

claim by Michigan and other Great Lakes states that Illinois was diverting more than the 3200 cfs of water from Lake Michigan permitted by U.S. Supreme Court decree, leading to a mediated settlement between Illinois and the other Great Lakes states (with Michigan taking the lead in the mediation) on October 9, 1996.

Most recently, the National Wildlife Federation, the Michigan United Conservation Club (MUCC) and the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation have written to Governor Engler asking that he veto a diversion of groundwater from the Crandon mine in Wisconsin to the Mississippi River, arguing that this groundwater diversion is also covered by gubernatorial veto.³⁴ The environmental groups obviously see Michigan's recent positions on Lowell and the Chicago diversion surplus taking as evidence that Michigan would be the most likely state to protect the region.

It would also seem likely that Canada and its provinces, which have maintained a strict no diversion policy similar to Michigan, might find that Michigan (of all the Great Lakes states) best represents its interests when addressing water diversion issues over which Canada has no veto power. Yet, it is clear that the old facade of Great Lakes unity on water diversion policy is all but gone, and that compromises must be made to avoid the continued political brokering of future water diversion proposals. It is equally clear that the old no diversion policy has a strong symbolic value that still resonates positively among the voters in Michigan and Canada, and thus care must be taken to ensure that modifications of the out of basin water diversion policy are supported by the key stakeholders in Michigan and Canada.

Accordingly, the next section of this article examines the water diversion views of key stakeholders in Michigan and Canada to determine what criteria would be acceptable to adopt in order to reconstitute a politically acceptable, yet protective Great Lakes water diversion policy reflecting the new political realities of the region.

GREAT LAKES STAKEHOLDERS AND WATER DIVERSION POLICY

The official position of Canada and the Council of the Great Lakes governors on the issue of Great Lakes water diversion largely is reflected in the 1995 formal position of the Great Lakes Commission (GLC), created by interstate compact and representing the Great Lakes states including Michigan. The position of the GLC:

Indiana, Waukesha-New Berlin-Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Akron, Ohio, an increase in the Chicago diversion, and New York City.

³⁴National Wildlife Federation, et al.. Letter to Governor Engler. 7 February 1997.