

of Reclamation engineers over the past half year, largely as a result of the technical consultative process developed last fall by federal and Manitoba officials and agreed to by the United States at the November 21, 1983 consultations in Ottawa.

The considerable success achieved by the Canadian Government in securing project modifications and safeguards for phase I features was evident at the most recent round of consultations held on April 25 in Washington. The Hon. Member is himself aware of the very positive results achieved by the Canadian delegation through the technical consultative process, and has gone so far as to stand in the House a week ago on May 1 to portray the April consultation as "good news" and even as "a breakthrough".

I believe that the Hon. Member's statement on May 1 is a more accurate and timely reflection of the success and status of government efforts to resolve the Garrison issue than is his motion which dates back to 1981. I agree, however, with his view that the April consultations represent an important step forward rather than a complete victory. I can assure him, therefore, that the Government will indeed continue diplomatic action through the technical consultative process to the point where no Garrison feature which potentially could damage or pollute waters flowing into Canada is constructed or contemplated. That said, I see no reason at this stage for the Government to adopt additional and unproven measures when measures already in place have already proven effective to the satisfaction of federal and Manitoban representatives.

The process to which I have referred a number of times already is one that is being pursued together by federal and Manitoban officials. It has two clear objectives: first, to ensure that technical modifications and safeguards for phase one Garrison features are fully adequate; and second, to obtain clear, credible and publicly convincing assurances from the U.S. Government that phase II as planned will never be built. These two objectives are based on recommendations of the International Joint Commission's report, which is and always has been the foundation of Canada's position on the Garrison Diversion unit.

With respect to project features defined by the United States as phase I, Canada has requested technical modifications and safeguards to eliminate the risk of accidental, inter-basin biota transfer, pursuant to the following recommendations of the International Joint Commission: