C144336

plan: not all parts simultaneously but severally, subject to the general plan, as opportunity permitted.

Are more interested in St. Lawrence than in Niagara Treaty. St. Lawrence transportation would appeal to so many Western and Lake States, while St. Lawrence power would be free from the objection re strengthening private companies which arises in the Niagara power case.

Possibly a way might be found for further Niagara development on U.S. side consistently with public ownership principles.

Quite clear, in any case, it will be impossible reach agreement with U.S. on Niagara without agreeing on St. Lawrence as well.

Provision for exclusive power rights over Ogoki diversion waters is included in present St. Lawrence Treaty, which also provides a definitive settlement of the Chicago diversion question.

Suggestion has been made that St. Lawrence development might be agreed upon, conditional upon postponement of power super-structures on Canadian side for an agreed period after completion of navigation and power sub-structures (which in itself would require 6 or 7 years after ratification).

Whether possible, in such case, to provide early additional Niagara power water, according to provisions of 1929 Niagara Convention but with some variation of Protocol (which provides for intervention of Niagara Falls Power Co.), is a further question which would require consideration.

W.L.M. King Papers, Memoranda and Notes, 1933-1939
(M.G. 26, J 4, volume 210, pages C143987-C144597)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA