

water levels in lake Superior and the upper lakes are 26 inches lower than they have been for some years. Indeed, since 1891 the lake levels have never been so low as they are at the present moment. The diversion at Chicago is estimated to lower the water in the Great Lakes, in lakes Huron, Erie and Ontario, to the extent of 6 inches. We have this undoubted situation because of the lower levels in the upper lakes and, of course, because of the illegal diversion of the water at Chicago. But we are objecting in a most strenuous way, we are not leaving any stone unturned in order to bring those protests through the proper channels to the attention of the American government. But, Mr. Speaker, I must deny—

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are the American ports advancing a claim in the same way?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And are they making representations to the American authorities?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. Their representatives are appearing before a committee in congress. The chairman of the Senate committee is Mr. Dempsey, of Buffalo. Every lake port on the American side has been complaining most bitterly, and has appointed delegates to attend the sittings of that committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): The minister is quite right when he says that he does not suppose that the House will want to have everything that was said last year rehearsed. I do not think the House would, I think no one would reasonably expect it. But the House would be very much more interested to know what progress has been made, to know why it is that we still continue to be in the position of having an obligation—which so far has not been denied—flouted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In what way has it been flouted?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My right hon. friend wants to ask a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am asking in what way the obligation has been flouted?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My right hon. friend was not listening to me. I asked why we are in a position of having an obligation, which as yet has not been denied, flouted? Surely the government know that water is still being taken? I assume that they know that. I would assume from what the minister immediately interested had said

it would not be necessary to point out to the government that water is being taken. I would have assumed that it was not necessary either to point out that we had a treaty dealing with this matter. Why, that was admitted last year. What we are interested in knowing to-day is surely this: There is a treaty admitted. There is the admitted taking of the water. What is the reason the treaty is not observed? Is there any reason to be given, or are we to understand that the matter really is—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend infer that there is a treaty allowing the American government to take any water?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, no. I am afraid I shall have to go into the whole history of the matter again. I thought the minister understood the situation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend spoke about a treaty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly, the treaty in connection with the waters of the Great lakes, providing that they are not to be withdrawn. Well, there we are. There is the treaty, the water is still being taken, and we have not yet been told why. What is the reason put forward for the taking of the water? Is the reason really, as was almost in so many words stated by the minister—and I was very sorry to hear him stating it—that the only way the United States government can be got at is by an ultimatum, to be followed by force? Because that is what my hon. friend said.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh no, I did not. I said it was for my hon. friends to suggest what action should be taken. We have gone the whole distance with protest, what else would my hon. friend suggest?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Ah, I do not think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) ever suggested force. The only suggestion of force that I heard came from my hon. friend the minister; I do not think he meant it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me repeat what I said if my hon. friend will permit. I said that we had gone the whole distance with protest through the proper channels. Now my hon. friend suggests that there is some other course, that we have not gone far enough, and I should like to know what that is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We do not know exactly how far the government have gone.