COPI

FILED

JAN 2 3 1957

JOHN T. PEY, Cle

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Nos. 2, 3 and 4, Original October Term, A. D. 1956

STATES OF WISCONSIN, MINNE-SOTA, OHIO and PENNSYLVANIA,

SOTA, OHIO and PENNSYLVANIA,

Complainants,

STATE OF ILLINOIS and the SANI-TARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO.

Defendants.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Complainant,

VS.

STATE OF ILLINOIS and the SANI-TARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, et al.,

Defendants.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

Complainant,

VS.

STATE OF ILLINOIS and the SANI-TARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 4 Original

No. 2

Original

No. 3

Original

RESPONSE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, COMPLAINANT, TO THE PETITION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS FOR EXTENSION TO FEB. 28, 1957, OF ORDER AUTHORIZING EMERGENCY DIVERSION.

Thomas M. Kavanagh Attorney General of the State of Michigan

By Edmund E. Shepherd Solicitor General

Attorneys for Complainant The Capitol—Lansing 2, Michigan

SPEAKER-HINES AND THOMAS, INC., STATE PRINTERS, LANSING, MICH.—1957



IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Nos. 2, 3 and 4, Original October Term, A. D. 1956

STATES OF WISCONSIN, MINNE-SOTA, OHIO and PENNSYLVANIA, Complainants, vs. STATE OF ILLINOIS and the SANI-TARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, Defendants.	No. 2 Original
STATE OF MICHIGAN,	
Complainant,	
vs.	No. 3
STATE OF ILLINOIS and the SANI- TARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants.	Original
STATE OF NEW YORK,	
Complainant,	
VS.	
STATE OF ILLINOIS and the SANI-	No. 4
TARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants.	Original
····	•

Response of State of Michigan, Complainant, to motion of State of Illinois for extension to Feb. 28, 1957 of order authorizing emergency diversion.

In view of the allegations set forth in Michigan's answer to the petition of the State of Illinois for temporary modification of Paragraph 3 of the decree in these causes issued on April 21, 1930 [281 U.S. 696], the State of Michigan does not oppose the motion of the State of Illinois for

extension to February 28, 1957, of the order entered by this Court on the 17th day of December, 1956, 352 U.S. 945, subject to the terms and conditions therein set forth. The fact that the State of Michigan does not oppose the motion of the State of Illinois, shall not be construed as an admission or evidence of the right of the State of Illinois, or any of its political subdivisions or other agencies, to divert any waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system except as provided in the Decree of April 21, 1930, as modified in this Court's order of December 17, 1956 or in Michigan's answer aforesaid.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas M. Kavanagh
Attorney General of the State of
Michigan

By Edmund E. Shepherd Solicitor General

Attorneys for Complainant The Capitol—Lansing 2, Michigan

CERTIFICATE

Edmund E. Shepherd, Solicitor General of Michigan, sworn, says that he has caused copies of the foregoing motion to be mailed to the following counsel at the following addresses, respectively:

Hon, Vernon W. Thomson Attorney General State Capitol Madison, Wisconsin Hon. Miles Lord Attorney General State Capitol St. Paul 1, Minnesota Hon. C. William O'Neill Attorney General State Capitol Columbus, Ohio Hon, Herbert Cohen Attorney General State Capitol Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Russell W. Root Attorney for The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago Law Dept., 100 E. Erie St. Chicago, Illinois

Hon. Jack P. F. Gremillion Attorney General State Capitol Baton Rouge 4, Louisiana Hon. T. J. Gentry Attorney General State Capitol Little Rock, Arkansas Hon. John M. Dalton Attorney General State Capitol Jefferson City, Missouri Hon. George F. McCauless Attorney General State Supreme Court Building Nashville, Tennessee Hon. Joe T. Patterson Attorney General State Capitol Jackson, Mississippi Hon. Jacob G. Javits Attorney General State Capitol Albany 1, New York

Hon. Jo M. Ferguson Attorney General State Capitol Frankfort, Kentucky J. Lee Rankin Solicitor General Department of Justice Washington, D. C.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11th day of January, 1957.

Notary Public.