of a reference to International Joint Commissior under the Boundary Waters Treaty being inadequate; recalls the efforts already made to secure treaties on both the Niagara and Ogoki matters, viz., the 1929 Niagara Convention and the 1932 St. Lawrence Treaty, which besides involving the waterway, the Chicago diversion, compensation works in Niagara and St. Clair Rivers, and co-operation in developing the power in the international section of the St. Lawrence, included under Article 8, expecially designed for the Ogoki case, the 1925 principle of exclusive national use of water diverted from a national watershed into the Great Lakes system; notes that both treaties have so far failed of ratification in the U.S.

Canadian Government still supports Niagara and Ogoki projects; have discussed whole situation informally but repeatedly with U.S.; but regret there does not appear "at present much prospect of action on the lines you suggest."

As regards Niagara, U.S. present attitude is definitely to confine action to scenic beauty and postpone question of further power.

As regards Ogoki, it would be settled if the St. Lawrence Treaty were ratified on both sides, but no prospect of this appears during present session of U.S. Senate. The alternative of action on Ogoki question alone appears to have no prospect of success. Negotiation of a separate Ogoki treaty difficult because U.S. Administration would be unwilling to sidetrack the St. Lawrence Treaty, and anyhow could not undertake new negotiations in the present short pre-election session. If negotiated, such

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

