

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty and Injustice to the Mississippi Valley

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

April 21, 1933

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I was informed this morning that my friend, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN], had undertaken to visa the Senate to find out how we stood on the St. Lawrence waterway treaty, and, for fear that some Senators will send in word that they are in favor of the treaty without having heard something upon the other side of the question, I am compelled to take up a few moments to let the Senate understand how well Canada thinks she has performed at the expense of the American people.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. May I say to the able Senator from Louisiana that I think there must be some error in the assumption that the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, an eminent Member of this body, would sound out Senators individually, with a view of ascertaining or directing their individual opinions. I think someone must have misinformed the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I do not think the Senator from Nevada is going to take exception to my statement.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am sorry to have to differ with the distinguished Senator from Illinois; I think I have never had to do so before; but I am attempting to ascertain now the sentiment of Senators on this side of the Chamber relative to action at an early date on the treaty referred to, and I intend to pursue that course.

Mr. LEWIS. I understood the Senator from Louisiana to intimate that the chairman of the committee had sought the opinions of individual Senators as to where they stood on that question.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I said "visé." I might know what that word means, but as I interpret the word, I will inform the Senator from Illinois, I meant by it that the Senator from Nevada was attempting to find out how Senators on this side of the Chamber stood with regard to that treaty. I do not think that would be improper, and if I were interested in it I probably would do the same thing.

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to say that if it is merely a question of taking up the treaty, I can understand that; but I thought the able Senator had intimated that the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee had sought to obtain the individual views of Senators on the treaty, which I knew he would not do.

Mr. LONG. I think we are all acquainted with our system here. Before bringing up some measure we find out how Senators stand on it. I do that, and I think the Senator

from Nevada learned to do that long before I ever learned to do so.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, with all courtesy, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I think his misunderstanding was due to the word "visé" used by the Senator from Louisiana. I perfectly understood what he meant, having discussed the matter with him.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his contribution.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], if he will not consent to have the resolution regarding the division of costs between the Federal Government and the State of New York referred to the Committee on Commerce? Since our last discussion of the matter here I have met the members of the power commission of my State. We discussed the matter at considerable length. When they left my office they expressed their willingness to have the resolution referred to the Commerce Committee provided it did not mean an endless discussion in that committee and delay of presentation of the matter. May I not ask the Senator if he would be willing to have the matter referred to the Commerce Committee?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the only object of referring a matter to a committee is that information may be gathered for the benefit of the Senate. The reference of this matter at this time to any other committee than the Foreign Relations Committee would certainly not expedite the obtaining of information for the benefit of the Senate.

As I said the other day, the question of whether or not the State of New York will be permitted to participate in the expenditure of the necessary money to build the St. Lawrence project and in consideration thereof shall have the use of the water allocated to the United States for the generation of power by the State of New York is involved in the whole question of whether we shall ratify the treaty or not. In the first place it involves the total cost to the United States Government in connection with the project. If the United States Government pays all the money allocated to the United States for the project, it will be probably \$89,000,000 more than if the water to generate the power were allocated to the State of New York.

The whole question was studied and investigated and reported on by a commission. The report of the commission is quite voluminous. It was referred to a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, together with the entire treaty, and exhaustive hearings were had upon it by that subcommittee. Hearings were had on all the questions brought out in the report of the commission. The question of the use of water allocated to the United States for the generation of power by the State of New York was involved in the whole consideration. The committee, it is true, as a committee has already favored the recommendation of the commission that the waters allocated to the United States, after a prior use of them under the treaty by the two Governments for navigation and without interference with the use of the waters for navigation, might be used by the State of New York for the generation of hydroelectric power in consideration of paying that proportion of the cost of the project that the commission stated should be allocated to the generation of power, which is \$89,000,000.

The whole question was gone into by the Canadian Government on exactly the same report. The Canadian Government approved the report of the commission and allocated to the Province of Ontario, which borders on the part of the river where the power is generated, the use of the waters allocated to Canada for the generation of hydroelectric power. That was a very natural thing to do. The policy established by the Congress in several acts has been that the States which are deprived of natural resources, whether they be sovereign waters or whether they be timber or whether they be oil, are entitled to compensation for the withdrawal of those potential resources and taxable property by the Federal Government for its own use. That is the policy of the whole United States.

That policy is recognized by Canada in this matter with respect to Ontario. Canada has said in effect that if private individuals built the dams across the river, which would serve the same purpose for navigation, that then the dams and power houses would be subject to taxation on the one half by the Province of Ontario and on the other half by the State of New York, and if the waters are to be utilized for power, and Ontario on the one hand and the State of New York on the other hand are willing to pay, then that part of the entire cost of the project as determined by the commissioners of Canada and the United States should be allocated to that part of the construction, and, of course, it should go to that source.

We have recognized the same policy in connection with the Boulder Dam project. We recognized that the States of Arizona and Nevada, being the owners of the bed of the Colorado River and the banks of it, but being compelled by our Constitution to allow the Federal Government under the interstate commerce clause to utilize that State property for the building of a project, Congress has recognized that they should be compensated, so to speak, and so it has been provided that during the period of amortization all over and above the annual collections for power required to amortize annually the amount of the cost to the United States Government shall be divided between the States of Arizona and Nevada. It is true in that case that the States put up no money, and therefore they get only the surplus over the amortization fund; but in this case the State of New York and the Province of Ontario are required to put up that part of the construction cost which the commission for both governments have allocated as a proper cost to be charged as between navigation and the generation of power.

But all of these questions are interlocked with the entire problem involved in this project which has for its primary purpose navigation, but for its secondary purpose the generation of cheap hydroelectric power for the people of this country.

The Federal Government approves the commission's report. The Executive has approved it. So far as represented by the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee the committee has approved it. It is approved by the Canadian Government and the Province of Ontario.

It would seem to me, whether the Senators from New York are opposed to the St. Lawrence Treaty or not, that they would be exceedingly anxious to have the resolution passed as soon as possible because it only provides that if and when the St. Lawrence Treaty is ratified by the United States Senate and becomes effective, then the water that may be used for power shall be used by the State of New York upon the payment of its just part of the construction cost. We have had voluminous hearings in the matter. Those hearings can be obtained by any Senator. They can be read and Senators can formulate their own opinions on this particular phrase or collateral issue arising out of the treaty.

