

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We will be perfectly willing to bring down the despatches.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps that will be the easiest thing to do, to table the despatches and then have this matter brought up another time. In any event I think it would be a good thing for the government that this motion should pass. It is merely backing up the government in taking the necessary action to look after Canada's rights. Do they object to it? I would assume not. If there is objection to it what is the objection? Is there not real sincerity in any action taken to look after Canada's water? I believe there is. Then why is there any objection to the House passing this resolution? I think the government should be asking the House to pass a resolution of the strongest possible kind in its aid. It really does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, a most extraordinary situation that a motion—which after all is really a motion asking the government to take any and all steps it can take to assert Canada's rights—should be objected to by anybody. There is another thing which seems to me to be very incomprehensible, and that is that in these two years—so far as the public know, so far as we glean from newspapers and the like—the question which is exercising public authority in the United States is not a question of solemn treaty rights, but is the question as to whether or not it is convenient to observe solemn treaty rights, just finding out where the balance of convenience is, whether this city here or that city there is going to be hurt more than Chicago will be helped. The effect of that would be lost a great deal if the government is in a position to take the House into its confidence. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing, if the mover of the resolution is also willing, that this matter should stand for the purpose of the papers being brought down. I understood the minister to say that he saw no objection to that course. If there is any objection I should like to continue my remarks.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no objection to bringing down the papers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend says there is no objection I do not want to delay the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Proceed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know who is really—I suppose the right hon. Prime Minister—

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We should like to dispose of this motion to-night.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: With the understanding that the papers will be brought down?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then may I ask if there is any objection to the motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is objection to the motion. It implies that action has not been taken by the government whereas action has been taken—immediate and direct action as the despatches will show. Last session a return was placed on the table of this House, a printed copy of which I have in my hand at the moment; it contains several despatches, representations made through the British embassy to the United States government with respect to this very matter of the Chicago drainage canal. Since last year further despatches have been forwarded. In the meantime the United States government itself has been dealing with this matter in a most effective way, in a manner more effective than would be possible for any of the other parties concerned to deal with it because the United States government itself has taken the position, upholding the decision of its Supreme court, that water should not be diverted through the Chicago canal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the United States government takes that position the matter is settled.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We hope so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the United States government takes that position so far as Canada's rights are concerned it is the first we have heard of it, and this debate has served a useful purpose in bringing out that

information. If it is taking the
10 p.m. position that Canada is right and
that this water ought not to be
taken I have nothing to say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States a few weeks ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My right hon. friend is confusing the question of national rights with court rights. Canada's rights were never submitted to the Supreme court, never, and my right hon. friend misses the point entirely. Let me try and make it clear what the Supreme court did, and I hope that I will be interrupted at once if my statement is wrong: What the Supreme court did was to consider the dispute between American interests entirely—the right of Chicago to