

obtain the water or not to obtain it. I think I am right in that, and what the Supreme court has done is to hold that Chicago has not the right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That Chicago has not the right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, but my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has gone further; he has said that so far as the government of the United States is concerned they take the position that the water ought not to be taken away.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, that is the view of the Supreme Court of the United States, supported by the government, as I understand it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In what way do they support it? In the answers to the representations made by this government? If that is so, I am content. If our treaty rights are now acceded to, and the only matter is one of the United States government properly policing some of its own subjects, I think we can safely leave that matter to them, and I am perfectly satisfied. That is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the United States government is able so to adjust this matter, in the interests of certain American states, as to prevent a continuance of the diversion of the water, the problem will be satisfactorily solved so far as the United States is concerned; and if satisfactorily solved so far as they are concerned, it will be equally solved so far as Canada is concerned, seeing the same waters are affected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the right hon. gentleman is right in one sense, but entirely wrong in another. He is right in the sense that if, as in the case he predicates, the majority of interests in the United States—that is American interests—is in favour of upholding the treaty, it helps undoubtedly; but it does not help very much on the other point, and it is rather a sad reflection if we are to approach this matter with the United States knowing that the regulations are only to be enforced if the preponderance of American interests calls for their enforcement. If my hon. friend tells me that the United States government have admitted, not rights in the water in Cleveland, not rights in the water at Detroit, not that as a result of the fact that Cleveland has rights and Detroit has rights that we get our rights that they have admitted, but rights in the water in Canada, I am content, and it is not worth while prolonging the discussion.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): May I say a word about this matter? The object to be attained in this particular case is to stop what I submit is an illegal diversion of water at Chicago. If that can be obtained the discussion as to treaty rights between the United States and Canada is a matter that can be threshed out. But I make this statement: that never since this controversy began has Canada been in as good shape as she is at the present time in regard to it. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church), if I remember rightly last year, criticised the government because they did not send somebody to Washington. At least, that is my memory of it. This government is not responsible at all for any person who went from any part of Canada, except Mr. Stewart, who was sent down from Ottawa, he being a very highly valuable official in the Marine department. This question has not been lost sight of by the government of Canada; but in addition to its own protest it has had also with it the protest of a large portion of the territory of the United States affected, and if that solid body of opinion against the diversion of water at Chicago is working with the United States government, and Canada is protesting through the legal channel in the constitutional way, what more can Canada do? I am not sure whether I will be upheld in this view or not by the House.

My hon. friend said a few moments ago that we should have asked that this question of the diversion of water be referred to the International Joint Commission. That immediately would be an admission that there was something to refer to the commission. My view—and I think it is the view of my colleagues—is that we should stand on the ground of the treaty rights of Canada, and there is nothing to refer to the International Joint Commission. When the correspondence is brought down it will be found that the position taken by Canada is a very strong one. These international relations are delicate matters at times, and Canada surely does not want to make any move which might jeopardize the action which would bring about an end of this diversion. I think that hon. members will find, when all the correspondence is brought down, that we have acted along lines of wisdom and effectiveness. The relationships in this matter between the United States government and the Canadian government are the most cordial and anything which has been suggested by Canada with the authority of this government and