It is evident that if the matter is referred to the Commerce Committee, or to any other committee than the Foreign Relations Committee, they must have hearings, they will have hearings, and in this session of Congress, when nearly every committee is intensely busy, when every Senator is intensely busy, when we are striving to deal with the most important problems that have ever faced this country, it

would seem that there is no reasonable excuse to go over and over again something that has already been accomplished. It would add no information for the Senate that is new, and it would accomplish nothing on earth except delay; and I hesitate to think that the Senator from New York would desire delay on any question.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I have not the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to ask the Senator from Nevada a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield in order that the Senator may address a question to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As I understand, the Federal Government and the Power Authority of New York have agreed upon the controversial questions involved, as to the use of water and the disposition of water.

Mr. PITTMAN. That has all been agreed upon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And is it not also a fact that a subcommittee conducted hearings for several weeks, gave everyone interested an opportunity to be heard, and that referring this matter now to the Commerce Committee, necessitating hearings, would only delay and prolong the consideration and final disposition of this treaty?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the only result that would be accomplished so far as I can see.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I agree to much that the Senator has said; but the matter which I have in my mind has not been studied by the committee. Ninety million dollars is a lot of money.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LONG. I am willing to yield to the Senator from Idaho if he wishes to ask something of the Senator from New York?

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand that the Senator from Louisiana proposes to enter upon a debate as to the merits of this treaty?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, if the debate is to be opened, of course, the farm bill will have to be put aside.

Mr. LONG. No; I am not doing it in that way. I am debating the farm bill.

Mr. BORAH. I understand perfectly what the Senator is doing, but others will do the same thing.

Mr. LONG. We have not anything else to do right now, anyway.

Mr. BORAH. If that is true, I have no objection.

Mr. LONG. We are waiting on the inflation bill.

Mr. BORAH. I supposed there was an amendment to the farm bill pending now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. LONG. Before yielding further, if my friend from New York will permit me, I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho—he was not here when we began—that what brought up this discussion this morning was the fact that within his just and legal and other rights, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was inquiring of Senators on this side of the Chamber how they stood on the St. Lawrence waterway treaty; and knowing, as I probably would have answered myself had I not known better and studied the matter a little bit more than ordinarily I would have studied it as a Senator, that a Senator might say he was all right on this proposal without looking into it particularly, I concluded that I had probably better give the Senate the Canadian view of this treaty.

The Senator from Idaho may not know it, and the Senator from Nevada may not know it, but I wanted the people of the country and the Members of the Senate to know just how Canada feels that it has caused America to invest \$600,000,000 to take away American commerce from America and to give the commerce to Canada. That is why, pending Senators being asked privately as to how they might preliminarily look on this matter, I thought it was necessary to say something about this treaty this morning.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to interfere with the Senator's program or any other Senator's program. I simply wish to know whether we are going ahead with the farm bill. If this treaty is to be opened to debate, of course that is within their pleasure, and other Senators will pursue the same course.

Mr. LONG. I do not intend to defer action on the farm bill, and I do not intend to speak more than just a few moments.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to say—

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Nevada did not answer my question, if the Senator will yield for just a moment.

Mr. LEWIS. May I say that I was unconscious that any move was afoot to bring this treaty before the Senate for discussion. I am very much interested in this treaty. The State of Illinois is very much interested in many phases of it. I am known to oppose these phases. I deplore the fact that a situation exists where there is an understanding from any source to bring this treaty on for consideration without full information in the Senate upon such a subject.

For myself I am glad to have the Senator from Louisiana say anything he desires; but I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho that I am heartily in accord with him. I had no knowledge that this treaty was being brought on for consideration. I am opposed to its being brought on for consideration now, supplanting the farm bill; and I desire to have it known particularly that I desire a hearing, and a full and complete hearing, as to this treaty when it comes up, that I may express, in behalf of the State of Illinois, its opposition.

Mr. COPELAND. Now, Mr. President, I want to add, if the Senator will permit me, another word to the Senator from Nevada. What the Senator from Nevada is doing is delaying the final action upon this matter because, with all due deference to him, there are some of us here who are sufficiently interested in this question to wish to know what will be the economic effect upon the United States of building the St. Lawrence Canal. My State is interested because it is proposed to tax New York \$90,000,000 of the cost of this canal. Any man who lives in that State must have enough interest in the taxpayers to want to know, "If we spend this \$90,000,000, are we going to get our money back in the way of returns from the value of the power, or are we going to ruin our State by the diversion of commerce and trade to the St. Lawrence Canal?"

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. How much of that \$90,000,000 is to be spent in Canada for Canadian labor and Canadian materials?

Mr. COPELAND. All of the money spent in the international section of the canal, which is the part involved here—all of it, all of the work which is done on Canadian soil—will be done by Canadian labor, but paid for by the United States, and \$90,000,000 of it will be paid by my State.

Mr. CLARK. In other words, under this treaty we win the privilege of footing the bill, and that is the only privilege we get?

Mr. LONG. Exactly.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, my desire is that this matter may be referred to the Committee on Commerce to deal with a domestic question. I am not talking about the engineering features, or the other features which were considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, and well considered; but I wish to have the domestic side of it con-

sidered now, in order that we may determine in the State of New York whether we are throwing away \$90,000,000, and harming our State tremendously. I want to say to the Senator from Nevada that if he thinks he is going to have rapid and immediate action on this matter through the process which he proposes, he is very much mistaken. I pledge for myself that if the matter goes to the Commerce Committee, these matters which have to do with the economic features will be the limit of what we will undertake—not the engineering problems or these other matters, but the purely domestic problems—and I think it is a perfectly fair proposal which I made to the Senate that this matter should go to the Commerce Committee for the consideration of those domestic problems.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. PITTMAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG. I hope Senators will not ask me to yield further. I intend to speak for only a very few minutes, and if other Senators wish to say anything they can do so in their own time. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada, however, if he wishes to answer what the Senator from New York has just said.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator says I did not answer his question. I thought my explanation was obvious. However, I will answer it almost categorically.

I certainly object, for the reasons I stated, to having the joint resolution referred to the Commerce Committee; and, to hasten the determination of the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on which committee it will be referred to without further debate.

