

more, if in Manitoba waters Utah chub will have a negative impact on indigenous fishes and may become a nuisance to anglers and commercial fishermen (through sheer volume of catch in the nets). We expect Utah chub will compete with whitefish and walleye for food and likely displace, to a major extent, existing forage species, particularly minnows . . . Therefore, we consider this fish to represent the same potential for major impact as rainbow smelt or gizzard shad.

Now I shall quote some figures. The report gives a table of percentage reductions in population size. They use three figures, the lowest, the most likely, and the maximum. I will use only the most likely figures.

In the Lake Winnipeg north basin, the effect on the lake whitefish will be a 50 per cent reduction; on lake herring it will be 75 per cent; and on walleye and sauger 50 per cent. In the south basin of Lake Winnipeg, the effect on the lake whitefish will be a 5 per cent reduction; on the lake herring a 5 per cent reduction; and on walleye and sauger a 50 per cent reduction. In Lake Manitoba, the effect on the lake whitefish will be a 30 per cent reduction; on the lake herring it will be 75 per cent; and on walleye and sauger 75 per cent.

The end result of this potential hazard to Manitoba fisheries will be nothing short of disastrous. In all the studies and the bantering back and forth there is one very important group of Manitobans who have been ignored. I am referring to the native people in the province of Manitoba. In a report prepared by a Winnipeg consulting firm, Rieber-Kremers and Associates in 1969, concerning the impact of the Garrison diversion unit on Manitoba Indian communities, they point out that at present some 17,000 Manitobans would have their livelihood seriously affected. Projecting into the year 2033 when the Garrison Diversion Unit is expected to have its greatest impact, the population figure at that time is projected to include 37,000 Manitoba Indians. At present these people rely on the fishing industry for their livelihood. In 1979 the value of the fishing industry to natives in Manitoba was \$1.9 million. As well, native people rely on fishing for subsistence. In other words, they catch fish to stay alive.

I shall now quote from the Rieber-Kremers report as follows:

We now come to those impacts which are not known and have not been dealt with in government sponsored studies, namely, the area of socio-cultural impacts. The Indian people in the impact zone are identified as having a viable culture distinctly different from other Manitobans. Attempts on the part of the IJC and government agencies to analyse the impacts solely in the form of bio-physical terms have led to the absence of a detailed examination of the impact on the socio-cultural base resident within the communities and of possible far-reaching changes that could occur, which would have a serious and lasting effect on daily life. The threat of the project is not only to "income", as described above, but to the very survival of a whole way of life based on the land and water. This area of impact is perhaps the most serious and yet most difficult to quantify. However, it can be stated with reasonable certainty that because both commercial and subsistence fishing are an integral part of the communities' socio-cultural structure, that this base will be detrimentally affected as a result of the project.

To come a little closer to home, I want to speak about a community in the northern part of my constituency called Easterville. It has 800 to 900 people. Almost all of the people are native, non-status and status Indians. In this community there are roughly about two dozen full-time jobs, such as working for the band office, village office, the school, the co-op

store, and operating the "honey wagon." That is about it. There are no other full-time jobs in Easterville. The fishing season comes twice a year. During the fishing seasons almost every adult male makes his livelihood by fishing. That is the only income for the year for the vast majority of people in this community. If the fishing industry is reduced by 50 per cent, as has been projected because of the adverse effects of Garrison, serious effects on this community will be untold. I just hate to think of how it would hurt such a community.

Let me now summarize. We in Manitoba have not been reassured in the past with regard to the government's concern about the Garrison diversion project. We have not been reassured by the United States State Department or the Executive Branch that the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 will be adhered to. Construction goes on all the time while we get these reassurances. When President Carter was in power we had a brief respite when he cancelled a number of water projects. However, in the last year, in a mad scramble for votes, he went soft on environmental issues and allowed a rather sizeable appropriation for Garrison to get through the House. Nor are we reassured by what we see in the immediate future.

The new governor of North Dakota, Governor Olson, said that it was up to Manitoba to prove that any harm will come to the province. We have the proof from the IJC and from many other studies. We cannot accept that kind of an argument. We are not reassured by new President Reagan and his interior secretary Watt who have never been especially strong on environmental issues in the past.

The bottom line for myself, for my other colleagues from Manitoba, and, in fact, all Manitobans, is that we oppose the Garrison diversion unit as designed. If we are sending out signals to the Americans, I want to make it fundamentally clear that we do not mean to interfere in their internal politics. We do not care what they do with the water inside North Dakota. But when that water threatens the very livelihood of Manitobans, then we do care.

As a politician representing a Manitoba constituency, I must accept the doubts. We cannot afford to take the risks of allowing any of this foreign biota to come into Manitoba. I might remind hon. members that in the lakes of Manitoba the carp fish was not native to Manitoba until some fisherman brought it in there in his bait pail. Carp fish now run rampant through all of the major lakes in the province. I might also point out that in Australia rabbits were not native. I think we all know what has happened in Australia as far as the rabbit population is concerned, only two of which were originally brought into that country.

Therefore we cannot allow one bucket of North Dakota water containing a gizzard shad, a rainbow smelt, a Utah club, or whatever, to come into Manitoba. We will not accept the fish screen which has been proposed by the American constructors of the Garrison diversion unit. It is not feasible that such a screen could successfully protect Manitoba waters. We will not accept the feeble platitudes of American politicians, such as Governor Olson, that there is no proof that harm will