

ba through the intricacies of international diplomacy and negotiation.

Through the efforts of the Canadian Government, agreement was reached in 1975 that the International Joint Commission would do a comprehensive study of the trans-boundary transfers expected to occur as a result of Garrison, a study I already referred to, Mr. Speaker. The IJC was also given a mandate to assess the impact of these environmental transfers on the ecosystem of Manitoba. It was 1977 before the IJC completed its report and made it public. Most people who live in Manitoba did not need to know the minute details of the report to grasp one basic conclusion that the IJC put forward, namely, that Garrison, if it were constructed and completed as designed in 1975, would have a serious impact on the waters of Manitoba. Not only that, but the study said it was likely that various kinds of fish alien to Manitoba would eventually find their way into the Province's lakes and rivers. With them would come the threat of competition for limited food sources and the possible waning of indigenous fish populations to be replaced by the hardier variety of southern fish.

Since the IJC report, Mr. Speaker, and on the strength of that report, Manitobans have been waging war against Garrison. The current Government has established a Garrison focus office to answer citizens' inquiries and to keep on top of the issue. I know the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake and other Members of the House from other Parties have travelled to Washington, along with Manitoba Cabinet Ministers, to lobby American legislators. Indeed, I had an opportunity to do this myself in September of 1981 when I was in Washington with a Canadian parliamentary delegation. I met with American politicians from North Dakota and Minnesota, and tried to get a meeting with Senator Mark Andrews, but he displayed the same kind of closed-mindedness that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine referred to. In fact, he was not even prepared to meet with me. I phoned one hour before the meeting and confirmed that he would indeed be meeting with me, and when I got there he had suddenly been called away. I had hoped to look him straight in the eye and just tell him what this project meant to Manitoba and what the Americans were doing to their relationship with us by being willing to go ahead with this come-what-may, despite the effects on Canada. But there was no opportunity to do that because, let us put it bluntly, he avoided me as I am sure he has avoided others on this issue.

My colleagues and I in the NDP, Mr. Speaker, are kept up to date on matters relating to Garrison by the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake, who has concerned himself with Garrison. I have been informed by him recently of allegations which emanate from the U.S. and involve bogus scientific information as distributed by the Department of the Interior. The information has to do with Garrison, and I would therefore like to move an amendment No. 28 that:

The Canadian Government do everything in its power to investigate charges that falsified information has been used in preparing U.S. environmental assessments relating to wetlands and wildlife habitats in North Dakota and that, further, the Government do everything in its power to ensure that no falsified

information has been used which might result in adverse environmental effects to Manitoba's waterways.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** The Chair would ask the Hon. Member if his amendment is in addition to the present text of the motion or does—

**Mr. Blaikie:** It is an addition and it will become item No. 4, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** The Chair finds the amendment to be in order.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, could we have copies of that amendment? Secondly, I assume it will be possible to discuss both the amendment and the motion at the same time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Yes. Debate is now open on the full text of the motion as amended. Strictly speaking, the debate would be on the amendment but the amendment includes the full text of the motion, so if you debate one, you debate them all. Also, the Hon. Member will get copies of the amendment.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Suzanne Beauchamp-Niquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, regarding the motion presented by the Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant):

That, ... the Government should consider the advisability of taking those measures necessary to ensure that there is no damage caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison Diversion Unit in the State of North Dakota and, that such measures to be considered could include—

And at this point, three suggestions are made. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with this opportunity to rise in the House today and address a matter of serious concern to the Government.

The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake is suggesting that the Government consider taking the measures necessary to ensure that no damage is caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison Diversion Unit in the State of North Dakota. The Government is very much aware of the risk of damage to the Manitoban ecosystem as a result of the present plans for the Garrison Diversion project, and consequently, it has taken steps to ensure that the United States does not renege on the assurances it has already given us that it will not undertake any work in connection with the Garrison project that might have a damaging effect on waters flowing into Canada. As the Hon. Member is aware, these assurances are based on the Boundary Waters Treaty concluded in 1909 between the United States and Canada, which provides, and I quote:

● (1610)

—waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other.

The assurances given Canada by the U.S. Government in connection with the Garrison Diversion project are also based