Mr. LONG. I do not want to have my remarks interrupted by any unanimous-consent proposal now, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks we vote without further debate.

Mr. LONG. I do not want to make any unanimous-consent agreement now. The Senator from New York might not be here. He has already announced that he has an important engagement this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. He has already spoken on the matter.

Mr. LONG. His remarks were interrupted by the morning hour having come to a close at 2 o'clock. That is my recollection. I am speaking about the other day.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say on this matter, but something ought to be said for the benefit of the American dollar and the American people on this St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

LENGTHENING ROUTE TO FOREIGN MARKETS

Mr. President, to begin with, I am afraid we have never been able to get the Senators who think they are interested in this treaty to look at just what they are doing. My friend from Nebraska no doubt believes that by favoring this treaty he is voting to shorten the route to the sea for the farmers of Nebraska. He is not doing any such thing. He is actually lengthening the route over a thousand miles in order to be able to spend \$600,000,000 of the American people's money for the benefit of Canada. We are not only lengthening the route to the sea by several hundred miles but we are diverting the traffic of America to Montreal and through Canada, and practically eliminating our own ports and our own traffic routes from all such things as participation in traffic.

Mr. President, I may not be able to convince the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Nevada that I am right about this matter. They may not take my word for it; but I will give them the word of the Empire with which they are dealing as to what we are about to do with America's \$600,000,000.

This is a photostatic copy of an editorial appearing in the Toronto Mail and Empire of July 19, 1932:

WATERWAYS TREATY PROVIDES SHIP AND POWER CANALS AT SMALL COST TO CANADA

To be sure it is "at small cost to Canada." They have learned how to build up there. Canada has found out how to build. Canada has found out that whenever she wants to

build anything in Canada, for Canada, with Canadian labor, for Canadian ports, the way to do it is to build it with the money of the United States. There may be some of us who have not found that out, but Canada has found it out; and every time I see the Canadian emissaries coming to the United States I shiver in my boots as to what they are going to leave us when they return.

Now, let me read this editorial:

On its face the St. Lawrence waterways treaty signed at Washington yesterday by Hon. W. D. Herridge and Colonel Stimson is more favorable to Canada than any previous arrangement ever made with the United States.

Well, it will have to go some if that is true. "On its face", says this great Canadian journal, this treaty that has been signed between the United States and Canada "is more favorable to Canada" than any other treaty that they have ever made with the United States. With the well-known fact that we never lost a war and never won a conference with Canada, they are gracious enough to tell us that this treaty is more in their favor than any that they have ever had before.

I read further:

It is more favorable than anyone outside a limited government circle could have hoped for.

Why, to be sure "it is more favorable than anyone outside a limited government circle could have hoped for." Nobody else except the birds in that government that has been getting concessions of this kind from the United States since long before we had the War of 1812 would have had any idea that we would undertake to spend \$600,000,000 of American money to build up ports in Canada, to increase the mileage distance to the sea, in order that they could take American commerce away from here.

I read a little further:

Congress must ratify the instrument before Parliament is asked to do so.

That is very noteworthy. Naturally they know they will have no trouble in getting the Canadian Parliament to ratify it.

The cost of the undertaking is to be borne mainly by the United States.

Why certainly. Why have that put in there? What is the use of informing the Canadian people that the cost of this Canadian project is to be borne mainly by the American people? It is a waste of space, it is a waste of breath, to try to inform the Canadian people that it is going to be borne mainly by the American people. Why certainly! They would not have been down here negotiating to build a canal in Canada, for Canadian commerce, with Canadian labor, for the benefit of Canada, if they had had any idea that the Canadian Government was going to have to pay for it. Why, certainly not! That is axiomatic. That goes without saying.

The Canadian two-stage plan in the international section is adopted in place of the United States single-stage plan. Canadian sovereignty over the works in Canadian waters is absolutely established.

Certainly; we knew that.

To this end there is a complete segregation of the properties on the two sides of the border. Without altering in the slightest degree Canada's age-long policy of joint development of the St. Lawrence waterway, we obtain a 27-foot navigation channel from the Atlantic to the head of Lake Superior. What is still more important, we have retained the right to construct an all-Canadian waterway, at any time in the future, if the expenditure involved in such undertaking is deemed advisable.

Certainly. In other words, because they not only control but—and I will read it again—they have "retained the right to construct an all-Canadian waterway at any time in the future if the expenditure involved in such undertaking is deemed advisable." In other words, we may sacrifice our rights to Canada, but Canada retains her rights in this matter.

The judgment of the United States Supreme Court, requiring Chicago to reduce the extraction of water from Lake Michigan to a mere fraction of what it has been and is today, is embodied in the treaty.

171636—9323

I am going to pause in the reading here long enough to try to inform some of the Senators from the Mississippi Valley and the Southern States and coast States what this means.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not a fact that while, under the terms of the treaty, the United States absolutely internationalizes a lake which lies wholly within the boundaries of the United States, thereby giving up for all time jurisdiction over the amount of water that can be diverted from Lake Michigan to the Lakes-to-the-Gulf project, it still permits Canada to take all the water she wants out of Georgian Bay to construct an all-Canadian waterway from Georgian Bay to the Ottawa River, lying wholly within Canada, and to take as much water as she pleases out of the Great Lakes system?

Mr. LONG. That is my understanding. The United States has spent hundreds of millions of dollars, as we understood, to promote our domestic waterway system for our foreign and domestic commerce. Now the proposal is to limit the amount of water supply that we can have through the Great Lakes system for this construction of the all-year-round waterway system from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, which is interwoven with our flood-control plan. A dollar spent for one is a dollar spent for both. But the proponents of this project intend to come along and to divert \$600,000,000 of our money, not for the purpose of promoting this American system of commerce but in order that \$600,000,000 may make it possible for Canada to take advantage of a proposition on which the United States is spending all this money.

PROTECT AMERICAN PORTS

Let us consider the ports of the State of Texas. They are as much interested in this matter as anyone else. Consider the ports of the State of Texas, like Galveston and Houston and Port Arthur; the ports of Louisiana, like Lake Charles, Baton Rouge, and New Orleans; the ports of Mississippi, like Gulfport; the ports of Alabama, like Mobile; the ports of Georgia, like Savannah; of South Carolina, like Charleston, and on up the coast line. Are the States like Missouri, Illinois, Arkansas, Louisiana, all of these States, to see trade advantages taken away from these ports and away from these waterways, and funds which are needed for the completion of the flood-control projects diverted up to Canada in order that Canada may have the only port which American commerce can patronize, because we have spent all of our money for the purpose of extolling the port of Montreal and other Canadian ports, and have denied the money that is needed for the proper development of our own waterways?

