

These various bills are very much alike and they were grouped to save time and have all discussion on the general principle of the diversion. The bills provide for:

1. The creation of an Illinois waterway.
2. For the diversion of an amount, not to exceed 10,000 c.f.s. per day from Lake Michigan.
3. The conditions under which the diversion is to be authorized.

The subject is being considered under the following five heads:

1. Navigation of the Great Lakes.
2. Navigation of a waterway from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi River.
3. Chicago sewage sanitation.
4. Illinois River Valley sanitation and fish industry.
5. The damages to, and the destruction of, property in the Illinois River Valley.

The first set of hearings was continued from the 17th to the 20th of March and at this the undersigned was not present. The hearings were resumed on the 15th of April and continued until the 18th, when another adjournment was made. The Committee met again on the 28th of April and adjourned on the 2nd of May. At the two latter hearings the undersigned was present.

Those in favour of the various bills are principally Officials of the Sanitary District of Chicago, and, it is presumed, represent to a large extent, the citizens of that city. Besides these are a few people in favour of the navigation of the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers.

The opponents of the scheme are from the states bordering on the Great Lakes, officials representing various large cities such as Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, etc.; representatives from the Lake Carrier Association and other navigation interest, various interests in the Illinois River Valley, the province of Ontario, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, the city of Toronto and the Dominion of Canada.

The Sanitary District, briefly speaking, claims that it requires this water, primarily, for sanitation purposes and is only incidentally interested in navigation for keeping its canal in existence. Incidentally the water used for dilution is used for power. The District claims that the diversion is not a very serious matter in the navigation of the Great Lakes. That the lowering of the levels is only partially due to its diversion and that the power interests at Niagara and in the Welland canal are accountable for considerable lowering in Lake Erie. It claims that it cannot afford within a reasonable time to instal proper sewage disposal plants to purify the wastes and return the purified water to the lake fit for domestic purposes.

The opponents of the scheme rest their case upon the effect on navigation and show what a loss there is from the diminished draft allowed to vessels trading on the Great Lakes. They claim that riparian owners all along the lakes are being robbed of their rights; that there is a great waste in power development in that 10,000 c.f.s. will generate only 100,000 horse-power, if used in the Illinois River, whilst it may generate about 500,000 horse-power, if used in the St. Lawrence Waterway. They claim that neither the Secretary of War nor Congress has the right to authorize a diversion of such huge proportions from one watershed to another but were prepared to wink at a small diversion for the development of this new waterway, say 500 to 1,000 c.f.s.

Another party of opponents, coming from the Illinois Valley, object to the sewage being dumped on them; to having their beautiful river turned into an open sewer for the benefit of the people in Chicago. They also object to this large volume of water being allowed to flow down,

because it gives a flood condition all the time, aggravated, of course, during the spring. They have entered action against the Sanitary District for damages but have not been able to get any satisfaction in the courts. These people assert that they have spent over \$20,000,000 in building protection works and in installing pumping systems to clear the drainage from their property, the new level in the river is higher than the land along which it flows. These people pointed out that the sewage of Chicago had reached almost to the water supply intake for the city of St. Louis and that fish caught thirty-five miles from St. Louis had been rejected as unfit for food on the markets of that city.

A suggestion was made that the diversion be limited to 1,000 feet of water sufficient for canal purposes; that the Sanitary District be required within a term of about ten years to instal proper sewage disposal plants to take care of all the wastes from the city, and purify the water to a degree fit for a return to the lake. That, in the meantime, Chicago should be granted a gradually diminishing quantity of water, to a maximum of 1,000 c.f.s., the rate of decrease to be determined by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and that all the works should be placed under his care and supervision.

Chicago claims the right to use this water in view of the Waterways Treaty. She claims that Canada is out of court because of some reports by the International Waterways Commission and by the fact that the treaty allows Canada 36,000 c.f.s. at Niagara and the United States only 20,000 c.f.s. Careful perusal of the report of the Waterways Commission taken in conjunction with the treaty will show that a priority was settled as it is, because the Waterways Commission found that power plants were being built to take care of over 30,000 c.f.s. on the Canadian side and about 16,000 c.f.s. on the American side; that this 46,000 c.f.s. could be taken from the river without impairing the scenic beauty of the falls and without seriously affecting the level of Lake Erie. Two of the plants on the Canadian side were being built with American capital and were to supply power to the United States. They had contracts extending for a period of 50 years and it was found that the United States would be getting full share of the water. It is true that the Commissioners did say that Chicago should be allowed 10,000 c.f.s. but the framers of the treaty took no notice of this and made no reference to it. Evidently the Governments saw fit to take no account of the recommendations of the Commissioners in this regard.

The Committee resumes its hearings on Friday when the Sanitary District will answer the points brought forward by the opponents.

WM. J. STEWART,  
Chief Hydrographer.

OTTAWA, May 7, 1924.

ENCLOSURE 2 IN No. 66

Excerpt from *The Journal of Commerce*, New York City. Issue of Friday, May 16, 1924.

"CHICAGO COUNSEL ATTACKS BRITISH ATTITUDE ON LAKE:

"Washington, May 15.—Louis J. Behan, of counsel for the Chicago Sanitary District, objected before the House Rivers and Harbours Committee to-day to what he termed 'officious intermeddling in domestic affairs' by the British Government and to 'the efforts of a supposed sisterly nation to repudiate a treaty.'