid on the table. This diversion is nothing but piracy and is ruining the light and power interests and the public works on the Lakes, the Niagara and the St. Lawrence rivers, is lowering the levels of all the harbours on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence by several inches, and it has been estimated by many engineers on the Canadian side that the damage in an economic way to Canadian light, power and navigation interests amounts to no less than \$35,000,000 a year. Are we to send minor officials to Washington? Washington is not the capital of Canada; Ottawa is. Is the British government to be ignored altogether in regard to the enforcement of the Boundary Waterways treaty? Is this treaty, so far as any application through the government of the Mother Country is concerned, to be allowed to be treated as a scrap of paper by the United States government? There are great national and international interests involved, the lowering of the water levels is affecting navigation and seriously jeopardizing the usefulness of the harbours of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence; it is also prejudicially affecting power rights, and the rights of riparian owners also are in-