I had a map here showing the situation, but the Senator from New York had to take it with him. It illustrates the matter. We do not need, in order to have a shorter route to the sea from these Western States, to go through Canada, unless we are determined that when we leave the sea we are going around close to Newfoundland in order to get to those States. A waterway can be cut for an approximate distance of around 300 miles; I do not know the exact distance, and I have not the figures which are shown on a map, which the Senator from New York had to take with him a moment ago, but if we want to transport traffic from the sea to the west, as I understand it, we can go down through the Hudson River a distance of only 338 miles, all-American, on American soil, with American labor, and go into the American port of New York City, a distance of only three hundred and some-odd miles, at a cost which will be infinitely less than it is going to cost to build the St. Lawrence waterway, and bring the traffic to the sea by a route which is some thousand or so miles shorter than to go through Canada, at an expense of \$600,000,000 of American money.

Mr. President, let me read further from this Canadian editorial.

Other advantages summarized.

Not only this! The United States abandoned its ancient contention that Lake Michigan is an "American lake."

Certainly! We might have known that if we got into anything with them, we were going to give up something.

\$600,000,000 is not enough. Building up a port of Canada is not enough. Lengthening the route in order that we can give our trade to Canada is not enough. We have to give away Lake Michigan.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I remind the able Senator from Louisiana that the Secretary of State, then Secretary Root, in dealing with Canada touching the question of a treaty concerning the lake, announced to Canada that that lake was an integral lake, a domestic body of water belonging to the United States, was in no wise an international body of water, nor were its banks international, and that, therefore, it was removed from the discussion as an international water; and Canada did not then, nor has she since in writing anywhere, taken issue with that fact, because it was established in history.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator. I had understood that there was no contention whatever, and I thank the Senator for the source from which this information comes, that there was no contention whatever that Lake Michigan was an international body of water, including even the banks. It has been accepted, and no claim has been made to the contrary, that Lake Michigan was an integral part of the United States of America. But lo and behold! we come here now with a treaty by which we are internationalizing Lake Michigan in order to give Canada water which is seriously and badly needed to take care of the domestic commerce and the domestic plan of navigation and flood control of the United States. I say domestic within the sense that it is within the borders of the United States.

Let me read a little further, because we get a better explanation from the Canadian papers than we have ever been able to get from the American press. They understand the matter better. If we want to find out what the treaty provides, we should not ask our American statesmen and our American friends to explain it. The gentlemen in Canada will understand it so much better, and can state its benefits so much more succinctly, if they state what it is, so far as concerns Canada, that it is a waste of time to fool around among our domestic statesmen and newspapers in trying to find out what a treaty contains. Therefore I read from the Canadian editorial again:

That great body of water has become forever—

Listen to this. This ought to make the American hearts swell with pride:

That great body of water has become forever through this new treaty an international body of water, which belongs to the St. Lawrence watershed instead of to the Mississippi watershed.

I wonder what the statesmen of the Mississippi Valley, 32 States which use the Mississippi River watershed—I wonder what the men who are sitting in the United States Senate from the shores of the Ohio River, and the Missouri River, and the Mississippi River, and from the States which are affected by the rivers which flow into the Mississippi River—I wonder what they think of this proposal that we now are to take Lake Michigan away from the Mississippi watershed to prevent the canalizing of the all-year-round waterway system and turn it over to the St. Lawrence waterway project in order that we can give Canada ports which the United States cannot have.

I read again:

While enlarged canals will not bring great ocean liners to Toronto and other inland Canadian cities, it will greatly stimulate water-borne traffic to and from these cities by lake vessels and ocean tramps.

Sure; we will not bring the great trans-Atlantic liners in there, but we will take the little old tramp steamers and the other little old vessels over water taken away from us and keep the United States from having anything but a jig-jog traffic moving into American ports in order to load up trans-Atlantic liners with freight at Canadian ports.

I read further:

Even Port Arthur and Fort William, more than 2,300 miles from the Straits of Belle Isle, will be in close touch by water with the shippers of Great Britain and the world. The deeper waterway

means much, not only in Ontario and Quebec, and the Prairie Provinces, for it also confers upon the eastern maritime Provinces, and even upon British Columbia, opportunities for increased trade with the interior of Canada.

Certainly. I hope Senators understood that. Here is a very salient statement made. It is stated here that this gives to the mother country, the British Empire, greater opportunities to promote its trade with Canada. The United States is not only spending \$600,000,000 to take Canadian and British trade from the United States, but we are actually spending this money so that hereafter the trade that is coming to the United States from Canada will be certain to go from Canada to Great Britain, at the expense of the United States.

What business we are getting out of Canada now we are giving up to Great Britain, spending \$600,000,000 of the money of the American people in order that the business the American people are now getting from Canada will go through the St. Lawrence project to Great Britain. That is what they say here in black and white. They know what they are doing. We may not know it, but they do. I read further:

On the eve of the imperial conference the treaty announces the creation of a larger field and new facilities for Empire trade.

Certainly; Empire trade, trade within the Empire. This project, which is to be constructed with the money of the people of the United States, makes it possible for the Canadians to announce that they have developed trade waterways, and facilities within the Empire so that the trade and interchange between the various provinces and countries of Great Britain will be expedited, to our loss.

I now read again from this sheet:

Cost to Canadian Treasury only \$38,000,000.

We are putting up \$600,000,000 to start with, and that will not half pay the cost before we get through with it, but the cost to the Canadian Treasury is to be only \$38,000,000.

Listen to this, gentlemen of the Senate. I want those who are legislating for the people of the United States to listen to this next line:

No feature of the treaty is more surprising or more satisfactory than the low cost to Canada at which the undertaking is to be carried out.

