

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE PROTESTS VIGOROUSLY AGAINST WATER STEAL

Liberal Leader Joins With Premier in Slashing Con- demnation of Illegal and Unneighborly Action of Chicago — Ask Diplo- matic Representations to U. S. Government

GLOBE IS PRAISED FOR LEADING WAY

As a final act before prorogation, members of all three parties in the Legislature united yesterday in unanimous approval of a strong resolution condemning the Chicago water steal. The motion was introduced just before adjournment, with Premier Ferguson as the mover and W. E. N. Sinclair, K.C., as the seconder.

Speaking to the motion, Premier Ferguson spiked the diversion propaganda with a vigor that brought applause from all sections of the House. Chicago's tactics constituted, in his phraseology, a serious and flagrant violation of a solemn obligation. It was another case, he said, of a strong nation regarding its pact with its weaker neighbor as no more than a scrap of paper. Mr. Sinclair, following the Premier, gave the motion the complete concurrence of both himself and the party he led, declaring that there was no division of opinion and could be no such division in the House on a question of such vital importance to the people of the Province of Ontario.

Loss Equals Chippawa Power.

After reviewing the situation from the time of the signing of the treaty of Jan. 11, 1909, Premier Ferguson launched his offensive against the Chicagoans. By the additional abstraction of water necessitated by the drainage canal, Chicago was taking from Ontario the equal of 500,000 horsepower, or, he said, virtually the product of another Chippawa development. The diversion was a blow to the people of Ontario that would have acute effect in monetary and industrial loss, he continued.

"The persistent determination," stated the Premier, "of our Chicago friends to serve their own selfish interests regardless of the interests of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario in direct violation of a solemn agreement is a subject of such importance to us that I think we should voice our opinions on the matter and see that the full import of our views is communicated to Ottawa. To my mind, it is a most serious and flagrant violation of the agreement entered into by Great Britain and the United States in 1909."

Mr. Sinclair stated that he would be pleased to have the privilege of seconding the motion. "There certainly is no division in this House on a question of such vital importance to the Province of Ontario," he said. "The water rights referred to by the Prime Minister are the very life blood of the Province, and it is quite fitting that we, as the representatives of the Province of Ontario, should place our views before the country. I am satisfied that the Dominion Government will welcome the protest coming from this Legislature. On behalf of the Liberal party, I am glad to associate myself with the Prime Minister in protesting against this violation of the water rights agreement."

—The resolution read as follows: "That, in view of the application of the United States Congress for legislation to authorize a further diversion of water by the Chicago Drainage Canal from the Great Lakes system, this House desires to place on record the following facts and considerations:

Have Vital Interest.

"The Sanitary District of Chicago has for some years been abstracting large quantities of water which is part of the watershed of the Great Lakes and diverting it to the Gulf of Mexico. The Province of Ontario, as joint riparian owner with the neighboring States of the American Union, has a direct and vital interest in this matter.

"There is in existence a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, dated Jan. 11, 1909, which governs international boundary waters.

"It has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that this treaty expressly provides against uses affecting the natural level and flow of the boundary waters without the authority of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and the approval of the international Commission.

"That the application to the United States Congress for legislation to sanction a further diversion at Chicago is, in effect, a proposal to violate this treaty.

"That legal actions have been brought by several of the States of the Union to have it declared that the United States Congress cannot pass any act depriving those States of the advantage of the flow of said water, and that such actions are still pending.

"In view of these facts this Legislature is of opinion that attempts to deal with this matter by way of legislation without reference to Canada or its interests are not in accord with the long-established friendly relations that have existed between these two countries, and which ought to continue.

"That this Legislature therefore requests that proper steps be taken to represent to the Government of the United States, through diplomatic channels, the unneighborly character of the proposed legislation, and the desirability of reaching an early adjustment of the matter by a mutual arrangement in accordance with the terms of the treaty."

Globe Is Praised.

Frank Keefer, Conservative member for Port Arthur, who long has stated his opposition to the Chicago diversion, spoke briefly to the resolution, commending the press for keeping the question before the public, and in this connection paying particular tribute to The Globe for its part in advertising the injustice that Chicago was endeavoring to do to the Dominion. Mr. Keefer expressed the belief that the great majority of the people of the United States, once they became educated to what actually "was going on," would rise up in protest.