

Adjournment Debate

commission cannot order the project stopped, only a court order can do that.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the state of Minnesota is taking court action against the state of North Dakota to stop this project. I understand the state of South Dakota is also entering into litigation with the state of North Dakota.

If the Lonetree reservoir is to be completed, then this will be the point of no return and the project cannot be stopped. Manitoba will be turned into a sewer. This is why the project must be stopped. Unfortunately the premier of Manitoba is taking no decisive action. He is being commended by the North Dakota legislature because he is going to take no action at all to have the project stopped.

I should like to point out that the Manitoba Environmental Council has stated that the United States Bureau of Reclamation is trying to bring work on the Garrison diversion irrigation project to the point at which the project would be unstoppable, regardless of its effect upon Canada. Ken Arenson, chairman of the environmental group, said Monday that the recent acquisition of land for the project's Lonetree reservoir is an indication that the bureau intends to complete the original project plan in spite of the fact that all available data indicates such a plan would pollute Canadian waters in violation of the boundary waters treaty between the two nations.

James Petrik, chief of the planning division of the Bismarck office of the Bureau of Reclamation in North Dakota, said the bureau was proceeding along guidelines set by the interior department. I hope the parliamentary secretary is getting the message tonight showing why we must call for a moratorium to stop this project.

The recommendations of Project "Garri", which was funded by the federal government to investigate this Garrison diversion project, included this recommendation among others that I have not the time to read tonight, that "all legal questions be answered before construction of the Garrison diversion unit continues". As I say, this project was funded by federal government moneys and we cannot ignore that. Another recommendation was that all bills concerning environmental protection should be given special consideration in all levels of government.

The Deputy Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management for Manitoba stated that Manitoba would not have any say in the matter if this project were passed on to the IJC to make a decision. That is why we have to make a decision tomorrow to make a protest against this project. Manitoba will be eliminated completely from any decision at all if this is placed in the hands of the IJC. This is clearly stated by the minister who has made some suggestion that it has been passed on to the IJC.

In addition, the Garrison project may jeopardize the quality of the waters of Lake Winnipeg. A top United States scientist warned that Canadian limnologists must study the effects the Garrison diversion project will have on Lake Winnipeg before irrigation from the project begins. That scientist was Dr. Dale Henegar, chief of fisheries for the North Dakota State Game and Fish Department. He said in an interview that the possibility exists that the water quality of Lake Winnipeg will be

dramatically changed and the lake might become a second Lake Erie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member as his allotted time has now expired.

Mr. Herb Breau (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, the effects on Canada of the proposed Garrison project in North Dakota have been under active study by officials of the federal and Manitoba governments for some time, and have also been the subject of a number of exchanges by the governments of Canada and the United States.

Since 1969, by means of a series of diplomatic notes and meetings, the Canadian government has sought information on this proposal by the United States Bureau of Reclamation to irrigate up to 250,000 acres of land in the Souris and Red River basins with water from the Missouri. These efforts culminated in October, 1973, with the presentation of a note to the United States State Department in which the government of Canada expressed the view that the project as proposed would violate the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

In the note the Canadian government sought assurances that the United States would honour its obligations under the treaty to protect fully Canadian property and health from being adversely affected by transboundary pollution from the project. In February, 1974, the United States government gave assurances that the United States would honour its obligations under the treaty and pledged that no project construction potentially affecting waters flowing into Canada would be undertaken unless it were clear that these United States obligations under the treaty would be met.

Following on this exchange of notes, and a further exchange of technical studies undertaken by both sides on the potential effects on Canada of the Garrison project, Canadian and United States officials met in Ottawa on August 28, 1974, and again in Washington, D.C., on January 16, 1975, to discuss this subject. The Canadian position at these meetings was that the Garrison diversion unit, as currently envisaged, would have adverse effects on the Souris, Assiniboine and Red Rivers, and ultimately Lake Winnipeg, which would cause injury to health and property in Canada. The United States officials reiterated the assurances set forth in the United States' note of February 6, 1974.

Hon. members will recall that in the January, 1975, Canada-United States meeting in Washington Canada put forward the informal suggestion, on an *ad referendum* basis, that the issue be referred to the International Joint Commission for study and recommendations. Following further exploratory talks with the United States, and with the full concurrence of the Manitoba government, we are now discussing with the United States the possibility of a joint reference to the commission under Article IX of the Boundary Waters Treaty on the basis of a Canadian draft. If this proposal is to be pursued with the commission, it will have to be on the basis of language acceptable to both countries which, on the Canadian side, clearly recognizes that significant modifications are required to the project as now conceived. Any final decision by Canada on the