Nothing, they say, is more surprising to Canada than the low cost of the project to Canada. Certainly it is surprising. I read further:

Because of want of information, the press has carried all sorts of extravagant statements as to the heavy financial burden with which the taxpayers were to be saddled in a time of depression. As late as last Saturday a Montreal newspaper estimated that the Canadian people would be mulcted to the tune of \$570,000,000. All such erratic predictions have been relegated to the realm of the absurd and sublimely ridiculous. The treaty provides that the cost of the deep waterways to the Dominion Treasury will be \$38,071,000. This total is reached by adding the \$22,320,000 to be spent in the International Rapids section for property damages, rehabilitation work, and the Chrysler Island Canal to the \$82,954,000 to be spent for locks and canals on the Canadian section, and by subtracting from the total \$67,202,500 to be paid by Ontario to the Dominion on account of power works in the international section. This total cost of \$38,071,000 may be cut to \$33,638,500 if a proposed guard lock at Beauharnois is found unnecessary, which is altogether probable. These figures are based upon the 1926 estimates made by the international board of engineers on the project and since revised by that board. It is not to be forgotten that general construction costs are now down about 30 percent. The reasonableness of this remark is based on the fact that the Livingston Channel, in the Detroit River, was estimated to cost \$7,000,000 and is now actually being built under contract for \$3,400,000. If the cost of construction were to remain as low as it is today during the years of construction the outlay by the Dominion Treasury might not amount to more than \$25,000,000. The cost to the United States is placed at \$243,661,000, made up of \$178,651,000 to be spent on the International Rapids section and \$65,100,000 for channel deepening and other necessary works in the upper lakes. Canada is given credit for \$128,000,000 spent on the New Welland Canal and for other construction work.

CANADIAN LABOR AND MATERIALS

Most of the construction work will be done in Canada. All the construction work on the national section will, of course, be done here, but there is more than that. Though the United States is to provide the \$54,718,000 for works situated on the Canadian side in the International Rapids section, Canadian engineers, Canadian labor, and Canadian materials are to be used.

I hope the Senate got that. This is a Canadian newspaper which says:

Though the United States is to provide the \$54,718,000 for works situated on the Canadian side in the International Rapids section, Canadian engineers, Canadian labor, and Canadian materials are to be used. All the labor and materials employed in the Canadian power development at Chrysler Island and Barnhart Island power plants is to be paid for by the Ontario Government and will, of course, be Canadian—

Why, certainly—

As indicated by the maps published in connection with the treaty, the international section, which reaches from a little below Prescott to a little below Cornwall, is 115 miles in length. Most of the development occurs in Canadian waters.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to skip just a bit of what is printed along that line and come to a reference to a very important part of this treaty.

MAY BUILD ALL-CANADIAN CANAL

Those who have been nervous about Canadian sovereignty should read article 5 of the treaty, which provides that each of the high contracting parties shall retain complete ownership of, and complete legislative and administrative jurisdiction over, all works lying on its own side of the international boundary, irrespective of the agency by which such works are constructed.

TIMELY GESTURE TO THE EMPIRE

Later on we read:

Chicago checked; Lake Michigan internationalized.

We ought to be proud of this. It seems like any time we can take a slap at Chicago, then everybody seems proud about it, but I see no reason for that, because Chicago's waterways are most necessary to all of us. What do they say about checking Chicago?

As already noted, the treaty itself puts an end to Chicago's ambition to drain the Great Lakes for the benefit of a deep waterway to the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Mississippi Valley.

It puts an end to the dream of Chicago. It puts an end to the dream of St. Louis and Cairo and Memphis and of Arkansas and of Mississippi. It puts an end, it says here, to all those things. I hope my able friend from Illinois heard me read it.

As already noted, the treaty itself puts an end to Chicago's ambition to drain the Great Lakes for the benefit of a deep waterway to the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Mississippi Valley.

Why, certainly; it is going to dry the Mississippi Valley to the point where it will be nothing but a floodgate. It will put an end to the navigation in the Mississippi Valley, according to this Canadian view of the matter. It will put an end to it because when you internationalize Lake Michigan and keep us from having the waters of that lake that are necessary to canalize that river in order to have all-the-year-round navigation you have bottled up the one great commercial waterway system of America that everyone thought should be kept open.

Away back yonder the President of the United States—I have forgotten which President it was—sent Robert Fulton down to New Orleans. Before he had invented the steamboat he was sent by Mr. Dearborn, the Secretary of War, down to New Orleans, La., to look into the proposition of cutting a canal between Lake Pontchartrain, leading into the Mississippi River, in order that the Mississippi River might be made a commercial waterway from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, and in order that it might be a great source of national defense in war time. Robert Fulton went down to Louisiana and reported back to the United States Government that there ought to be constructed a canal connecting Lake Pontchartrain with the Mississippi River.

BUILT AND PAID FOR BY LOUISIANA

The United States Government never did build that canal from Lake Pontchartrain to the Mississippi; but when the war came on with Germany, in 1918 the State of Louisiana was appealed to by the national authorities, and that State laid out a total sum of \$26,250,000 to build the canal between Lake Pontchartrain and the Mississippi River for the benefit of the people of the United States. We thought we were going to get our 26¼ million dollars back; we were entitled to our \$26,000,000 back; but, instead of paying us back the \$26,000,000 for building that canal between Lake

Pontchartrain and the Mississippi River, which everybody from Fulton's day down to now said ought to be built, you have taken our money, added about \$75,000,000 to it, and propose to give it to Canada to destroy this great project in the Mississippi Valley for the benefit of the port of Montreal.

I will read a little bit further from this article. I sometimes think, Mr. President, that we ought just to have an executive council, so that we might get along a little bit better. I tell you if this thing keeps going on the thing for us to do will be to move to Canada. If I had money enough to move to Canada, I believe I would go there; I want to get nearer my boss. Now I read a little bit further from this Canadian newspaper:

It provides that the abstraction of water through the Chicago Drainage Canal shall be reduced by December 31, 1938, to an amount not exceeding an annual average of 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to the domestic pumpage by the city of Chicago.

This arrangement, which permits a 9-foot channel to the Mississippi, cannot be varied except by international agreement. It is the first time in history that the United States has agreed to place the abstraction of water from Lake Michigan under international control. This really means that Lake Michigan is admitted by the neighboring Republic to be an international waterway, like the other Great Lakes. Henceforth it belongs definitely by international agreement to the St. Lawrence watershed and cannot be exploited for the increased benefit of the Mississippi watershed.

