At the request of Ambassador Bryce, the Canadian Government and Canadian navigation interests were allowed four weeks in which to prepare memorials of protest against the application. At this hearing, on March 27th last, the case for the Canadian Government was argued by Daniel Mullin, K.C., of St. John, N.B. Protests were also filed by the Commission of Conservation, Dominion Marine Association, Shipping Federation, Montreal and Toronto Harbour Commissioners and Montreal, Toronto and Kingston Boards of Trade.

These were the first comprehensive presentations of the case that had been made and counsel for Chicago acknowledged that it was a very strong indictment. In the Reply, filed by the Chicago Sanitary District with the Secretary of War, seven days later, they attempted, but without success, to meet the arguments that had been preferred by the Canadians. The second statement of the Canadian Government traverses the various points raised in the Reply of Counsel for Chicago and is a sweeping arraignment of that city for its endeavour to abstract from the basin of the St. Lagrence an enormous volume of water, ostensibly to purify its sewage, but really to generate enormously valuable water-powers in the Desplaines river.

The "Conclusions" as set forth in the Second Statement on behalf of the Canadian Government are as follows:—

- 1. That there is no imperative necessity for such a large diversion of water from Lake Michigan for sanitary purposes, as is requested in the application.
- 2. That the historical facts presented in this brief shew conclusively that the Sanitary canal cannot be considered as the outgrowth and development of a scheme which has received recognition by the United States Government or that of the Dominion of Canada.
- 3. That the claim that the Sanitary District is entitled, as a matter of right, to the use of so much of the waters of Lake Michigan as may be necessary for sanitary and domestic purposes, cannot be entertained in so far as it relates to the extraordinary and wasteful use proposed.
 - 4. It has been shown that very substantial injuries have been,