

the Canadian parliament has been through correspondence between the two governments.

Now protests have been made and the progress towards settlement of this question has not been closed. The Supreme Court of the United States granted an injunction. After that injunction an appeal was made on behalf of Chicago to allow a continued diversion of ten thousand second cubic feet—that is ten thousand cubic feet a second. If members of the House have watched closely they will have seen I think that the Secretary of War immediately told the Chicago representatives that they need not discuss the continuation, even for a short time, of that amount of water because he would not grant a license for it, and it is to him they apply for permission. The question arose following that as to the result that might accrue if this diversion of water were immediately stopped at Chicago. After all, in this treaty and in the arrangement between the United States and Canada their reason for the diversion of water or for the use of water is given and placed in proper sequence. Chicago has been taking more water than she was entitled to under the treaty, and Canada does not admit that she is entitled to one cubic foot of water, and that is the ground on which we are standing.

The United States government has been very cordial in this matter, and has treated our protest with the greatest deference, and our protest combined with the protests made by the states of the union affected has been treated with due regard, and I think has had great effect. The Supreme court issued an injunction, a hearing was had before the Secretary of War who grants the licenses for diversion, and he told the Chicago people that they need not argue to continue the diversion even for a short time of the amount they are now taking, but they are considering very seriously what effect it would have on the health of the millions of people in Chicago if they immediately cut off this water. I think nobody in Canada or anywhere else would take any sudden action that would injure the health of a very large portion of the population of Chicago and vicinity. But the United States, through their Secretary of War, laid down the principle at that hearing that although a diversion is made, extending to a certain percentage which he mentioned, it could be only for a term of years. That term of years has not, I think, been decided upon, and the diversion is merely for the purpose of allowing Chicago to put in a modern system of drainage. In addition to the objection taken by Canada and certain states in the matter of navigation, some of

[Mr. Graham.]

the states affected by the pouring of sewage into the river used by Chicago in the lake diversion are objecting on account of the injury to the health of their localities. On the whole, therefore, the position is good for Canada at the present time as well as for the states of the American union injuriously affected, but it will take a little time.

There are two or three things which I object to in the passing of this motion. In the first place, it asks the House to tell the government to do what we have already done; it implies that Canada has not done anything. But I submit that Canada has done everything that ought to be done or that can be done under the circumstances and done constitutionally. Furthermore, suppose in the face of the progress that has been made in this matter, the Canadian parliament should pass a resolution which practically declared that neither the United States nor Canada had done anything: that would prejudice our case very materially perhaps before the United States authorities, and that is one thing we do not want to do. So far the progress has been satisfactory, and I think it would be a serious mistake on the part of the Canadian parliament to pass a resolution at this time which might in any way prejudice our position.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) has referred to the action of the Canadian government by way of protest. I have in my hand a few of the despatches that have passed; it will I think be of interest to the House were I to read specifically what in this connection has been said on two or three occasions by the government of Canada to the government of the United States.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Have these been published?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, in part. In the return that was brought down last year and placed on the table of the House in reference to the St. Lawrence waterway project and the Chicago drainage canal, there was a copy of a despatch sent by His Excellency the Governor General to the Charge d'Affaires at Washington on December 19, 1923, and subsequently transmitted through the British embassy to the Secretary of State of the United States. That despatch makes reference to previous communications and reads:

Sir,—

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that numerous communications have been received by the Canadian government from various interests and corporate bodies directly concerned, protesting vigorously against the diversion of water from lake Michigan. The position