Do you think, Mr. President, that we who are living on the Mississippi River, who have stood the scourges of floods on that river year in and year out, who have seen our homes washed away, our agricultural land destroyed in the space of a nighttime, who have seen men, women, and children picked up in boats from the waters that come from all over the United States and have been flooded on that land—do you expect now that we are going to let you make us nothing but a dumping ground for the flood waters of this Nation, and that we are not going to be allowed to share in the international benefits of navigation when America has waters within its own confines? Is that going to be the policy of the United States? Are you going to turn your back on a flood-control project to which this Nation is committed and which involves an expenditure of \$1,000,000,000 or more, and take \$600,000,000 of that money and divert it to Montreal in order to give this country a port?

And what are you doing to New York? Why destroy the port of New York? Why destroy Chicago? Why destroy New Orleans? And you are doing the same thing to the ports of the Pacific coast. There is nobody sitting in the Senate from the Pacific coast who has studied this question sufficiently who does not know that if you are going to throw this whole thing over in the mountain part of this country to where it has got to go by Canada by the shortest route that can be provided to Great Britain, it is going to mean the condemnation of Pacific coast ports; it is going to mean the same thing to those ports that it is going to mean to Atlantic ports.

DEVELOP AMERICAN WATERWAYS

Mr. President, every man with any kind of pride is interested in the waterway improvement work that has been done from Florida up to the Great Lakes. I see my friend the Senator from Florida in his seat. We have been trying to get a canal cut across the peninsula of Florida in the United States. Such a canal would accommodate more commerce than the Panama Canal accommodates. We have been trying day after day and night after night to get this country developed not only through the means of Mississippi waterways and Ohio waterways and Missouri waterways, but we have also been trying to get a canal cut across the peninsula of Florida. Somebody said it would cost two or three hundred million dollars to do it; various estimates have been made of the cost; but, regardless of what estimates have been made of the cost, it could have been done for less than one third the amount of money that we are going to spend under this international treaty in order to benefit the port of Montreal. We have not built that canal; that is too expensive a proposition; we cannot complete the

Mississippi River improvement, that is going to cost too much; we cannot complete the Missouri River improvement; that is going to cost too much; we cannot complete the work on our ports and the work on our harbors because it is going to cost too much; but here we are in a treaty, in order to have the privilege of giving away Lake Michigan to Canada, in order to have the privilege of giving away the commerce of the Lakes we are to spend more money than it will cost for all the projects that have been mentioned and which are being held up today because it is said America has not got enough money to pay for them. What statesmanship! I graduated out of the class I formerly belonged to so long ago, Mr. President, until I do not feel at home.

As I said a few days ago in the Senate, something ought to be done to make us feel some consciousness of the welfare of our own people. I believe it is going finally to come down to a time when some one will propose a constitutional amendment to provide that members of the Cabinet and legislators who make and ratify treaties shall spend a few days in some other occupation and learn a little more about them, because when we become embroiled and entangled with these questions and with transactions and dealings of this kind with foreign nations we never come out of them except by giving up the rights and commerce of America and paying for foreign investments and foreign improvements in order that we may take away commerce from the United States.

Mr. President, I think I have talked enough on this matter. I am not going to read the remainder of this article, but I am going to send it to the desk and ask that it may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks; and, if possible, I ask that it be printed in regular size type, if there is no objection, because I should like to have the article read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule it cannot be printed in the regular size RECORD type without authority of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. LONG. Then I will just ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the article will be printed at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

(The article appears at the end of Mr. LONG's remarks marked "Exhibit A.")

Mr. LONG. I will say this word in closing. I ask Members on this side of the Chamber and on the Republican side of the Chamber, until they have had an opportunity to go into the points of this treaty not, preliminarily or otherwise, to commit themselves as being in favor of this monstrosity. I ask, regardless of any poll that may be made in the Senate, that no Senator preliminarily, conditionally, or otherwise, commit himself in the remotest degree or extent to the support of what is contained in this international treaty between Canada and the United States; and when this matter shall be properly before the Senate we will then be in a position to go into it from Dan to Beersheba and register our objections to the United States spending the money of its people for the benefit of Canada and thereby creating further unemployment among its own citizens.

EXHIBIT A

[Editorial from the Toronto Mail and Empire, Toronto, Canada. One of the outstanding newspapers of the Dominion. It expresses the joy and appreciation of Canada at the great victory won by Canadian statesmen in the St. Lawrence treaty between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington, July 18, 1932.]

WATERWAYS TREATY PROVIDES SHIP AND POWER CANALS AT SMALL COST TO CANADA

On its face the St. Lawrence Waterways Treaty signed at Washington yesterday by Hon. W. D. Herridge and Colonel Stimson is more favorable to Canada than any previous arrangement ever made with the United States. It is more favorable than anyone outside a limited Government circle could have hoped for. Though executed at the American Capital, it concedes to this country practically all the conditions long insisted upon by the most jealous guardians of Canadian rights. Congress must ratify the instrument before Parliament is asked to do so. The cost of the undertaking is to be borne mainly by the United States. The Canadian 2-stage plan in the international section is adopted in place of the United States single-stage plan. Canadian sovereignty over the works in Canadian waters is absolutely established. To

this end there is a complete segregation of the properties on the two sides of the border. Without altering in the slightest degree Canada's age-long policy of joint development of the St. Lawrence waterway, we obtain a 27-foot navigation channel from the Atlantic to the head of Lake Superior. What is still more important, we have retained the right to construct an all-Canadian waterway, at any time in the future, if the expenditure involved in such undertaking is deemed advisable. The judgment of the United States Supreme Court, requiring Chicago to reduce the extraction of water from Lake Michigan to a mere fraction of what it has been and is today, is embodied in the treaty.

OTHER ADVANTAGES SUMMARIZED

Not only this, the United States abandons its ancient contention that Lake Michigan is an "American lake." That great body of water has become forever, through this new treaty, an international body of water which belongs to the St. Lawrence watershed instead of to the Mississippi watershed. While enlarged canals will not bring great ocean liners to Toronto and other inland Canadian cities, it will greatly stimulate water-borne traffic to and from these cities by lake vessels and ocean tramps. Even Port Arthur and Fort William, more than 2,300 miles from the Straits of Belle Isle, will be in close touch by water with the shippers of Great Britain and the world. The deeper waterway means much not only to Ontario and Quebec and the prairie Provinces, for it also confers upon the eastern Maritime Provinces and even upon British Columbia opportunities for increased trade with the interior of Canada. On the eve of the imperial conference the treaty announces the creation of a larger field and new facilities for empire trade.

