

States have caused damages to His Majesty's subjects in Canada amounting to millions and millions of dollars every year by the diversion of water through the Chicago Drainage Canal. This diversion has been taking place for some time and we have had no redress; I do not know why. I know some people wrote to the British Ambassador, Sir Esme Howard, and told him that His Majesty's subjects were suffering at the hands of a foreign country; but nothing has been done. We are suffering enormous damages every year. Honourable gentlemen have no idea of the volume of water that should be flowing into the basin of the St. Lawrence, but is being poured into the basin of the Mississippi. It is equal to the flow of the mighty Saguenay, or twice the normal flow of the St. Maurice River.

Now that we have an Ambassador, perhaps he can do something to stay this diversion. He cannot stop it entirely, I understand, because the Supreme Court of the United States and the Secretary for War have agreed that a certain amount of water may be taken. If only the water absolutely necessary for sewage purposes were taken, the damage would not be very great, but no less than 11,000 cubic feet per second is being used. About 30 miles from the shores of Lake Michigan no less than 40,000 horse power is being developed on a drop of 40 feet. If that water were allowed to follow its natural course, where there is a drop of 400 feet, it would develop 400,000 horse power. But we are deprived of the benefit of that. Perhaps we were little previous in appointing an Ambassador, a minister plenipotentiary; possibly we might have been satisfied with Consuls, as has been suggested by President Coolidge. However, this is not a commercial question, but an international matter that will require all the skill and ability of a real plenipotentiary.

There is another case now before the Supreme Court of the United States in which the State of New York, the State of Michigan, and other States are protesting against the action of the State of Illinois. But we have no redress. When the case was before the Court and the action of the State of Illinois was being condemned, what did the lawyers say? I had the briefs of the appellant and the appellee, which contained no less than 500 pages. What did they say? In the last three pages they upset all their arguments by saying: "We do not ask you to stop the diversion of the water; we simply want you to confirm the supreme right of the United States in this matter, and to state that you have the right to stop such diversion." It was said that there were 3,000,000 people in Chicago and that the public health would be jeopardized if this water supply were cut off.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN.

The Secretary of War allowed the taking of only enough water for sewage purposes, but that order was being disobeyed.

While I am on this subject, let me refer to another matter. There are commissions of engineers, one in Canada and one in the United States. What do the United States want? They want us to hand over our rights in the St. Lawrence river, nine-tenths of which is in the Province of Quebec. The State of New York wants a neutral zone established, five or ten miles in width, on both sides of the St. Lawrence river. That zone would take in the cities of Montreal, Three Rivers, and Quebec. Just fancy the treatment that we would get at the hands of those mighty American engineers! You can hear them saying: "Why, don't you know that the United States of America is paying for this? We are going to do as we please." It reminds me of the story of the English lady giving advice to her boy. "My boy," she said, "if you play marbles, always play with a fellow smaller than yourself, so that if you cheat you can lick him." That is the way we would be treated by the United States.

Therefore I say this is a matter of urgency, and I hope the Government will immediately issue instructions to our new Ambassador, His Excellency the Hon. Vincent Massey, to see at once that we receive some sort of redress. I suppose that under our new status, which the Leader of the Opposition did not want to talk about, our Ambassador would have access to His Majesty, and I would suggest that he be given instructions to communicate with His Majesty and tell him that his subjects are suffering at the hands of a foreign people to the extent of millions of dollars a year. I would advise him to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, to hold back from the money owing to the United States an amount sufficient to cover those damages till something is done to remedy the situation. If there is one thing the people of the United States like, it is money—even if they did win the war they want every cent that is owing to them.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is the Treaty of Lausanne. I think we should tell the poor Turks that we are still at war with them. They do not seem to know it. I know we made war with them, for I had a son very near the Dardanelles, and as Canada was not a party to the Treaty of Lausanne, we must still be at war with them. That situation should be ironed out. Perhaps we should make a Treaty of our own. In any event, surely we should not remain in a state of suspense.