COST TO CANADIAN TREASURY ONLY \$38,000,000

No feature of the treaty is more surprising or more satisfactory than the low cost to Canada at which the undertaking is to be carried out. Because of want of information, the press has carried all sorts of extravagant statements as to the heavy financial burden with which the taxpayers were to be saddled in a time of depression. As late as last Saturday a Montreal newspaper estimated that the Canadian people would be mulcted to the tune of \$570,000,000. All such erratic predictions have been relegated to the realm of the absurd and sublimely ridiculous. The treaty provides that the cost of the deep waterways to the Dominion Treasury will be \$38,071,000. This total is reached by adding the \$22,320,000 to be spent in the International Rapids section for property damages, rehabilitation work, and the Chrysler Island canal to the \$82,954,000 to be spent for locks and canals on the Canadian section, and by subtracting from the total \$67,202,500 to be paid by Ontario to the Dominion on account of power works in the international section. This total cost of \$38,071,000 may be cut to \$33,638,500 if a proposed guard lock at Beauharnois is found unnecessary, which is altogether probable. These figures are based upon the 1926 estimates made by the international board of engineers on the project and since revised by that board. It is not to be forgotten that general construction costs are now down about 30 percent. The reasonableness of this remark is based on the fact that the Livingston Channel, in the Detroit River, was estimated to cost \$7,000,000 and is now actually being built under contract for \$3,400,000. If the cost of construction were to remain as low as it is today during the years of construction, the outlay by the Dominion Treasury might not amount to more than \$25,000,000. The cost to the United States is placed at \$243,661,000, made up of \$178,651,000 to be spent on the International Rapids section and \$65,100,000 for channel deepening and other necessary works in the upper Lakes. Canada is given credit for \$128,000,000 spent on the new Welland Canal and for other construction work.

CANADIAN LABOR AND MATERIALS

Most of the construction work will be done in Canada. All the construction work on the national section will, of course, be done here, but there is more than that. Though the United States is to provide the \$54,718,000 for works situated on the Canadian side in the International Rapids section, Canadian engineers, Canadian labor, and Canadian materials are to be used. All the labor and materials employed in the Canadian power development at Chrysler Island and Barnhart Island power plants is to be paid for by the Ontario Government and will, of course, be Canadian. As indicated by the maps published in connection with the treaty, the international section, which reaches from a little below Prescott to a little below Cornwall, is 115 miles in length. Most of the development occurs in Canadian waters.

MAY BUILD ALL-CANADIAN CANAL

Those who have been nervous about Canadian sovereignty should read article 5 of the treaty, which provides that each of the high contracting parties shall retain complete ownership of, and complete legislative and administrative jurisdiction over, all works lying on its own side of the international boundary, irrespective of the agency by which such works are constructed. Such works shall constitute a part of the territory and property of the country in which they are situated. This proviso is deliberately inserted to protect Canadian sovereignty over all structures lying on the Canadian side, even though these structures have been built with United States money. In addition to this, Canada retains the specific right to construct at any time in the future, wholly within its own territory, alternative channel and canal facilities along the Great Lakes or in the St. Lawrence River, including the international section of the St. Lawrence. It has a right to use for such purely Canadian canal purposes whatever water there may be necessary for the operation thereof. As we

indicated before, this clause places Canada in a position to build an all-Canadian waterway, if at any time in the future it is deemed wise to enter upon the expenditure involved in such an undertaking. This is one of the most important and one of the most satisfactory points in a treaty which fairly bristles with satisfactory points.

TIMELY GESTURE TO THE EMPIRE

The Ottawa Government regards this treaty as of great importance to Great Britain and the Empire. It was, therefore, anxious to have it signed before the opening of the imperial conference, and it is to be congratulated upon having obtained its wish in this respect. It is stipulated in one of the articles of the treaty that all British shipping in all parts of the Empire shall have the right to navigation in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence waterway for all time. This means that all British ships as well as all Canadian ships shall have access through the deepened water channels to the head of Lake Superior. In this sense, the Great Lakes are merged with the oceans. The Great Lakes become the Mediterranean Sea of North America. It is not expected that great liners will ascend the canals, but there will be an ever-increasing flow of freighters and ocean-going vessels carrying cargoes inland and returning with outgoing cargoes.

The deepened route will be of a special advantage to the shipping and trading industry of the United Kingdom, because, according to the gnomonic map projection, Montreal and Windsor, Ontario, lie in a straight line on the shortest route from Liverpool. The deep waterway will thus provide a remarkably direct route for the shipment of grain, flour, coal, and other commodities between interior Canada and Great Britain. We thus have Windsor, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, and Quebec (with Fort William and Port Arthur only a little out of line) on an invaluable imperial trade artery connecting them with the mother country.

CHICAGO CHECKED, LAKE MICHIGAN INTERNATIONALIZED

As already noted, the treaty itself puts an end to Chicago's ambition to drain the Great Lakes for the benefit of a deep waterway to the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Mississippi Valley. It provides that the abstraction of water through the Chicago Drainage Canal shall be reduced by December 31, 1938, to an amount not exceeding an annual average of 1,500 cubic feet per second, in addition to the domestic pumpage by the city of Chicago. This embodies the decree of the United States Supreme Court in international law. Chicago must cut its present flow from 8,180 cubic feet per second to the maximum prescribed in the treaty. This arrangement, which permits a 9-foot channel to the Mississippi, cannot be varied except by international agreement. It is the first time in history that the United States has agreed to place the abstraction of water from Lake Michigan under international control. This really means that Lake Michigan is admitted by the neighboring Republic to be an international waterway like the other Great Lakes. Henceforth it belongs definitely by international agreement to the St. Lawrence watershed and cannot be exploited for the increased benefit of the Mississippi watershed. It is further provided that there shall hereafter be no abstraction from the Great Lakes system to another watershed except by authorization of the international joint commission representing both nations. This constitutes a perpetual safeguard to the waters of the Great Lakes system from Port Arthur, Fort William, and Duluth to the Gulf of the St. Lawrence.

OGOKI WATERSHED AS COMPENSATION

Canada gains another victory over the so-called "Ogoki diversion." It has been known for a long time that Ogoki Lake, lying north of Lake Superior, and all the waters flowing into it, which now find their outlet in Hudson Bay, can be readily diverted into Lake Nipigon, and thus into the St. Lawrence River system. Canada thus gains the right to divert 4,000 cubic feet per second of water into Lake Nipigon for use in power developments on the Nipigon, St. Mary, and St. Lawrence Rivers. It is estimated that this additional flow of water will furnish 520,400 horsepower, and this is all to belong to Canada. There is another important point in the fact that this access of water from the Ogoki watershed will compensate for the limited loss for the drainage canal which is to be allowed Chicago. In this connection it is to be added that the United States is to spend millions of dollars on the construction of compensation works in the Niagara and St. Clair Rivers. These works will, the engineers say, furnish adequate protection for navigation all down the Great Lakes system to Montreal.

CANADA GETS 4,000,000 HORSEPOWER; UNITED STATES 1,000,000

The treaty has its power side as well as its navigation side. The work in the international section and in the national section will develop about 5,000,000 horsepower. Of this, 2,000,000 horsepower will be available in the international section and 3,000,000 in the national section. Canada—that is to say, the Province of Ontario—is to obtain 1,000,000 of the 2,000,000 horsepower to be produced in the international section, but all of the 3,000,000 horsepower to be developed in the national section, which is wholly in Quebec, will belong to this country. This means that Canada is to obtain 4,000,000 horsepower and the United States 1,000,000 horsepower out of the whole St. Lawrence waterway development. We thus come in on a basis of 4 to 1, which ought to be satisfactory to most hydroelectric enthusiasts and to most private power enthusiasts in Quebec. It is, of course, up to Quebec to use the power available in its own provincial area in the manner that it sees fit by agreement with the federal authorities. Our point at the present is that by the negotiation of this

highly favorable treaty with the United States, Ontario and Quebec are protected for long years to come against a shortage of power. This power means much to the industrial future of the nation, because it can be used to operate plants lying along 2,300 miles of deep-water navigation in full communication with every part of the world. This combination of cheap power and transportation facilities will be one of the most remarkable in the world.

GREAT ST. LAWRENCE INDUSTRIAL REGION

It is probably not going too far to predict that with this new canal and power development on the St. Lawrence River, with little cost to Canada, the Great Lakes region and St. Lawrence Valley will, in the next few years, be lifted into a place of industrial leadership. The present depression is only a passing phase. The deep waterways treaty, like the imperial conference, is a long step on the road toward the recovery of prosperity. As already indicated, with the deep-water channel to Great Britain and to other parts of the world, and with an abundance of cheap power for manufacturing purposes, a multiplication of industries along the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River is certain to occur within the next few years. We shall probably not be viewing the situation too optimistically if we say that the new St. Lawrence River development will give this part of North America a foremost place in industrial development. We believe, indeed, that the most highly industrialized section of the New World will bestride the international boundary.

IN HARMONY WITH PAST DEVELOPMENTS

We have already shown that there is to be no abandonment of Canadian sovereignty in the St. Lawrence. The treaty involves no departure from the historical Canadian policy regarding the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. For many years the Canadian and United States Governments have cooperated in improvements to navigation in order to provide larger and larger vessels with adequate accommodation and especially adequate depths of water. The United States has used our canals and Canada has used the American canals. Much of the excavation work in the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers has been done by the United States in Canadian waters, with, of course, Canada's consent. On the other hand, channels deepened by Canada have been free to the United States. A good deal of this sort of work and of compensation work remains to be done between Lake Erie and Lake Huron, in the Niagara River, in the upper St. Lawrence River, and in the lower St. Lawrence. Our contention is that in working with the United States under the restrictions embodied in the treaty there is no departure from our long-established national policy.

REMOVING OBSTACLES TO NAVIGATION

The primary object of the treaty is to provide a 27-foot waterway from the ocean to the head of the Great Lakes. This depth of water is already available for all but a small fraction of the distance. That fraction lies between Lake Ontario and Montreal. This part of the route, with its 14-foot canals, has for long constituted a definite obstacle to navigation. It has held up the development of the rest of the route. It renders the new Welland Canal, upon which we have spent \$128,000,000, or nearly four times as much as the new development is to cost the Dominion Treasury, comparatively useless. This is a matter in which all of Ontario, all of Quebec, and indeed the whole of Canada, are intensely interested. The time has come to remove the hiatus in order that the greatest lake and river navigation route in the world may come into its own. The missing link is to be fitted into the chain. It would be foolish to leave the job undone.

TRIUMPH FOR BENNETT AND HERRIDGE

The waterways treaty between His Majesty the King and the President of the United States was signed by the Hon. W. D. Herridge, Canadian minister at Washington, and by Hon. H. L. Stimson, United States Secretary of State. The Prime Minister has said that it fulfills the conservative pledge regarding the St. Lawrence made at the Winnipeg convention of 1927 and the Prime Minister's own pledge in the same connection, which he gave in Winnipeg during the general election of 1930. We are not surprised at his frank assertion that no big interests are to be allowed to block the enterprise.

The negotiation and the conclusion of the treaty illustrate the present Government's belief in the future of Canada. They also illustrate the driving power of the Prime Minister and his capacity for getting big things done. On the eve of the greatest Empire conference the world has ever seen, he has been able to announce this new Canadian and imperial arrangement with the United States. To Mr. Herridge goes the main credit for the negotiation of the treaty. Ever since last October he has labored night and day to bring it about. He has made countless trips between Ottawa and Washington on this special mission, and with the backing of the Premier he has been able to secure an instrument which concedes to Canada practically all of Canada's demands. He has obtained a treaty which places the bulk of the cost on the United States and involves the Dominion Treasury in an expenditure of less than \$40,000,000. This and his success in obtaining a greatly increased number of air channels from the United States for radio purposes, amply justify his appointment to the Washington post. He would not have accepted that position but for the prospect of doing these two jobs for Canada, and his double achievement marks him as an international diplomat of first-class order. We do not think that any Canadian will take exception to this statement. In the language of the street, he has carried the message to Garcia, delivered the goods, and brought home the bacon.